

# 300 IELTS WRITING SAMPLES ESSAY

# **DO YOU NEED A TUTOR?**

YES IELTS HỌC IELTS ONLINE TƯƠNG TÁC CÙNG GIÁO VIÊN IELTS 8.5

https://www.facebook.com/ielts9onlinecourse/ https://yesielts.net/ 070 676 2826 www.ielts2.com

Some sports are extremely dangerous but many people still like them very much. Why do people take part in dangerous sports? Give some suggestions on how to deal with these dangers.

In recent years we have seen a considerable rise in dangerous or extreme sports. This essay shall discuss some of the main reasons why people engage in such sports and suggest ways in which some risks involved in such sports can be reduced.

The main reason why people go for dangerous sports is that they get the thrill out of them. They like taking risks. They like to challenge their abilities and potentials. They feel a sense of satisfaction when they come face to face with fears while bungee jumping, rock climbing and so on. In addition, going through a dangerous experience gives them courage and confidence to face the hurdles of their daily life.

Another reason for pursuing such sports is that there is a lot of fame and money involved in them. They get attention by doing stunts on motorcycles and jumping from tall buildings. They make headlines in newspapers and TV News Channels. They feel great when their name comes in the Guinness Book of World Records. Once they get famous they get a lot of money also. For instance, many businesses hire them to endorse their products. They also get jobs on the basis of such skills.

Many steps can be taken to reduce the risks are that involved. Firstly, these sports should be done under strict supervision. All safety precautions should be taken. Such sports should be performed after sufficient training and under supervision of adults. Sport companies which cater to such sports should require a licence for providing such training. Some people suggest banning some sports. However, I do not believe that banning is a good solution. We all know that forbidden fruits taste sweeter and people will do such sports in hiding which would increase the risks involved.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, people do such sports for fun, for money and for fame. However, such sports should be performed after sufficient training from licensed companies and under some supervision.

# People try new dangerous sports such as sky-diving or rock climbing. Should such sports be banned?

In recent years we have seen a considerable rise in dangerous or extreme sports. Although I do not support an outright ban on such sports, I do feel that the government should regulate such sports so that they are played under supervision which will minimize the risks.

It is irrefutable that dangerous or extreme sports can cause injury or even death to the individuals. However, banning such sports is not the answer. Instead, the government should ensure that the companies or centres which provide the facilities for such sports should meet the required, legal safety standards. Another argument against banning is that then people would play them in hiding and then they would be even more risky. After all we all know that forbidden fruits taste sweeter.

Furthermore, if government bans such sports, it could be viewed as an infringement of the rights. Those who choose to participate in these sports know the consequences. They know very well what is good or bad for them. They argue that if such sports are banned, then all those other things that are harmful for individuals should be banned like smoking, drinking and eating fast foods.

What is more, those sportsmen who excel in such sports bring name and fame to their country. They break records set by others and when they do so, the name of their country shines in the whole world.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, such sports should be performed after sufficient training and under supervision of experts. Dangerous sport companies should require a license for providing such training. To lay a ban on such sports is not the answer.

When families have a meal together it is considered social activity. Do you think eating together is important to people in your country?

It is irrefutable that eating together is a social activity. Sharing dinner together gives everyone a sense of identity. It can help ease day-to-day conflicts, as well as establish traditions and memories that can last a lifetime.

The first and foremost advantage of eating together is that it creates a sense of belonging. Conversations during the meal provide opportunities for the family to bond and learn from one another. It's a chance to share information and news of the day, as well as give extra attention to your children and teens. Family meals foster warmth, security and love, as well as feelings of belonging. It can be a unifying experience for all.

Secondly, family mealtime is the perfect opportunity to teach appropriate table manners, etiquette, and social skills. Parents can be perfect role models in this and children learn by following them. What is more, meals prepared and eaten at home are usually more nutritious and healthy. They contain more fruits, vegetables, and dairy products along with additional nutrients such as fiber, calcium, vitamins A and C, and folate.

Furthermore, research shows that frequent family dinners (five or more a week), are associated with lower rates of smoking, drinking, and illegal drug use in pre-teens and teenagers when compared to families that eat together two or fewer times per week. To add to it, children do better in school when they eat more meals with their parents and family.

In my country most people do value shared mealtime. However, the fast paced life and influence of the global culture is taking some away from this custom. Fortunately, some recent studies have shown that even in the developed countries people are realizing the importance of family meals and are downshifting. It is indeed time to bring the "family" back to the dinner table.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that eating together is definitely an important social activity. That is why it has been said that, \_The family that eats together stays together'.

Some people say that parents have the most important role in a child's development. However, others argue that other things like television or friends have the most significant influence. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Human development is a complex interplay of many factors. Some individuals are of the opinion that parents have the most significant role in a child's development whereas others opine that friends and other environmental factors such as TV have a more important role. It is necessary to look at both arguments before forming an opinion.

Parents have direct interactions with the children. They provide a sense of identification to the child. These have their greatest effect on intellectual development and character traits. They also play a very important role in the socializing process of the child. Right from the bed time stories to the behavioral habits parents play a very important role in making a child a responsible citizen. They know their child's temperament better than anyone else. They can provide critical input better than anyone else. That is why it is believed by some that parents have the strongest role in a child's development.

Friends, on the other hand, are important in order to help children grow emotionally and socially. Children find out who they are by comparing themselves to others. They learn about attitude, character and personality. Building good relationships boosts a child's self esteem and they find comfort in those friendships when things get tough such as losing a pet or facing family problems. Therefore, friendships are essential to assure children develop a healthy psyche. When kids are surrounded by friends or have one close friend, they have better self esteem, feel a sense of well being and experience fewer social problems.

Television is also one of the most prevalent media influences in kids' lives. How much impact TV has on children depends on many factors: how much they watch, their age and personality, whether they watch alone or with adults, and whether their parents talk with them about what they see on TV.

In my opinion, we cannot generalize as to what has more significance. In the early years family generally has more impact but in adolescence peers and TV may impact more. It appears that the power of the peer group becomes more important when the family relationships are not close or supportive. For example, if the parents work extra jobs and are largely unavailable, their children may turn to their peer group for emotional support.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that behavior is affected by a complex interaction of many different factors such as parents, peers and environment. All these are inextricably linked in the development of children. There is individual variation and therefore it is difficult to generalize which factor plays the most significant role.

# Wild animals have no place in the 21st century, and the protection is a waste of resources. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

I disagree with the notion that wild animals are redundant in the current century and therefore we need not waste our precious resources in protecting them. I believe that the conservation of these species should be our top priority as they are our most precious resources. In the following paragraphs I shall put forth my arguments to support my views.

The most important reason for saving wild animals is that they are part of our ecosystem. Every species of wildlife plays a role to maintain the balance of life on Earth. Thus, the loss of any species can affect us directly or indirectly. Let us consider species to be like a brick in the foundation of a building. We can probably lose one or two or a dozen bricks and still have a standing house. But by the time we have lost 20 per cent of species, we are going to destabilize the entire structure. That's the way ecosystems work.

Secondly, wild animals provide many valuable substances such as medicine and fur. The horn of the rhinoceros has medicinal value and the fur of the mink is very valuable. The recreational viewing of animals at zoos is also a source of revenue. Thus, the financial value of wild species is important to the economies of many nations.

Finally, wild animals have aesthetic appeal. They are beautiful creatures of nature and are a part of our bio-diversity. Their beautiful and mysterious life has enchanted mankind since the dawn of evolution. Scientists have been awed by observing their behavior. Such study has helped scientists understand how the human body functions and why people behave as they do. Scientists have also gained medical knowledge by studying the effect of many drugs on these animals.

In conclusion, the protection of wild animals in the 21st century is by no means a waste of resources. In fact it should be the most important global priority today. I pen down by a quotation – —Scientists know we must protect species because they are working parts of our life-support system.

Some people claim that there are more disadvantages of the car than its advantages. Do you agree or disagree?

Someone has rightly said that - — The car has become an article of dress without which we feel uncertain, unclad, and incomplete<sup>||</sup>. In my opinion, the advantages of the car outstrip its disadvantages.

There are many advantages of car. The most important advantage is that it has given people freedom of movement. The ease of transportation which a car brings is more than any other form of transportation. For instance, you can go from destination to destination and no time is wasted waiting for the bus or train.

Therefore, time and distance are not a barrier any more. What is more, families can go out together. This becomes especially helpful when there are elderly or the disabled and sick members in the family.

Furthermore, the automobile industry provides jobs to millions of workers. Filling stations, restaurants, and other businesses that serve automobile travelers are of major importance to a country's economy. In addition, many developing nations have begun making automobiles to boost their economy. That is why India has promoted many automobile manufacturing industries such as Tata and Mahindra.

On the other hand the disadvantages of the car cannot be overlooked. The increase in pollution, traffic jams and accidents are the natural sequelae to the burgeoning population of cars. Moreover, our overdependence on cars can lead to decrease in practices such as walking and cycling and this has led to a number of diseases such as obesity.

On balance, the advantages to people's lives and the economic impact created by the car definitely outweigh the disadvantages. However, we must know when and how-much to use the car so that we can minimize the demerits to some extent.

Tobacco is a kind of drug. People have been free to use it. Some people think that it should be illegal to use it comparing with other drugs. To what extent do you agree or disagree? What is your opinion?

#### (Against banning)

Every year, thousands of people worldwide die from both smoking tobacco and involuntarily breathing it in. Despite this, I do not agree that it should be made illegal. However, I also believe that there should be a regulation on its use, considering its harms to health. In the following paragraphs, I shall put forth my arguments to support my views.

It is irrefutable that tobacco products, especially cigarettes, could cause lung cancer, heart disease, and other illnesses. Drug abuse also has many potentially harmful effects not only on individuals but also on family, friends, work and society. Frequent drug users may turn to crime to meet the increasing expense for their habit. Continued drug use may cause personality changes. Some users lose interest in school or work, or have difficulty meeting the responsibilities of a job or family.

Nonetheless, it costs society far more to prohibit a drug than it does to regulate it. And I'm not talking about just money. Prohibition creates organized crime, and with it you get street wars, and police corruption. With more violence comes more police, and that means more cost. Regulation on the other hand, works quite well. The government should decide who gets to make it, who sells it, and who it is sold to. There should be controls on tobacco regarding potency, packaging, advertising, and a lot of other things. This is definitely better than banning a drug which leads to organized crime.

Moreover, tobacco has long been a source of money for the governments in many countries. This income comes from taxes on the manufactured products. Excise taxes also come from tobacco that arrives from other countries. Finally, I believe that it is better to educate people about the harms of tobacco. This approach has worked better in many countries and there has been a reduction in the sale of tobacco products

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, banning tobacco is not a good idea. Drug prohibition has been the most failed social policy and banning tobacco is a step backwards. However, there should be control on the manufacturing and sale of tobacco.

Tobacco is a kind of drug. People have been free to use it. Some people think that it should be illegal to use it comparing with other drugs. To what extent do you agree or disagree? What is your opinion?

#### (For banning)

Every year, thousands of people worldwide die from both smoking tobacco and involuntarily breathing it in. Therefore, I agree that it should be made illegal considering its harms to health. In the following paragraphs, I shall put forth my arguments to support my views.

It is irrefutable that tobacco products, especially cigarettes, could cause lung cancer, heart disease, and other illnesses. Smoking tobacco kills more than alcohol, drug abuse, car crashes, murders, suicides, and fires combined. World-wide some 3 million people die from smoking each year, 1 every 10 seconds. Smokers are more than 20 times more likely to develop lung cancer than non-smokers, and smoking can lead to a host of other health problems, including emphysema and heart disease.

The detrimental effects of cigarette smoke are not just on the active smoker, but also on the passive smoker. Smoking tobacco not only gives the smoker a high chance of an early grave it gives those around him/her the same chances due to second hand smoke. What is more, a child born to a woman who has actively or passively smoked during pregnancy has chances of developing congenital defects.

Drug abuse also has many potentially harmful effects not only on individuals but also on family, friends, work and society. Frequent drug users may turn to crime to meet the increasing expense for their habit. Continued drug use may cause personality changes. Some users lose interest in school or work, or have difficulty meeting the responsibilities of a job or family.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, one of the main responsibilities of any government is to ensure the safety of its population, that is why taking tobacco should be made illegal.

Some people say that the government should not put money on building theatres and sports stadiums. They should spend more money on medical care and education. Do you agree or disagree?

It is a highly debatable issue whether the government should spend money on medicine and education rather than on theatres and sports stadiums. In my opinion, all these things are important for the people and therefore, the government should allocate equal resources for both.

Basic medical care is very important for the general public. If people are healthy, there will be more productivity of work and the country will prosper as a whole. There are many people who live below the poverty line and it is the government's responsibility that they should receive medical aid whenever needed. There are also the elderly who have paid taxes throughout their working life and now need good medical care.

Good education facilities are also the duty of the government. Today, there are a number of children from deprived backgrounds who get substandard education. They would definitely require a high quality of education if they are to succeed in later life. What is more, an educated society has less crime and violence and the country gets good recognition in the whole world if its people are educated.

On the other hand, theatres and sports stadiums are equally essential for people. Art and entertainment is also a basic human need. Theatrical shows provide entertainment and at the same time preserve our culture and tradition. Our artists earn name and fame for our country. Sports stadiums, similarly, attract millions of spectators to watch matches every year. Many more millions watch games on television, read about them in newspapers, and discuss them with their friends. Therefore, we cannot say that these are unnecessary expenditures and therefore the government should ignore them.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, medicine and education are needs that we recognize, but theatrical or sports events are also basic needs. Therefore governments should allocate resources for both these things.

Some people think that children should learn how to compete, but others think that children should be taught to cooperate to become more useful adults. Express some reasons for both views and give your own opinions.

It is a highly debatable issue whether children should learn to compete or co-operate in order to become productive citizens of society. In my opinion, both competition and cooperation are necessary virtues of life and children should learn both. What is more important is to teach children where they need to compete and where they need to cooperate.

Competition is very important in life. Children can be taught to compete when they prepare for the exams or when they play solo sports like athletics. They have to learn to compete to excel in studies or win a race or any athletic event. This virtue comes handy in adult life. For example, when they do any business, they have to compete with other businessmen to succeed in business. Definitely, successful businessmen are useful adults in society.

On the other hand, there are many fields where cooperation is needed. Children can be taught this virtue in the sports field when they play team sports like cricket and hockey. They can also be taught cooperation when teachers give them group assignments in studies. This virtue also makes them useful adults because they have to cooperate in many fields of life. For instance, when they work as scientists to research the treatment of diseases like cancers and AIDS then it can never be a one-man show. It has to be a joint effort. Software developers also have to work as a team to bring benefits to all of us who use technology nowadays.

There are also situations where both competition and cooperation are needed simultaneously. For example, when children do team sports, they learn to cooperate with their team members and at the same time they learn to compete with the opposite team. Similarly, in adult life they have to learn to cooperate with their country-men to compete with those of other countries. We all know that today's era is highly competitive and the big planet Earth has shrunk to a global village. For example, Indian auto industries have merged to compete with the German and Japanese industries. So, competition and cooperation go hand in hand.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, it is clear that children should be taught both - to compete as well as cooperate and more importantly where in life they have to apply these attributes.

# The world would be a much poorer place without colour. To what extent would you agree or disagree.

Colours are one of the greatest blessings that god has bestowed upon people in the world. Have you ever thought what it would be like to live in a world without colour. Forget everything for a moment and start using your imagination. Try to think how you would feel if people, cats, dogs, birds, butterflies and fruits had no colour at all. You would never want to live in such a world. Would you?

Colours have a crucial role in man's communication with the outside world and in the proper functioning of his memory. Hearing or touch alone, are not enough to define objects. How can we define colourless flowers placed on a colourless table.

Human eye can recognise millions of colours. Identifying objects and our surroundings are not the only benefits of a diversity of colours. Colours also give us a lot of pleasure. The beautiful blue sky, the blood red sunset or a rainbow after a rainfall do add happiness to our lives. The colours of nature have been arranged so as to appeal to the human soul. Nowadays some prisons are painted pink and green to put prisoners in a better mood.

Colours hold a special significance in our culture also. In some parts of the world white is worn for weddings and black for funerals. In other parts white is the colour of mourning. Red is the symbol of love. Red also represents danger. Blood is red; fire engines are red and traffic signals are also red.

Colours also reflect the personality of a person. The colour of your clothes can have a considerable impact on how you are perceived. Light colour reflects a sober personality. Colours also have been used as a treatment of some mental disorders.

To put it in a nutshell, I can say that the world would definitely be a much poorer place without colour. They add life and beauty to our world.

The computers are widely used in education and some people think that teachers do not play an important role in the classroom. To what extent do you agree?

It is irrefutable that computers have become an indispensable part of education but I disagree that teachers do not play a significant role in the classroom. I believe that no amount of technology can ever replace the teacher. In the following paragraphs, I intend to support my views with my arguments.

It is an undeniable fact that teachers can never lose their importance. In learning and practice of more complex ideas, the computer is not adequate. It can tell if the answer is right or wrong but it cannot tell where the student went wrong. Tasks involving reasoning cannot be taught using computers. Moreover, teachers add their own knowledge gained through experience to that of books and other resources.

Furthermore, teachers can stimulate interest and it is an undeniable fact that interested stimulated people tend to learn more. They can keep students focused on study. A student studying by himself may get bored and stop studying. Teachers can provide a faster and simpler way to present information to the students. They can come down to the level of a student and so are definitely better than computers. What is more, teachers are role models for students. They are scholars in action. They not only teach academic subjects, but also many social skills.

On the other hand, it is also true that the use of computers in today's classrooms is also the need of the day. Teachers should use computers to add innovation to their teaching methods. Power point presentations can make even the dull and boring subjects seem interesting. So computers and teachers should not be treated as rivals to each other. They should play a complementary role so that today's classrooms become very interesting and our children can compete with other children of this global village.

To put it in a nutshell, I can say that, no doubt computers are being used in the classrooms but they can never replace the teacher.

Some people think that charity organizations should only offer help to people of their own country. But others believe that these organizations should give aid to people in great need wherever they live. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

—To have enough to share; to know the joy of giving; to thrill with all the sweets of life - is living. Helping others is a very virtuous thing. Charities help in basically two ways. One is by offering support to people in their own country, and the second is by helping the needy irrespective of their country. In this essay I intend to delve into the benefits of both approaches.

There are many advantages if charities help their own country's people. Firstly, these organisations remain directly in touch with the needy. They can see how the money or other the other resources provided by them are being used. It has been well said that charity begins at home. What is more, domestic charities target problems specific to their home country, for instance the Help Age India is an Indian charity providing help for the aged in India.

There are also many advantages if these organisations help the needy in any corner of the world. In such cases these organisations work on a larger platform and provide help for global issues. A larger platform is a must if one has a lot to offer in charity. Help activities can be better spread through a larger network. Help need not be always in the form of money. It can be in the form of services also. For example, these organisations can provide doctors and teachers who volunteer to provide medical aid and also teach in the under-developed nations.

Help in any form is good. The condition of one's country could influence the way of helping. In a developed country, where even the poorest of the poor has the basic amenities of life, it would be better to help in any part of the world where people need help. But, in the case of a developing or underdeveloped country it would be better to help those around you.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that the purpose of charity organizations is to help people in need and it does not matter where this help goes. If people of the home country need help then it would certainly be advisable to help those around you first.

9<sup>th</sup> October AC - IELTS essay - India

<u>History tells that people have often thought about creating an ideal society, but most of the times fail in making this happen. What is your opinion about an ideal society?</u> <u>How can we create an ideal society?</u>

If we look at history, it is clear that since time immemorial, people have always wanted to create an ideal society but have been unsuccessful. In the following essay, I intend to discuss what makes an ideal society and how we can create one.

An ideal society is a society where needs of the people regardless of their race, religion or wealth would be met. Many great thinkers, such as Plato, Thomas More and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. have offered their opinions on this to the public over the years. However, these dreams failed because different people have different ideals about a perfect society. To make it happen, either the ideals of all the people have to be fulfilled, or all the people would have to have the same ones.

Imagine a society with no crime, no terrorism, no warfare, no conflicts of cultures, no racism, no gender discrimination, no poisoned tongues, no killing, no lying, no stealing, no adultery and no excuses. Such a society can never exist. It would be wrong even to think of one. A perfect society needs some kind of social inequality, or as I call it, a distinction in ability. Those in the higher strata of society would be there because of their superior abilities and have greater responsibilities and, therefore, a higher social standing. An ideal society should have some struggle. If you had no struggle in life would you be happy? No, because that takes all the fun and enjoyment out of the difficulty, the losing, the failures, and the overcoming, the victory, the success.

There are many ways in which we can make an ideal society. First of all, there must be democracy and a strong government which has the ability to rule over the country. It should try to make the citizens life better by making better social and financial conditions to live. There should be no corruption in the government. Finally, I believe, one of the most necessary things of ideal society is freedom. No people and no society are happy and ideal when they are not free. However, we must remember that -\_One's freedom ends there where other's starts'. If we will feel free and do not disturb others freedom we will have ideal society. An ideal society would allow complete freedom to everybody and complete individuality.

To sum up, I pen down saying that, a perfect society is difficult to attain as everyone has different concepts of an ideal society. However, if we all respect our freedom and in doing so know our limitations, so that others can enjoy their freedom then it can be called an ideal society.

#### 14<sup>th</sup> October essay (AC)- India

Some people believe that tourists should accept social and environmental responsibility while others believe that tourists should not accept any responsibility at all. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is irrefutable that tourism industry has become the backbone of many economies of the world. No wonder all countries are opening their doors to tourists. The negative social and environmental impacts of tourism have led many to suggest that tourists should accept responsibility for this. I definitely agree with this notion. Eco- tourism, sustainable-tourism, responsible-tourism, modern-tourism or whatever name you may like to give it, is the need of the hour. In the following paragraphs, I intend to put forth my arguments to support my view.

The most important reason why tourists should be responsible is that many tourist destinations are endangered now because of the litter and pollution spread by the tourists. For example, the Sukhna Lake in Chandigarh, which is a popular tourist spot, once got so badly damaged by the wrappers and plastic bottles which tourists threw that no boating could be done there and it smelled so bad that people stopped going there. It took months to get it cleaned up and restore tourism there. The local people and the governments cannot handle such situation effectively unless the tourists themselves lend a hand by being careful.

Secondly, there is over-consumption of resources by tourists such as of water and fuel and this is incompatible with sustainable development. Tourist demand for resources such as water and food may also compete with the needs of local people and may lead to injustice with the locals. For example, in Shimla, a popular hill station, tourists stay in five star accommodations and take two showers a day where as the people outside are short of drinking water. To add to it many tourism activities such as skiing, boating, motorised water-sports, and trekking represent a stress to fragile ecosystems. Who will welcome the tourists to those places if tourists don't accept responsibility? Instead of five star accommodations, they could live with the locals and be satisfied with one shower a day.

Finally, if tourists do not respect the local people's culture and environment, then the natives would be hostile towards them and the whole purpose of tourism would be lost. For example, in our religious places, it is customary to cover our head and take off our shoes. If tourists don't do so they would not be welcome by our people there. So, the onus is on the tourist to know beforehand the norms of the place and fortunately nowadays, everything is available on the net or one can get all information from the tour operators.

Responsible tourism is everyone's responsibility. The well being of the destination is not only the responsibility of the tourism sector - it is also the responsibility of the tourist. That is why it has rightly been said that - A good tourist is one who leaves behind nothing, but footprints; and takes away nothing, but photographs.

#### 30-10-2010 India AC

Some languages are increasingly spoken in different countries, while the usage of others is rapidly declining. Is this a positive or a negative development?

Today, we do not belong to a big planet called Earth. We are part of a global village and there is more interaction among people of different parts of the globe than ever before. Therefore, some languages are being spoken more and the use of a few languages is declining. This is both - a negative as well as a positive development.

On the positive side, the increasing use of some languages is easing communication among people. For example, English is now spoken in more than 86 countries of the world and French in around 33 countries. In fact English has become the lingua franca in many parts of the world. Because of this people do not face difficulty when they travel from one country to the other. What is more, if people speak the same language then they also find it easy to do business with each other. Global trade is based on good communication. We all know that lack of communication gives rise to many misunderstandings. Businesses cannot flourish if for every small communication an interpreter is required.

Nowadays, we belong to a 24/7 society. Many multinational companies have opened in different parts of the world. The rich nations who own these MNCs provide jobs to millions of people worldwide. Naturally, a person who knows their language is better placed in these companies. The pay package is also better and chances to work abroad also go up. In a way the widespread use of a few languages also helps to decrease the gap between the rich and the poor.

On the downside, the decline in use of some languages is also something to be concerned about. It is a well known fact that language and culture are inter-related. If languages die out then culture also dies out. We all enjoy life on this planet because of its diversity. If diversity decreases, then boredom sets in and the earth becomes a dull and boring place to live in.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, the increase in use of a few languages and the decline of others is both a positive as well as a negative development. This situation is an inevitable sequel of globalization. If the governments take steps to protect the endangered languages, then the negative effects can be minimized.

#### 23-10-2010 AC India and 30-10-2010 GT India

These days many people leave their country to work abroad and take their family with them. Do you think benefits of this outweigh disadvantages in terms of family development?

The opportunities to work abroad are more today than they have ever been in the history of mankind. The big planet Earth has become a small global village and sovereign barriers seem to have disappeared. While working in a foreign country, some individuals take their family with them. This situation has both merits as well as demerits but definitely the merits outweigh the demerits.

There are many obvious benefits of going abroad to work along with family. To begin with, individuals have more bonding with family. The family relationship would not be weakened by distance. Some couples finally end up in divorce, as one or both of them cannot endure the long-term separation. Secondly, many people feel homesick and lonely and therefore cannot adjust in the foreign country and return home thereby missing the golden opportunity of working abroad.

The most important point is that children, especially who are in young ages, need the care from both parents. Childhood is a crucial phase of life and comes only once. If children are deprived of one parents love it may have a considerable impact on their psyche. Therefore, working abroad with family can provide complete love and care to the children.

On the other hand, there are some problems of working abroad with families. To begin with, living with family members abroad means more expenses. A single person can share room with someone in the initial stages but a complete family needs a proper house. What is more, all the members face stress of adaptation to alien surroundings. Parents themselves feel culture shock and therefore cannot help their children.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, there are both advantages and disadvantages in any choice of this issue. Personally, I believe that people should decide according to their specific circumstances. If there are financial constraints, then it is better to go alone initially. However, the family should be called as early as possible.

# Everyone should stay in school until the age of eighteen. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

In many countries, school attendance is mandatory for all children up to a specific age. In India this is 14 years of age. In the UK and many other countries it is 16, although the UK government now has plans to raise the school leaving age to 18. I agree that children should be in school till the age of 18. In the following paragraphs, I intend to put forth my arguments to support my views.

The most important reason for raising the school leaving age to 18 is that, the age of 14-18 is the most impressionable age of a child's life. During this period of adolescence, the children undergo physical and hormonal changes because of which they are under a lot of pressure. Therefore, lengthening compulsory schooling helps protect childhood. While at school students will be protected from some of the pressures in life. They have the rest of adulthood to work, make budgets balance and make choices. Providing them with space to grow for as long as possible can make them better prepared for adult life.

Secondly, more education provides the opportunity to acquire more skills and therefore more options. It has been shown many times that those with more education find it easier to find work and that they are more likely to find that work satisfying. What is more, raising the school-leaving age is a crucial investment in society's future. Doing so increases the economic potential of the future workforce, and so will bring increased tax revenues in the long term.

However, the opponents claim that extending the period of compulsory education requires a huge investment in teachers, books and new school buildings which would be very expensive. They also say that many families need their children to make an economic contribution to the family income and working early can help these families to survive. Finally, just being in school does not guarantee that a student is learning. Unwilling students become disruptive and damage the education of others in their class.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, as every garden has weeds, similarly compulsory schooling also has some drawbacks. However, these drawbacks are nothing as compared to the vast benefits this approach would bring and the cost needed to implement would be negligible if compared to the huge economic potential of the future workforce. Therefore, I believe that everyone should stay in school until the age of eighteen.

Mothers generally stay home to take care of their children after pregnancy. Do you support the opinion that these mothers should be compensated by the government?

I definitely agree with the notion that mothers, who stay at home to look after their children after pregnancy should be compensated by the government. In the following paragraphs I intend to put forth my arguments to support my views.

My major argument is that the future of the world rests largely in the hands of the generation we are rearing. Once a child is born, it becomes national property. Mothers are the front line child care providers and therefore, if they are supported by the government they can do their job better. This help can be in the form of a paid maternity leave. In most Indian homes the mother's salary is necessary to support the family. So, if the mother does not get a paid maternity leave, then she has to go back to job earlier and this affects the childcare. Nurseries fail to provide the one-to- one interaction children need.

Secondly, a woman has to go with very stressful time physically, emotionally, and financially during pregnancy period. There is extra financial burden related to her prenatal care, preparing for a new baby, and then the care of the baby. Therefore, government help can ease their burden and they can look after their babies nicely. Finally, if women are supported by the government, they can look after their health. Health as such involves several factors. It is not simply being free from diseases. So, proper education, enough employment opportunities, food security and affordable medical care are some of the contributory factors that the government can provide to make women healthy. Needless to say, there should be enough provision for all these in a society that expects to be healthy today and tomorrow. It is well known that women play the most crucial role in managing the health of the family. And healthy families contribute greatly to social welfare.

The opponents, however, claim that it is a personal choice to have a baby. So, why should there be government support for women who stay at home to look after their children? They have a point, but I still feel that women need the aid considering the physical, emotional, and financial stress they face.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, women should be supported by the government after delivery to look after the baby and themselves. This can contribute a lot to social welfare.

Some people think that paying taxes is enough to contribute to the society. Others argue that being a citizen involves more responsibilities. Discuss, what is your opinion?

A good citizen is a blessing to society. Some people opine that paying taxes is enough contribution towards the society whereas others believe that a good citizen has a lot more responsibilities than just paying taxes. I personally go with the latter view. In the following paragraphs I intend to enumerate the responsibilities of a good citizen.

It is irrefutable that paying all the taxes and in a timely manner is one of the major responsibilities of a citizen. It is necessary to pay taxes because the money that is paid by citizens is used for constructive purposes, like building and maintaining roads, schools, fire protection, defence services etc. The different types of taxes to be paid by citizens are income tax, excise tax, property tax, sales tax etc. Most people try to avoid taxes, but to have the freedoms that we have, we must fund our government agencies. All taxes exist to make our lives better. To enjoy our comparatively trouble free lives, we must pay taxes.

However, there are many other obligations which a good citizen must fulfil. To begin with, voting in elections is very important. When citizens fail to vote or have political opinions, they allow vested interests to have their way. Secondly, they must obey law and order. If all citizens are law abiding, then the whole nation would be a paradise on Earth.

It is also the responsibility of a good citizen to provide public service to the government. This means volunteering for various agencies and charities. Finally, it is a citizen's duty to scrutinize the government's actions and take stands when something wrong happens. When citizens get too complacent, they will not notice when their freedom is being cut down.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, a good citizen should pay taxes, exercise his voting rights, be law abiding, do voluntary work to help the government and take a stand if anything goes wrong. Blythe Danner has rightly said, -We all have an obligation as citizens of this earth to leave the world a healthier, cleaner, and better place for our children and future generations.

Some companies and organizations require their employees to wear uniform. What are the advantages and disadvantages of wearing uniform?

Setting a dress code in the workplace is becoming increasingly common. In the following paragraphs, I intend to delve into the advantages and disadvantages of wearing uniform at work.

One of the major benefits of a dress code within the office is that it establishes an atmosphere of discipline and uniformity. It ensures that inappropriate or dirty clothing is not worn to work. It is also a social leveller. If everyone is dressed to the same standard, there will be no judgements made towards other employees on the basis of their clothes. Having a uniform also reduces employee confusion: a clear dress code means they don't have to wonder "what" to wear or whether something would be appropriate to wear to work.

A dress code is also very important in non-office environments, such as in factories, for keeping employees safe. For example, if the employees work around machinery that a tie could get caught in, ties are not appropriate. The same is true of jewellery, belts, scarves, and long hair. Therefore, a dress code keeps employees safe from injury and also allows them to look presentable if clients or visitors come on site. This dress code is also very beneficial for other places of service, such as fast food, or grocery stores. It portrays a feeling of cleanliness when you know the staff is wearing their appropriate uniform, as opposed to if they were wearing their own clothing.

Furthermore, a dress code sets the "tone" of the company. For example, a law office with all the lawyers and associates wearing suits and formal business attire is viewed as being professional and able to handle court cases. How the public perceives a company is important to the type and amount of business it does.

The disadvantages are that it can become very boring to wear the same clothes daily. Secondly, the uniform may not be very comfortable to wear. These disadvantages can, however, be lessened by giving the employees a say in the choice of uniform.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, a dress code is very essential nowadays in the workplace. The disadvantages are negligible as compared to the advantages.

For some people shopping is not just about buying what is necessary, but a form of entertainment. Do you think it is a positive or a negative development? Give your opinion and examples from your experience.

Shopping is generally thought of in terms of fulfilling needs. Shopping is seen first as a function and secondarily as something that serves emotional and social needs. As incomes have grown, choices have exploded and free time has increased, shopping has become entertainment as much as anything else. This can be seen as both - a positive as well as a negative development. In the following paragraphs I intend to explore the pros and cons of shopping as an entertainment.

On the positive side, shopping satisfies our needs. Everyone needs the basics of life such as items of food, clothing and shelter. Apart from that, needs vary from person to person. The things which were considered the luxuries of yesteryears have become the necessities of today. For example, the mobile phone has become a must-have for even the lower income group of people. Many businesses and jobs thrive on the connectivity provided by the mobile phone and the internet.

Furthermore, shopping has given rise to the consumerist society of today. This has given employment to many. For instance, people are working in the manufacturing industries and in the retail sector also. Mega stores and malls are also having a mushroom growth. What is more, psychologists claim that the best way to cope with stress or any kind of strong and negative emotion is to hit the shops and do plenty of shopping. It is called <u>retail therapy</u> and, according to many, it is guaranteed to boost spirits.

On the negative side, excessive shopping makes us pile up things in the home which we don't even need. It also leads to a throw-away society which is detrimental to the environment. To do shopping, people need a lot of money and if this money does not come by fair means people resort to unethical means of getting it which leads to violence and crime in the society.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, shopping is good as long as it is done for need, but when it is done for greed then it becomes a bane. So we should do shopping only according to our requirement and then it will be a pleasurable experience also.

Young people these days tend to be less polite and respectful than in the past. Causes and solutions.

It is irrefutable that the modern generation nowadays has become less considerate and civil than in the earlier times. In this essay, I intend to explore the possible causes of this situation and suggest some ways forward.

The most important reason is the disintegration of the traditional joint family system. In today's nuclear families, there are no grandparents to teach moral values to children. Parents are busy working and do not spend quality time with children. Consequently, children become self-centred and uncaring for the world around them.

Secondly, we are part of a consumerist society. We desire to have the latest things and to get those things we are becoming workaholics. We set goals for ourselves and work hard to achieve them. As a result politeness and respect have taken a back seat. Finally, we have the influence of the western culture. There, it is considered quite normal to argue and question the elders.

The solutions are not simple. To begin with, it is necessary to instil moral values in children at a young age. So, joint family system should be encouraged. Secondly, community welfare programmes should be part of high school curriculum. We can also take the help of media to show programmes which highlight the good points of earlier times and discourage consumerism. But, the final onus is on the people themselves. They should be willing to change.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, in the fast-paced world of today, people have changed and become selfish and self centred, but steps can be taken to re-imbibe some virtues of the olden times.

Nowadays for many people the Internet is replacing regular books. What do you think will happen in the future and what is your opinion?

Version 1

It is irrefutable that the Internet and the other forms of e-media have come as a threat to the physical book. My view, however, is that despite the many threats, the book will remain as strong in the future as it was in the past.

Many people fear that the book may not survive because of the many threats it has been facing. Films were an early threat because they were very effective in telling stories in a visual way. Next, there was the radio followed by the TV and finally the internet. Surely, there are enough reasons why the book ought to be dead. But, it is not just alive, it is hale and hearty.

To further strengthen my point of view, I would like to segment books in three categories. In the first category are books that deal with academic curricula of schools and colleges. Students will always need to buy these books and carry them in their bags to schools and colleges for learning.

In the second category there are all the types of general education books like dictionaries, thesauruses and the like. The use of these books may be affected slightly because of uploading some of their content on the net. Other books dealing with diverse subjects like history, geography, cookery and hobbies will hardly be affected in any way. This is evident from their robust sales at the book counters.

In the third category we have the books dealing with fiction. These are companions for the traveler as well as the home bird. Their position can hardly be affected. Added to this the book is such a practical tool; it doesn't cost too much; it is usually small enough to carry around and it can be easily revisited.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, despite the threat of the internet, the book has maintained its place. So I feel we'll never go without books because they have served us so well for so long.

Nowadays for many people the Internet is replacing regular books. What do you think will happen in the future and what is your opinion?

Version 2

The Internet as the mainstream of media plays a very important role in transferring information. Some people assert that internet would take the place of books in the future. However, in my opinion, each medium has its own advantages and disadvantages. Books will always hold a place in our lives.

Admittedly, internet has made our lives very convenient. Firstly, it can transform information instantly. It can tell us what happened in the world right away with very impressive pictures. Secondly, it plays an important role in education. People can study history, culture, language and cooking skills from the internet. Even the books are now available in electronic format (e-books) and that is the reason some people find it a threat to the traditional, physical, book.

However, we should not neglect the importance of books which are very convenient to carry and easy to get. Books are available everywhere, such as in the library, in the book store, in your pocket or beside the pillow. After a day's work we can relax in our bed or sofa by reading some book or magazine. Books are also very good travel companions.

Moreover, it is very difficult to sit for long hours glued to the monitor screen. Eye strain and back pain are also some disadvantages of the internet. With so many power cuts, as in my country, we cannot rely on the internet. Last but not least, the day is not far when all people will be able to afford the internet connection.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, despite the threat of the internet, the book has maintained its place. So I feel we'll never go without books because they have served us so well for so long.

Today, majority of children are raised by their grandparents due to the fact that their parents are busy working. To what extent do you think it affects the whole family?

It is irrefutable that both parents are working nowadays and as a result children have to be raised by either maids or grandparents. Definitely, grandparents are better than any other option and this situation affects the family in both positive and negative ways which I shall highlight in this essay.

On the positive side, looking after the grandchildren keeps the grandparents energetic and vibrant. Grandparents bathe, feed and even read books to the child. This leads to a sort of symbiotic relation in which both grandparents and grandchildren are benefited. In other words we can say that it is a win-win situation for both. Grandparents don't suffer from loneliness and depression which is very common at that age and children are also well looked after.

Moreover, such a situation encourages joint family system. Therefore, all the benefits of a joint family are there. There is security in the family as we all know that there is security in numbers. Another big advantage is that grandparents teach moral values to children. If grandparents do not look after children then parents use TVs as baby- sitters and children can become couch potatoes.

On the negative side, it is generally seen that grandparents are over-doting and, out of love, may pamper and spoil the grandchildren. Another disadvantage is that if there is not enough harmony between the parents and grandparents then it can lead to frustration and spoil the whole atmosphere of the house. In such cases children are the worst sufferers.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, it is very beneficial if grandparents look after their grandchildren. Grandchildren learn moral values, are looked after well and grandparents enjoy themselves and don't suffer from loneliness and depression.

In many countries, children are getting fatter and less fit day by day. Why is it so and suggest solutions.

It is irrefutable that childhood obesity is a burgeoning problem these days in many parts of the world. In this essay I intend into the causes of this problem and suggest some ways forward.

The most important reason is unhealthy diet. Children are attracted to fast food which is rich in sugar and fat. They are ignorant of what constitutes a healthy diet. Parents nowadays are busy in their work and are not present to guide their children. To add to it, children are bombarded with advertisements from fast food companies.

Another important factor is that children are much less active than they used to be. In the past young people took part in activities that burned a lot of energy. However, today they spend a lot of their time indoors, sitting in front of the computers or playing video games. This sedentary life style is playing havoc with the health of young people.

There are a number of steps that need to be taken to solve this problem. The first is to educate children about nutrition. Schools should organize compulsory lessons to explain the main elements of a healthy diet and teach pupils how to prepare healthy meals. Parents should also cook healthy delicious meals at home so that children are deterred from eating fast food. Furthermore, governments should have some restrictions on the type of adverts shown in children's programmes. Finally, children should be encouraged to take part in sports. Schools have a great role to play in this.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, childhood obesity is a serious problem and it should be tackled on a war footing otherwise the young people of today will have a very unhealthy middle and old age.

<u>Scientists believe that computers will become more intelligent than human beings.</u> <u>Some people find it a positive development while others think it is negative development.</u> Discuss both points and give your own opinion.

There are a lot of computer scientists who are convinced that when computers become many times faster than they are now, and more complex, they will be more intelligent than human beings. Some take it as a blessing where as others take it as a curse. In the following paragraphs I shall discuss both viewpoints and finally give my opinion.

On the positive side, computer machines or robots can do lots of jobs for human beings and this saves the labour force to be engaged in other aspects. More and more automated machines have replaced human labour. Computer manages our banks and the tickets at the airport are issued by machine-robot. In addition, the robots have entered offices, departments and houses to help people to work easily and to enjoy longer leisure hours in their own homes. The computerization certainly relieves human beings from heavy labours. What is more, robotic surgery is being done to overcome the limitation of human beings such as trembling of human hands. Microscopic surgeries and eye operations can be better done with the help of robotic surgeons.

On the downside, if intelligent machine-robots replace human being's work then this would cause many to out of work. Unemployment would further cause a lot of problems. What is more, people would rely too much on computers and become lethargic which would lead to problems such as obesity. Finally, robots may dominate our world just like what is shown in our science fiction movies of today.

I believe that computers hold much more information than the human brain possibly can, but the collective information that is found there came from large groups of human brains around the world. Without the human brains, computers wouldn't be available to gather that information. The computer only has information if a human being adds to the system. A computer can think to some extent. You can ask it questions and it will give you an automated answer. It cannot touch the human brain though. Experience is sometimes a better answer than the mechanical version of it. Human brains certainly outweigh computers because computers can't feel. Technology will never be able to create something that could surpass the incredibly complex and ever changing human.

In conclusion, Artificial Intelligence has both positive and negative effects. What we must do is make sure that the positive ones are encouraged and negative ones are eliminated as far as possible. After all it is in our hands not to become slaves of our own technology.

Small shops in towns and villages are closing and replaced by big stores. Explain your opinion. Do you think it is good or bad?

Commercialization has grown rapidly in the modern era. Consequently, there is a mushroom growth of big shopping malls. As every garden has weeds, this phenomenon also has its pros and cons. On the whole, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

There are many advantages of big stores. To begin with, they save our time. We do not have to waste time going from one small shop to the other. Secondly, these stores offer a huge variety of goods. For example, in some stores you can buy anything ranging from a sewing needle to a car.

Furthermore, such stores purchase items in bulk and so they can afford to sell the products at a lower price than the other small retailers and therefore the customers are benefited. To add to it, they sell mostly the branded products and so the quality is assured. Another advantage is that most of such stores accept credit cards and so you don't have to carry heavy chunks of cash.

On the downside, such malls promote consumerism. They pull the customers through attractive displays and schemes and as a result customers end up buying more than they need. Moreover, such shops are opened with huge investments. So they can withstand adverse market conditions for a long time. Because of this the small retailers and vendors are finding it difficult to cope with them.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that big shopping malls are definitely an asset to the customer and society despite their drawbacks.

Some people say that subjects like arts, music, drama and creative writing are more beneficial to children and therefore they need more of these subjects to be included in the timetable. Do you agree or disagree?

Arts have little or no place in the educational curriculum so far because we have a feeling that time spent on these things is time wasted. Recent studies, however, have shown that a good curriculum that includes arts education can have multiple benefits which I shall highlight in this essay.

The most important benefit of arts in schools is that it contributes to making a well rounded student. Not only that, certain forms of arts instruction enhance and complement academic skills such as basic reading skills, language development and writing skills. So, children do well in other subjects also.

Another big advantage is that it encourages the pursuit of extra-curricular activities. Children get a chance to show their creative expression. When such hidden abilities are exposed in school time then those with exceptional talent can be encouraged to adopt it as a profession later-on in life. It is a well known fact that people in such professions are earning telephone figure salaries nowadays.

Last but not least, such subjects are stress-busters. In the highly competitive era of today, pressure of academic subjects is too high. Arts like music, drama and creative writing break the monotony of tough academic studies.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that our educational curriculum needs a serious revision and more of such subjects need to be added to the school curriculum. They complement academic study, bring out hidden talent and break the ennui of tough academic studies.

Discuss your opinion on how modernism can affect our health. What can the government do to overcome such situations?

Modern life can be very taxing. Today, we live faster, work more and have less free time than ever before. In addition, our conveniences come at the expense of the purity of the environment. In this essay I intend to delve into the negative effects of modernism on our health and the steps that can be taken to overcome them.

There is an age old saying, -We are what we eatl. This holds good even today. Nowadays, good food is hard to find. Many people are eating the quickest and the cheapest foods they can find, which, unfortunately, are the least nutritious. They lead to obesity which can predispose to many diseases such as hypertension and obesity.

The second major effect of modernism is lack of exercise. Machines and the automobiles have made our lifestyle very sedentary. In addition to it, the fast paced lifestyle and the IT revolution have increased our expectations from work. Not only that, the consumerist society also makes us work more. This makes us workaholics and as a result we suffer from stress which has led many to a nervous breakdown.

Many steps can be taken to combat the negative effects of modernism. The best way to do this is to start educating people on how to live a healthier life. This has to be done on a large scale. The government can take the help of the media for this purpose. There should be a ban on the ads of fast foods. People have to be told the difference between a healthy meal and a fattening one. Secondly, exercise should be incorporated in our daily routine. For short distances, people should be encouraged to walk. This would kill two birds with one stone as people would be healthy and also pollution from vehicles would reduce. This pollution also causes health problems. Finally, government should fix working hours. This would give people more time to relax and exercise.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, modernism can affect our physical and mental health but government can take many steps to lessen these effects.

Advertising influences people to buy things such as clothes and shoes. What are the problems caused by that? What solutions can be given.

It is irrefutable that advertising promotes consumerism. In this essay I intend to explore the problems caused by excessive consumerism and suggest some ways forward.

To begin with, advertisements can cause people to be dissatisfied with what they already have and make them want more. Being exposed again and again to products which one cannot afford leads to frustration and dissatisfaction.

Furthermore, not all parents are in a position to afford the goods which the children see advertised and want to possess. This often leads to feeling of inadequacy among the less well off.

In addition to this advertisements create materialism. It is a fact that people are prepared to work longer hours and even turn to crime to buy these material goods. Last but not least, excessive consumerism leads to a throw-away culture which is detrimental to the environment.

The solutions are not simple. Advertisements cannot be banned because they are a source of valuable revenue which is used for the benefit of majority. The onus is on the people not to get carried away and buy only what they actually need. The government can, however, ban unnecessary packaging. Furthermore, educating people is a crucial tool against excessive consumerism. People could be made to understand how they are exploited by the adverts. It is also vital to teach our children financial management right from the early years. This way there will be less chance for them to be swayed by the advertisements.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, advertising does promote consumerism but people could be educated about the ill effects of excessive consumerism.

In companies, promotions to high positions should be given to employees inside the company and not to somebody outside the company or new hiring. Do you agree or disagree?

It is a highly debatable issue whether promotions should be given to employees from within or new hiring should be done. The given statement proposes to in-house hiring. It is necessary to look at the pros and cons of promoting from within the company before forming an opinion.

There are many benefits to hiring from within. To begin with, the employee is familiar with the company. No special training needs to be given. The person knows about the general working of the business. Moreover, employees feel that they will be rewarded for their extra effort and hard work. So, an employee who has been tested and excelled at a lower level can be shifted to an upper level.

On the other hand, there are some disadvantages of hiring from within. Sometimes, the established policy of hiring from within makes some employees feel that they are entitled to promotion just because they have spent time with the company. Secondly, this can hurt the feelings of other employees who are not promoted. They may feel that they deserved the position better.

In my opinion, a manager or business owner needs to remember that all the hiring decisions need to be made with the idea of strengthening the business. This means that sometimes a person from within can be moved up and sometimes a highly qualified person can be hired from outside.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, each promotion needs to be done on a case to case basis and at all times the HR manager needs to do what is in the best interest of the company.

Do you agree or disagree that animals should be kept in men made cells.

I disagree that animals should be kept in men made cells. I feel that zoos are an unsuitable environment for animals and therefore should be abolished.

Firstly, zoo animals are kept in very confined area compared with their vast natural habitat. Due to this zoo animals develop unnatural habits like pacing back and forth or swaying from side to side. For example, polar bears are given about 10 metres of walking space where as in their arctic home they roam for hundreds of kilometers.

Similarly, lions and tigers are confined in cages where they lack exercise and stimulation. What is more, it is very common for visitors to tease and provoke caged animals. This also leads to unnatural behavior in animals.

Secondly, the breeding programmes taken up by zoos are not very successful. For instance, the \_Panda Breeding Programme' has been very costly and unsuccessful. Also, zoo life does not prepare animals for the challenges of life in the wild. They are provided good food in the zoos, but if left in the jungle, they may die of starvation because they cannot hunt for themselves.

Finally, the zoo is an unnatural environment that exposes animals to many dangers. Diseases often spread between species that would never live together naturally. For example, many Asian elephants have died in African zoos after catching herpes from African elephants.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, zoos are unnatural habitats for the wild animals and there is no justification in caging these marvelous creatures of God.

#### Should old people live with family or separately with the same aged people?

It is a highly debatable issue whether old people should live with family or old-age homes. This is a very important issue because demographic trends suggest that we are part of a graying society in which the population of the elderly is growing by leaps and bounds. I have strong arguments to suggest that they should live separately.

Aged people should live separate because this will give them a feeling of independence. Moreover, by doing so, they will command more respect in the eyes of their children. It is irrefutable that relationships become strong and meaningful when people are not under the same roof. Hence, if aged people are away from their children physically, both will be closer to each other emotionally.

What is more, the mushroom growth of old age homes is ample evidence that they are a boon for the society. They give the opportunity to the elderly to be in the comfort of people of similar age and experience. They also remain healthy with timely day-to-day activities. In such homes, the elderly also get a chance to do some social service activities which in turn help the society.

Furthermore, the culture of the old age homes tends to refine some attitudes of the aged such as short temper and negative thinking. Old age homes are also a boon for those elderly who face social isolation in their own homes where their so-called loved ones neglect them badly and have no time for them.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, the elderly should live with people of their own age group, in old age homes, where they enjoy the retired period of their life nicely, comfortably and productively.

Do you think children should be given freedom to do whatever they want or parents should impose restrictions on them.

Young children are beginners. They have lots to learn and one of the biggest lessons they must learn is to behave or act in a responsible manner. So, it is a debatable issue whether there should be rules on children or whether they should be given total freedom.

Firstly, restrictions create responsible and respectful children who, in turn, mature into respectful adults. They know the value of respect for others. They know the importance of relationships. They know their cultural values as well. They know their boundaries.

However, if too strict restrictions are imposed on them, they may become rebels. They may start doing just the opposite of what is told them to do. What is more, they may show abnormal behavior. They may fall into bad company or start taking drugs. Finally, imposing too strict rules destroys the individuality of children. They may withdraw into a shell and become introverts.

What is important is that parents should learn where restrictions are needed and where it is important to give room to children. Having absolutely no restrictions and letting children do whatever they feel like would be very wrong. They are not mature enough to solve all problems and they have to be taught their limits.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, parents should impose restrictions but should also know where to draw the line. They should be flexible and modify the rules according to circumstances.

Some people say that parents should control their children's behavior from a very young age. What do you think?

I definitely agree with the view. Young children are beginners. They have lots to learn and one of the biggest lessons they must learn is to behave or act in an acceptable manner. So parents have the onus of instilling the best values in their children. They must do so from a really young age because a little late may be too late.

Firstly, restrictions create responsible and respectful children who, in turn, mature into respectful adults. They know the value of respect for others. They know the importance of relationships. They know their cultural values as well. They know their boundaries.

Moreover, children are like sponges which very easily absorb what is taught to them. If you teach them good values, they will imbibe them. If parents don't realize their role and don't bother much, children will learn from other sources like TV and the people around them. They learn whatever they see and observe and if no one tells them at an early age what is wrong and what is right, they may learn vulgarity and violence. Later on parents may find it impossible to make them unlearn those things.

Furthermore, if parents don't control their children's behavior from a very young age, they may fall into bad company. They may start taking drugs under peer pressure. Once children become drug addicts, it is very difficult to bring them to normalcy once again.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, parents are responsible for bringing children into this world and it is their responsibility for instilling good behavior in them. So, the earlier they do so the better. If they keep waiting, things may go out of hand.

Some people think if students are afraid of the teacher it is better. Others say that having a friendly relation is better. What do you think?

Young children are buildings under construction and teachers are the builders. It is a highly debatable issue whether teachers should be friendly or strict. In my opinion, extremes of both approaches are bad. I good teacher should know when to be friendly and when to be strict and also know the degree of friendliness and strictness required.

There are many advantages if teachers are strict. To begin with, discipline can only be maintained if teachers are strict. For example, if students are afraid of the teacher, they will attend classes regularly and complete their work in time. But, if the teacher is too strict, then the students may lose interest in the subject and may not come to the teacher with their problems.

On the other hand, a friendly teacher is like a good mentor with whom students can share their problems. Students also take more interest in the subject. Students bloom under the guidance of such a teacher. The disadvantage, however, is that a too friendly or partial attitude results in diversion from studies.

In my opinion, a good teacher should be like a friend, philosopher and guide for his students. But, from time to time, he should pull the reins so that the students do not go out of hand. After all, he is shaping the future of the nation. There is a well known saying in Sanskrit that \_Acharya Devo Bhava' which means that a teacher is like a God.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, it has to be decided by the teacher when to be friendly or strict and how much degree of friendliness or strictness is required because extremes of both approaches are detrimental for the future of a student and ultimately for the future of a nation.

Road transport is taking over rail services. Discuss the positive and negative effects of this development. Is this situation true for your country?

Transport refers to the activity that facilitates movements of goods and individuals from one place to another. So, it removes the distance barrier. Roadways and railways are the two means of land transport. It is true that in many countries road transport is becoming more popular. It is both a negative as well as a positive development which I shall discuss in this essay.

There are many advantages of road transport over rail transport. To begin with, it is a relatively cheaper mode of transport than rail transport. Secondly, perishable goods can be transported at a faster speed by road carriers over a short distance. Moreover, it provides door-to-door service. So, loading and unloading is possible at any destination. Finally, it is the only mode of transport in hilly areas which are not connected by other modes of transport.

On the downside, road transport has its limitations which are indirectly the plus points of rail transport. Firstly, due to limited carrying capacity, road transport is not economical for long distances. Secondly, road transport is affected by adverse weather conditions like floods, rain, landslide etc. on the other hand rail transport is hardly affected by such situations. Finally, road transport leads to too much congestion on roads which in turn may cause accidents and increase pollution.

In India, over the years, more and more inland freight traffic has been shifting from rail to road. In 1951, 88% of the country's freight was moving on rail and 10% on road. But today, about 60% of the freight moves on road and 38% on rail.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, road transport definitely has an edge over rail transport. That is why it is becoming more popular. This situation has both pros and cons which I have explained in the above paragraphs.

Some people think that competitive sports have a positive effect on the child's education while others argue it is not so. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages and opine.

In recent years, due to stiff competition in almost every area some people opine that competitive sports have a beneficial impact on children's education. However, there are some who disagree with the above notion. Before presenting my view, I intend to explore both sides of the argument.

There are many advantages of competitive sports. The first and foremost advantage is that such sports prepare children for a society that thrives on competition. Competition is a normal part of human nature and a part of everyday life. Secondly, competitive sports provide challenges and help children deal with such challenges. Finally, these games teach discipline and help build character and confidence.

On the other hand opponents on competitive sports argue that these sports lead to stress which is detrimental to the mental health of children. If these games are played with a win-atall-cost attitude then sometimes unethical means are adopted to win and this is definitely not what children should learn in schools. Competitive sports also have a toxic effect on the relation among children. Each child may regard others as a rival to his own success and it leads children to envy winners and laugh at losers.

In my opinion, competitive sports are good but over competitiveness should be discouraged. The win-at-all-cost mentality should not be there. In childhood, competition should be introduced gradually and children should build skills, participate fully and focus on playing rather than winning.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, competitive sports have more pros than cons. Students should play competitive sports because they make them adapt better to this competitive society. However, schools should take effective measures to avoid destructive competition.

Competitive sports like football are considered to add a lot of value by bringing people of different states and nationalities together. Yet some people argue that these sports divide people on the basis of nationalities and age groups. What is your opinion? Write about each view and then describe your answer supporting it with relevant examples from your own experience.

It is irrefutable that competitive sports such as The Football World Cup and The Olympics are watched by millions of people worldwide. There are divided opinions on whether these games unite or divide people on the basis of age and nationalities. In the following paragraphs, I intend to discuss both views followed by my opinion.

Sports provide people with entertainment and something to get excited about and they are topics for conversation. They provide a common bond for complete strangers and a common team to cheer for. For example, Brazil has a high rate of unemployment and crime because of which Brazilians have a low self esteem. But, when the world cup starts, then the people forget all their problems. An amazing feeling of pride and patriotism comes in them and they cheer their team together.

The Olympic games are one of the best examples of how sporting events can bring people of different nations together. In ancient times, the Greeks and Romans would interrupt battles to participate in games. Even India and Pakistan forget their differences on the cricket ground and the players embrace each other after every match.

On the other hand there are many examples of violence and conflicts which such games have brought about. Football hooliganism or football violence is well known to all. The 1985 European Cup final between Liverpool and Juventis in Heysel Stadium led to the death of 39 supporters. Any wrong decision by the referee can lead to violence. A lot of emotion and passion are involved and all reason and logic fly out of the window. That is why some people hold the opinion that such games divide people.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that competitive games generally bring people together. There are a few incidences when over-patriotism prevailed and people got divided but such incidents can be counted on the fingertips.

Films can have effect on the children's education and teach them many things. Do you think it is always a positive influence? Discuss.

It is irrefutable that movies can be very educative for children. However, the effect of movies is not always beneficial. In the following paragraphs, I intend to discuss the positive and negative effects of movies on children.

On the positive side, movies are enjoyable for children of all ages. They stimulate children's emotions, imaginations and conversations. Movies also introduce children to cultures and historical events. Movies used in the classroom enhance learning. Therefore, if the movies are good they can have a very positive influence on a child's growth.

On the downside, children are negatively affected by movies with sex, violence drug abuse and offensive language. Older children and adolescents may copy the risky things they see in movies. What is more, movies glamorize things like smoking and drinking and children are quick to pick up these traits.

Furthermore, watching too many movies can impede the development of healthy habits like playing outdoor games, reading and spending quality time with family. Children who are avid film viewers are more likely to suffer from obesity related problems throughout their lives.

I believe that as everything has its pros and cons, movies too can have both - good and bad influences. It is very important for parents to check the movie ratings before allowing their children to watch any movies. The best thing for parents could be to watch movies with their children. Watching movies together could be a very rewarding experience.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that movies can have a positive or a negative influence on children but if parents take steps in choosing their children's movies, then the effect can be largely positive.

Some people believe the range of technology available to individuals today is increasing the gap between poor people and rich people. Others think it is having an opposite effect. Discuss these points of view. What is your opinion?

Technology seems to promise infinite benefits for mankind. While it could be argued that the development of new technology always expands the gap between rich and poor, it is also true that the level of technology used in developing countries and low- income countries has been quicker than the developed countries over the last few years and this has helped to bridge the gap between the rich and the poor. So, both views have some ground which I shall be discussing in this essay.

There are many reasons why people say that technology increases the gap between rich and poor. To begin with, new technology itself tends to be affordable by only the richer elements of society and the poorer elements are denied the opportunities that this provides, such as the ability to be able to train for better paid work. It is understandable that because of their ability to acquire new technology, the learning ability within the richer elements of society is much improved. Therefore they get better job placements and continue to grow further.

What is more, with the power that wealth and knowledge brings, richer segments are more able to exert influence over the direction of society, usually to their own benefit. The poorer segment does not have this ability, and therefore their demands and needs tend to be driven lower down the list of political priorities.

On the other hand there are reasons to hold the opposite view. While it is true that the initial level of technology in lower-income countries was much lower to begin with, there is strong evidence of catch-up between middle-income and high-income countries. Technological progress increased 40% to 60% faster in developing countries than in rich countries. Use of some new technologies, such as mobile phones, has risen quickly.

Technology has created huge opportunities for the poor where none existed previously. For example, some technologies such as communications or networking give poor people a chance to earn a better living. It is not uncommon for some people who used to live in poverty becoming millionaires or billionaires by taking advantage of the internet. This has definitely led to narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that technology can do both - widen the gap between the rich and poor as well as narrow the gap if the poor get access to it. Therefore, it is not the technology to blame for the gap; it is the access to technology which is to blame. So, we should see to it that everyone gets equal access to technology.

<u>Students at schools and universities learn far more from lessons with teachers than from</u> others sources (such as the internet, television). To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is irrefutable that students can learn a lot nowadays from internet and television and these have become an indispensable part of education but I firmly believe that teachers play a more significant role in the classroom. I believe that no amount of technology can ever undermine the importance of the teacher. In the following paragraphs, I intend to support my views with my arguments.

To begin with, teachers can stimulate interest and it is an undeniable fact that interested stimulated people tend to learn more. They can keep students focused on study. A student studying by himself through internet and TV may get bored and stop studying. Teachers can provide a faster and simpler way to present information to the students. They can come down to the level of a student and so are definitely better than computers. In addition, teachers are role models for students. They are scholars in action. They not only teach academic subjects, but also many social skills.

Furthermore, there are many practical subjects which students can learn best from the teacher. For example, experiments of physics and chemistry are best learnt by the teacher guiding you at every step. What is more, teachers give assignments and regularly check them. This helps the teachers to recognise the weak points of students and guide them accordingly. All this cannot be done by the internet and TV.

On the other hand, it is also true that the internet is an ocean of knowledge. You can get information about any topic on Earth from the internet. But there is no authenticity of this information. What information to get and from where to get requires a lot of expertise. The television also has a lot of educative programmes but students still need the guidance of the teachers at all stages of learning. Teachers can make even the dull and boring subjects seem interesting. So definitely students learn more from teachers.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, no doubt TV and the Internet are very educative these days but students definitely learn more from the teacher.

Today, people can work and live in anywhere they want, because of the improvement of communication technology and transport. Do advantages of this development outweigh the disadvantages?

It is irrefutable that because of the advances in telecommunication technology and travel, today's person can live and work in any part of the globe. The advantages of this definitely outweigh the disadvantages. In the following paragraphs I shall put forth my arguments to support my views.

There are many advantages of being able to live and work from anywhere. First of all, people have more choices of jobs because of technological advances. Not only can you work in any part of your home country, you can work for any company in any part of the world by telecommuting. Secondly, modern wireless technology has made work easier and created more time for self and family. What is more, people can lessen their work hours and still do their work more efficiently. Another advantage is that people can manage more than one work at a time. This is the need of the day as inflation is touching the sky and people need to earn more and more.

Furthermore, the modern transportation modes like the metro and light rail have lessened the travel time and also made it more convenient for commuters. This has also decreased the need for people to live in the cities to do jobs because now it is possible to work in cities and come back to peaceful countryside in the evenings because of modern transport systems. This has decreased the overcrowding of cities which was making cities unbearable to live in.

On the downside, this is leading to a sedentary lifestyle as people don't need to travel. Another disadvantage is that people become so dependent on technology that any network failure may lead life to come to a standstill. Nevertheless, I still believe that these minor disadvantages are of no importance if we look at the plethora of advantages this situation has to offer.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, people can live and work anywhere today and this situation is more of a boon than a bane.

Fossil fuels (coal, oil, natural gas) are the main sources in many countries, but in some countries the use of alternative sources of energy (wind energy and solar energy) are encouraged. To what extent do you think it is a positive or negative development?

It is irrefutable that fossil fuels are the main source of energy in many parts of the world, but some nations are taking a step forward and using renewable sources like wind, solar and tidal energy. Definitely, it is a positive development. In the following paragraphs I intend to support my views with my arguments.

The main advantage of using alternate sources is that the conventional sources like coal and oil are non-renewable. They take millions of years to make and we are finishing them at an alarming rate. This means that if we finish the existing resources they will be gone forever as far as our and the coming many generations are concerned. Energy from the wind, the sun and the sea is an everlasting source of power. So, more and more governments should come forward in promoting these sources.

Another big advantage of these non-conventional sources is that they do not pollute the environment. We all know that global warming and damage to the protective ozone layer are caused by carbon-dioxide and other by-products of fossil fuels. If urgent steps are not taken towards the use of natural sources like sun and wind, then the time is not far when the whole earth will transform into a boiling pot.

Although the use of these alternative sources has some hurdles such as the initial cost of setting up solar panels and wind farms is very high and these are also dependent on the geographical locations. However, once the initial cost has been met with, their maintenance is practically negligible.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that the use of these alternative sources is a very positive development. It should be the global priority to invest in such research and development.

Do you agree or that improvements in technology reduce the role of Olympic Games.

Olympic Games are the world's most important international athletic competition. They bring together thousands of the finest athletes to compete against one another in a variety of individual and team sports. Although technology is having an impact on the Olympics in a profound way I disagree that it is reducing the role of Olympic Games. I believe that technology allows us to more fully appreciate everything about the competition and the athletes who commit their lives to fulfill their dreams.

To begin with, winning an Olympic event is the highest honour people can achieve even in the modern times. Unknown athletes get the chance to attain national, and in particular cases, international fame. Secondly, Olympic Games are the best medium of cultural exchange even today. Different people of different countries, religions, cultures etc get together at Olympics and the participants get a chance to know about other cultures. The Games also constitute a major opportunity for the host city and country to showcase themselves to the world.

Although the technological realities of the modern times have brought many changes in the Olympic Games of today, they have not reduced the importance of the Olympic Games. Technology plays a part in every aspect of these games, from the first torch relay hand-off to the closing ceremonies. Athletes and trainers use technology in preparing for the games to optimize their training. Sports equipment manufacturers use design technology to build improved apparatus, gear and more that will enable their clients to deliver a high level performance. Broadcasters use technology to better inform viewers of all aspects of the events. As a consequence, more and more people are exposed to these games.

People who opine that technology has reduced the role of Olympic Games say so because the ugly claws of commercialism have crept into this field also. As a result, the Olympics has shifted away from pure amateurism to professionalism. The win-at- all-cost attitude has come up and many use unethical means to win. They also say that only the rich can afford technology to boost their performance and this creates a gap between the rich and poor. I still believe that without inherent ability no amount of technology can make anybody a winner or loser.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, technology has brought colossal changes in The Olympic Games of today but in no way have they decreased the role of Olympic Games.

Many students have to study subjects which they do not like. Some people think this is a complete waste of time. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

In today's competitive world, a broad knowledge is needed to succeed in any field. Therefore, I disagree that it is a waste of time if students study subjects which are not of their interest.

Let us first examine the reasons why some people hold the opinion that students should not have to study all the subjects and should be allowed to choose the subjects they want to study. They opine that in this case the students will probably be more enthusiastic about their study. In addition, if students are forced to study all subjects, they can easily lose interest in education. What is more, if all subjects are compulsory for studying, students will not have enough time to learn all of them properly therefore they will be constantly under a lot of pressure.

However, I believe all subjects are of great importance and for the holistic development of the students they need to study all subjects equally at school level. Later on, during admission to the colleges, students can select the subjects of their choice and can explore them further. At that age they are mature enough to decide their subjects for themselves. At school level the student may not know what his real interests are.

Furthermore, nowadays, the job market is very demanding and the recruiters select students who are skilled in various fields. Having the basic knowledge of varied subjects during school time definitely widens the horizons for the students. To add to it, it is a well known fact that most subjects are related to each other in some way or the other. For example, a basic knowledge of mathematics is needed to excel in computer languages. Finally, I believe that it is up to the teachers to develop interest of the students in any subject. For instance, during my school days, my history teacher was so good that a boring subject like history was the favourite subject of the whole class.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, students should learn all subjects at school level as they are not mature enough to know their real interests at school level and a broad knowledge is also needed for their holistic development.

Nowadays, people get information through news and papers, but meanwhile are uncertain about the truth of these news. Should we believe the journalists? What qualities should a good journalist or correspondent have?

News and newspapers are an indispensable part of our everyday life because they keep us connected with the outside world. This essay shall discuss whether or not we should believe the journalists and also explain the characteristics of a good journalist.

We have to believe the journalists because they are our only source of information. But, we should take it all with a pinch of salt. Sometimes they may spread ill-founded news just to sell their papers. On the whole, they are doing great service to us. They are a link between the government and the people. They shape our opinions. They make us feel part of this global village by keeping us in touch with it and at times they even provide justice. For example, in the Jessica murder case, it was because of the effort of these journalists that a politician's son got punishment and Jessica's family got justice.

A good journalist should have many qualities. First of all, he should promote the truth and not rumours of ill founded news. Only authenticated news should be given. Secondly, he should be unbiased and not favour any group or political party. He should not hurt the sentiments of any particular community. This is very important in a pluralistic (multicultural and multi-religious) society like India. He should also have excellent communication skills.

Furthermore, a good journalist should be versatile – he has to cover varied fields such as sports, business, entertainment and politics. He should always be on his toes because you never know when the sky is going to fall. Finally, he should be bold and brave because he has to handle tough situations. For instance, during the 26<sup>th</sup> November terrorist attack at Mumbai, it was these journalists who brought us the first-hand news.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that we have to believe the journalists because they bring us the latest news and a good journalist should be a multifaceted personality.

Some teachers say students should be organised into groups to study. Others argue students should be made to study alone. Tell the benefits of each study method. Which one do you think is more effective?

Some educationists hold the view that studying in groups is better for students while others believe that studying alone is better. This essay shall delve into the benefits of each study methods.

There are many benefits of studying in groups. To begin with, when you work with other students you are able to share your ideas and experiences, and have more time to do this. For example, if every student spends just two minutes talking individually to the teacher, the class time is soon finished. However, if students work in groups they can spend much more time talking to the teacher than just two minutes.

Secondly, when we study in groups this helps students practise negotiation skills like making a contribution, agreeing or disagreeing with someone and asking a person to give examples of their point. Finally, we can put forward working in groups as an example of what happens in real life, in work situations and say that studying in groups in class prepares us for this.

On the other hand, when students study alone then they have no distractions and they can concentrate better on study. This is especially helpful in subjects like mathematics and physics. Studying alone also increases the confidence and ability to solve problems on one's own. Students become more competitive which is a necessary virtue in the competitive era of today.

I feel that teachers should mix and match both these methods depending on the subject and the situation. For boring subjects like history and philosophy students should be organised into groups but for subjects that need concentration, individual study should be encouraged. Both methods have own importance and should complement each other rather than being treated as rivals.

In recent years, the number of crimes committed by young people in major cities throughout the world is increasing. Discuss this issue. Give reasons and suggest some solutions.

It is a very shocking situation that the number of youngsters involved in crime is increasing day by day. In this essay, I intend to discuss the reasons for this phenomenon and suggest some solutions.

A number of factors are responsible for juvenile delinquency. Media is one powerful influence. Many times, vulgarity and violence is shown on TV. Children are vulnerable and accept it as natural and try to copy what is shown. For example, in Virginia USA, a student killed 30 students just after watching a TV program. Another cause of crime among youth is the changing family structure. Nuclear families are the norm of the day. Earlier, there were joint families in which grandparents used to teach moral values to children. They kept an eye on the friend circle of their grandchildren. Nowadays, both parents are working and children are left unattended at home. They may fall into bad company and resort to drugs under peer pressure. For drugs they desperately need money which turns them towards crime.

Furthermore, increasing poverty, unemployment and competition is causing hopelessness and frustration among the youth. They are over ambitious and want to earn quick money. They have a lot of energy and if that energy is not harnessed in the right direction, they can go astray. Consumerist society is also a big factor to put them on the path of crime. When they see new things in the market, they want them by hook or by crook. Parents cannot satisfy all their whims and so they start doing petty crime which turns to major crime very soon.

The solutions are not simple. The issue has to be dealt with on a war footing. Some censorship of TV channels is needed. Parents should ration the TV viewing hours of children. Parents should watch TV with children so that they know what their children are being exposed to. We should also encourage joint families. Parents should be good role models Good family atmosphere should be provided to children. Friend circle of the children should be monitored. We should also educate children about the harms of consumerism. Schools should also provide good education. Finally, government should try and reduce unemployment and poverty which are the root causes.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, crime among youth is a big problem and youth alone cannot be blamed for that. We should look into the causes and take relevant steps to fight this problem.

Food can be produced much more cheaply today because of improved fertilisers and better machinery. However, some of the methods used to do this may be dangerous to human health and may have negative effects on local communities. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Yesterday's fiction is today's reality. Such colossal developments have taken place in agriculture which we could not even think of earlier. It is a highly debated issue as to whether these improvements in fertilisers and technology are a blessing or a curse. In my opinion, there are both pros and cons of this situation but the advantages are much more than disadvantages.

On the positive side, farmers now have a wide range of selection, in terms of seeding, irrigation and use of pesticides and fertilizers. Technology has saved people from tedious work and in the mean time increased the production markedly. Machines save the cost of labour and also save time, so productivity has increased dramatically. All this is needed to meet the demands of the burgeoning population.

Furthermore, genetic modification of foods has given us such species which need little or no insecticides and no fertilizers. The quality of food has also improved. For example, fish gene has been added to tomato to make it frost resistant. A nut protein has been added to soya bean to increase the protein content. We have more choices and even the colour and shape can also be changed. We have sweeter fruits and square watermelons and yellow coloured ones. Finally, factory farming, in which animals are fed nicely so as to increase their meat, is also the need of the hour.

On the downside, such technology has reduced the need for manpower and many people are now jobless. This has a negative effect on communities. Genetic modification is also considered unnatural and as it is relatively new, people are also concerned about its long term harmful effects. Some methods are also dangerous to environment as there is contamination of the neighbouring crops by the altered gene pool. Last but not least, the rich countries can use this technology and further increase the gap between the rich and the poor.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that as every garden has weeds, such developments have their pros and cons. We should know where to draw the line and take maximum advantage of this technology minimising its harmful effects.

Leisure is a growing industry, but people no longer entertain themselves as much as they used to because the use of modern technology has made them less creative. Do you agree or disagree?

I disagree with the statement that people do not entertain themselves as much as they used to because of modern technology. I believe that modern technology has not made people less creative. In fact it has changed the definition of leisure and the lifestyle of people.

Modern technology has changed our definition of leisure. Earlier, leisure meant going out and meeting people, playing outdoor games, going to cinema to watch movies and so on. However, today, leisure time is full of choices. We have so many things to do within the four walls of our house. We can watch countless programs on national and international channels; we can play online games; we can chat with friends and relatives in any corner of the world; we can do arm-chair tourism by which we can visit any historical place or museum sitting in our arm-chair. That is why perhaps it looks as if we people do not entertain ourselves as much as we used to in yesteryears.

Another reason why people don't entertain as much as before is also not because of technology. Technology has, in fact, given us more time to enjoy but we can't strike a balance between work and play. We have become workaholics. Life in the past was simpler. People worked for basic needs. Now work is not just a way of life. It is for personal fulfillment. We set goals for ourselves such as a house or a car. We choose this way of life. Now we have improved standard of living but this has come at a very high cost.

Finally, I would like to state that the given statement is flawed because nowadays people specially take out time to entertain themselves. This can be evident from the mushroom growth of leisure centres such as hotels, restaurants, fun parks and spas. Tourist places are full of people and train and air reservations have to be done well in advance.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, technology has not made us less creative. We entertain ourselves more than earlier times but the ways of entertainment are different and technology has given us more choices than before.

People can perform everyday tasks, such as shopping and banking as well as business transactions, without meeting other people face-to-face. What are the effects of this on individual and society as a whole?

The availability and application of modern devices and tools of communications like Fax machines, telephone, interactive TV and computer have brought tremendous convenience and efficiency to both life and work. Thanks to telecommunications, daily tasks and business transactions can be performed without meeting other people in person. This practice certainly has positive effects on the individual and the society as a whole.

Undoubtedly, e-shopping and e-banking make life more convenient than ever before. People can stay home comfortably, looking on the Internet where a vast sea of information is available to find what they need. They Log on to the relevant websites and look for detailed information on the products and services that they are interested in. They read the descriptions, examine the pictures, and check the prices. Eventually, they make a decision and send an e-mail to order and pay for it by e- banking. All can be done at home, without scanning newspaper advertisements, reading reference print materials, going around downtown as they did before. As a result, they have more time to take part in social activities, pursue hobbies and interests and communicate with families, which are all indispensable parts of quality life.

The trend of doing business by telecommunications equally benefits the whole society because business can be done more efficiently and effectively at a much lower cost. An extra benefit is that more natural resources can be saved. Moreover, small businesses have almost the same opportunities to advertise and promote their products and services on line to compete with those large ones, which makes the whole society fairer.

To sum up, performing everyday tasks and business transactions by means of telecommunications benefits the individual and the society enormously. There is simply no going back.

Some people think visitors to others countries should imitate local customs and behaviours. Some people disagree; they think the host country should welcome cultural differences. Discuss the two views and give your opinion.

Today, with the passage of time each and every country is on the path of development, and with this development there is a growing trend of visiting different places in different countries. It is a highly debated issue whether tourists should do and behave as the people of the host country or should the host country accept visitors as they are. Both situations have their own pros and cons which I shall discuss in this essay.

There are many benefits of adopting host countries customs. Firstly, it decreases chances of misunderstanding and embarrassment. For e.g. in the UK it is offensive to ask about pay to anyone, which is common in India. Secondly, a nation's customs and traditions are fascinating and offer a deep insight into that country. People visit other countries to broaden their horizon. So, if tourists copy the customs of host country, they learn more about them and that too in an interesting way. Finally, visitors establish a rapport with local people because people feel respected when their customs are understood and imitated. They become a member of the host country and so they don't suffer any culture shock.

On the other hand there are many reasons why a host country should tolerate and embrace foreign culture. To begin with, no country should cling to its own customs and traditions and accept the new customs and traditions brought by visitors. Secondly, there should be no binding on the visitors to adopt the customs and traditions of the hosts. For example, if the visitors are pure vegetarians, they should not be forced to eat non-vegetarian food just because the host country's people eat that.

On balance, I feel that someone who is moving to another country should respect the customs, culture, traditions etc. of that country. This is necessary because a newcomer is like a guest in someone else's home. So he is expected to follow the rules of that country. However, it is not reasonable to compel a believer of certain religion to ignore his religion in order to comply with the local customs.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, mutual understanding between both the visitor and the host is necessary to maintain harmony. A cosmopolitan society in which everyone is tolerant of each other's customs and traditions is the need of the day. After all, today, we are part of a small global village and not a big planet Earth.

It is generally believed that education is of vital importance to the development of individuals and the well-being of societies. What should education consist of to fulfil both these functions?

It is irrefutable that education is of crucial significance to the progress of people and societies. It has been well said that - Education is a companion which, no future can depress, no crime can destroy, no enemy can alienate and no nepotism can enslave.' In the following paragraphs I shall discuss how education can benefit individuals and societies.

First of all education should impart professional knowledge. Such knowledge enables individuals to earn a livelihood. In this way they are benefited themselves and also they can look after their families better. This leads to better societies because an educated society is a crime free society. People are self-sufficient and so do not need to go on the path of crime.

Physical education should also be provided by a well-rounded education. It is a well known fact that healthy individuals would make a healthy society. Good health is a basic human need and for the holistic development of individuals, physical education should be incorporated in school curricula.

Education should also teach moral values. This makes us adaptive to society. There is less violence and less crime in society is there if people are educated. They become more open minded and live in harmony with each other. Moral science should be a compulsory subject till high school level.

Finally, today environmental education is the need of the hour. All schools should have mandatory lessons on saving the environment. Small steps can go a long way in saving energy. Energy saved is energy generated. We all have to do away with some luxuries if we want a better tomorrow.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate that education should have professional, physical, moral and environmental education. After all, \_Education is not the filling up of a pail but the lighting up of a fire'. A well-rounded education consisting of all the above components would benefit both the individual and the society.

Some people think that cultural traditions may be destroyed when they are used as moneymaking attractions aimed at tourists. Others believe it is the only way to save these traditions. Discuss on both sides and give your opinion.

It is irrefutable that cultural traditions attract tourists from all over the world and develop local economy. Some individuals are of the opinion that these may be destroyed if they are modified to attract tourists. Others, however, hold the view that if we don't use them for tourism, they will die. In the following paragraphs, I shall discuss both sides of the argument.

We have to make these cultural traditions alluring for tourists because we need tourists. Firstly, tourism boosts our economy and secondly we get a chance to spread our culture to different countries. If our artists and artisans do not earn money from their art, which depicts our culture and tradition, then this art will die off and we'll only be the losers.

Tourism is the backbone of any country's economy and every country does their effort to attract tourists. Many people depend on tourism for their livelihood. People in the food industry, hotel industry and transport industry depend on tourism. Presentation is very important to attract visitors and to present nicely, some change is inevitable.

On the other hand, when cultural traditions are used as money-making attractions, they lose their original features. Sometimes it makes cultural traditions disappear altogether. However, I believe that culture and tradition are deep rooted and minor superficial changes cannot harm them in any way. Change is the law of nature and all we should look into is that the changes are made with caution to retain the inherent elements of culture.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, to save cultural traditions we need to make some changes to make them alluring to the tourist of today. If we don't do so we'll lose our cultural traditions altogether and we'll lose our tourists also.

Pressure on the school and university students is increasing and students are pushed to hard work when they are young. Do you think it is a positive or negative development?

It is irrefutable that the burden on school and university pupils is burgeoning and they have to work very hard at a young age. This situation has both positive and negative effects. A balance needs to be created in which parents and teachers have a big role. In the following paragraphs, I shall discuss the issue in depth.

Pressure on students is increasing because of many reasons. Firstly, today we belong to a highly competitive era. Students need to get good scores to get into a good college. To add to it, higher education is very costly and students need to do part time work to fund their education. What is more, sometimes parents push children to adopt those subjects in which the child has no aptitude. This also creates tension on the mind of the students.

This is a positive development because the habit of working hard right from early years makes them realise the dignity of labour and they are better placed in life later on. Secondly, they do not indulge in any violence and crime and drugs. This is because they don't have time for such activities. Finally, if they work hard in early years they will develop a sound career and will have a happy and contented later life.

It is a negative development because it leads to stress and strain. Sometimes, students cannot strike a balance between work and leisure which may result in boredom. Secondly, when students face failures or can't cope with the pressures they can have suicidal tendencies. Students also face stress if they are forced to choose a course against their wishes.

On balance, I believe that being pushed to hard work is a positive development. However, parents and teachers need to do proper counselling and guide them properly. Aptitude of the student needs to be given consideration. Alternate career choices should be explained to both parents and children

<u>Nowadays education quality is very low. Some people think we should encourage our</u> <u>students to evaluate and criticise their teachers. Others believe that it will result in a loss of</u> <u>respect and discipline in the classroom. Discuss on both sides.</u>

It is a highly debated issue whether students should evaluate their teachers after each course. Some people believe the system has many advantages to the students and the teachers. Others argue that it would lead to poor discipline in the classroom. Indeed, evaluation of teachers by students has both pros and cons.

There are many drawbacks in student assessment. First of all, students are very young and, compared with their teachers, are less knowledgeable both in theory and practice on a subject. Therefore, they are unable to evaluate their teachers' performance in a sound way. Secondly, student assessment would lead to poor discipline in the classroom. If each of the students is allowed to comment on the

teacher's performance, then there would be chaos in the classroom. Thirdly, in order to gain a better evaluation, teachers would seek to please the students and not bother about the content of their lectures. This would harm the students' academic performance in the long run.

However, advocates of student assessment have their reasons. Firstly, this kind of feedback can be used to improve teachers' performance. Teaching methods can only be successful if they are student-centered. Therefore, listening to the students' constructive suggestions, teachers will have a better idea of what students' needs

are and can then adjust their teaching to meet them. Secondly, the process of writing evaluations will help the students think in their own way independently. Students should be encouraged to learn by even challenging their teachers' thinking. Thirdly, it would help the administrators. Teachers who provide good educational services could be retained and others could be laid off. So, all teachers would strive to do their best. This would be a win-win situation for all.

In my opinion, student evaluations of teachers would be beneficial to both teachers and students. Of course, the evaluations must be done responsibly, but when the students feel that their views are important and are listened to, I think they will do their best to contribute to the improvement in education.

The advantages brought by the spread of English as a -global language will outweigh the disadvantages. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this view?

English has become the lingua franca in many parts of the world. Because of this, I agree with the given statement that the spread of English as an international language will have more pros than cons.

Second, English is easier to learn than any other language. Unlike Chinese, for example, English has only 26 alphabets which are combined to make words and sentences. It is easy even for non-native speakers to read written English. In addition, a number of English words have been borrowed from many other languages, and many English words have been adopted by many languages and are used as part of their own languages. Therefore, many people in different countries already know some of the English. So, it could be the easiest language to learn.

Furthermore, it is the language of global business and also jobs. It is the language of technology. You can make the best use of internet if you know English as many websites are written in English. Knowledge of English makes travel easier. There would also be no need of expensive translations. Finally, English will be the most promising language. Since English is used in many fields such as economics, politics, and academics, more and more people will study English in the future. If you have an international meeting in any field, it will probably be done in English. The demand of English will never stop.

As every garden has weeds, there would be some disadvantages also. Many people fear that local languages would die out and with that, local cultures would die out because language and culture are inter-related. Moreover, it is bound to be divided into dialects.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, there are more advantages than disadvantages of English as a global language. Its popularity and demand will increase more and more in the future.

Some school leavers travel or work for a period of time instead of going directly to the university. What are the advantages and disadvantages.

A gap year is a year after high school when a student takes time to explore his or her interests, which usually entails some type of travelling or working. After the gap year is over, the student begins his or her career. It has both pros and cons which I shall discuss in this essay.

There are many benefits of taking a year off. Firstly, the student can explore his interests before deciding on a major. Just passing out of secondary school, a student does know what his real interests are. A gap year gives him time to introspect and he may also find something he has never considered studying before. Secondly, he can save money to finance his education and ease some burden off his parents' shoulders. Higher education is very expensive and some parents cannot afford the full cost of students' university fees.

Furthermore, during this year, the student meets different people and experiences different cultures. As a result his personality develops and he comes to know about the outside world. Finally, a well planned gap year is attractive to some admissions tutors and to future employers. For example, a student can add his activities of the gap year in his resume when he applies to the university or for some job after completion of his education. This is taken in a positive light by the admissions committee and some job providers.

As every garden has weeds, similarly a gap year also has a downside. A student may find it difficult to get back to study. A year is a long time and once that tempo of attending classes and doing home-work etc. is lost, a student may not feel like studying again. Secondly, if he starts earning enough, education may seem unimportant. Finally, if a student doesn't plan it properly, it may end up as a wasted year.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that a gap year has a lot of advantages provided it is planned well.

(Similar essay – (12-09-2009 India) When students leave school and enter into university or college. The time in between leaving school and entering college, the experience of work is more important than travelling. To what extent do you agree or disagree?)

Many people are optimistic of the 21<sup>st</sup> century and see it as an opportunity to make positive changes to the world. To what extent do you share their optimism? What changes would you like to see in the new century?

Change is but natural. Everything undergoes a sea of changes over a period. Many changes are expected in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. I am an optimistic person and I believe there will be many beneficial changes which I would like to see in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

To begin with many positive changes are expected in the medical field. Our researchers are working day and night to find treatment of various types of cancers and other fatal diseases such as AIDS. Because of advanced diagnostic techniques like MRI and nuclear scan, many diseases can be detected so early that treatment is now possible. Advances are also going on for cell transplant instead of organ transplant. If this becomes true, transplant surgeries will become a thing of the past.

Furthermore, terrorism and wars will be there only in history books. The whole planet Earth has already shrunk into a global village. National boundaries will disappear completely. We will also have better alternatives to energy sources. Global warming will be dealt with effectively and everyone will have the basic amenities of life.

Finally, illiteracy and poverty will be wiped out. Everyone would be educated and contented and therefore there would be peace, harmony and happiness all around. Holidays in space might be common. Change is imminent in every sphere of human life. What is certain is that those who accept changes, instead of those resisting them, will be more successful.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that all this might sound too optimistic, but I would surely wish to see all these in the  $21^{st}$  century.

## Nowadays, some universities offer graduate students skills that assist to find employment, but some people believe the main function of a university should be to access knowledge for its sake. What's your opinion?

As university education is the last stage before the starting of career, many people believe that it prepares students for employment only, but the fact is that it serves a lot many purposes. In this essay I shall discuss the various functions of a university.

Universities provide specialised education in fields such as medical, engineering, commerce etc. They provide library facilities, which support the curriculum. They provide laboratory facilities for science and technology related subjects. They send students to factories and industries so that they get practical experience. This job- oriented training helps them to understand the working conditions and also gives them an idea about competition in the market. They also create job opportunities for the students by arranging campus interviews.

On the other hand, universities also perform other functions which help the students in their personal life. They organise co-curricular activities such as cultural programmes, sports, debates, fairs etc. They gain many qualities such as self- confidence and positive attitude, which help them in their future life. Moreover, some people just go to university for gaining knowledge just out of interest for the subject. For example, a doctor may want to learn French language just for interest in the language.

Furthermore, a university is a place to know more about the world because there are students from across the globe in a university. For many, who may never travel abroad, this may be a chance of a lifetime for them to broaden their horizons and know more about the different cultures of the world. For example, in LPU( Lovely Professional University), there are 200 students from Malaysia, Korea and other parts of the world.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, universities do not simply prepare a person for employment, but also have many other functions.

#### Version 2

It is irrefutable that the main purpose of a university is for career preparation, but a university has a lot of other benefits also - to have new experiences, and to increase their knowledge of themselves and of the world around them.

Career preparation is probably the primary reason that people attend university. These days, the job market is very competitive. Careers such as information technology will need many new workers in the near future. At university, students can learn new skills for these careers and increase their opportunities for the future.

Students also go to university to have new experiences. For many, it is their first time away from home. At university, they can meet new people from many different places. They can see what life is like in a different city. They can learn to live on their own and take care of themselves without having their family always nearby.

At university, students have the opportunity to increase their knowledge. As they decide what they want to study, pursue their studies, and interact with their classmates, they learn a lot about themselves. They also, of course, have the opportunity to learn about many subjects in their classes. In addition to the skills and knowledge related to their career, university students also have the chance to take classes in other areas. For many, this will be their last chance to study different subjects.

Universities offer much more than job preparation. They offer the opportunity to have new experiences and to learn many kinds of things. I think all of these are reasons why people attend university.

The government is responsible for protecting a nation's cultural identity. Thus, some people believe new buildings should be built in traditional styles. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

Every city has its architectural character, and this architecture represents the culture of the place. However, I disagree that modern buildings should be built in traditional styles. In the following paragraphs I shall put forth my arguments to support my views.

Firstly, in most large cities, land is scarce and consequently it is very valuable. This has led to the construction of tall buildings which occupy only a small area of land while providing lots of floor space where people can live or work. We also have to meet the needs of the growing population for which tall buildings are the answer.

Moreover, there is no need for deforestation to provide more land.

Secondly, modern materials are more practical. Now we use concrete and steel instead of stone, timber or brick. Because of these things buildings can be built comparatively quickly using prefabricated materials. They do not use local materials, such as stone, timber or brick, which used to give character to those buildings.

Finally, changes are taking place in climate and energy sources are depleting fast. So we need energy efficient houses. Modern buildings use double glass front walls and POP( Plaster of Paris) ceilings which lessen the energy requirements. Moreover, now we need smaller houses as family structure is changing.

However, I believe that every city should preserve the already existing historic buildings which give character and identity to the city. The various forts and palaces in Rajasthan, India have been preserved and are being used to attract tourism. I agree with this kind of initiative taken by the government.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, it is the need of the day that modern buildings be built in today's contemporary styles and to give identity to a place one or two historic buildings may be there in every city.

Sending criminals to prison is not the best method of dealing with them. Education and job training are better ways to help them. Do you agree or disagree?

There are many different opinions on the best way to reduce crime. The traditional solution is to punish the criminals by putting them in prison. Some hold the view that education and job training are the long term solutions to cut crime. In my opinion, prison is the only answer in a few situations, but in most cases education, vocational training and rehabilitation are better.

Prison is the only answer in case of criminals who are a risk to the society, such as murderers. They cannot be made to mix with society. Some people also say that people would not be afraid of doing crime if fear of imprisonment is not there. But I still feel that in majority of cases, we can do without prisons.

In traditional prisons, people learn a lot about crime and so when they leave prison they will commit even more crime. In other words prisons act as universities of crime. So petty offenders like shop-lifters and pick-pockets should be given some vocational training and education. It is a well not fact that the basic causes of crime are poverty, illiteracy and unemployment. So, if we provide education and job training then we would be removing the causes of crime. If criminals are rehabilitated by some form of employment then they would certainly not re-offend.

Furthermore, the prisons are expensive to maintain. The government can spend that money on other important matters such as education and healthcare. This would ease some burden from the government's shoulders. The petty and minor criminals can also be employed in some community service projects after providing education and vocational training.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that we should hate the crime and not the criminal. To fight crime we should focus on the causes of crime. Education and job training help to rehabilitate the criminals. So, people who commit less serious crimes should not be sent to prison. Focus should be on reforming them.

Some people think that the news media nowadays have influenced people's lives in negative ways. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

I disagree with the given statement that media has a negative influence on our lives. In the following paragraphs, I intend to put forth my arguments in support of my views.

There are many positive effects of media. To begin with, the usefulness of the media in almost instantly providing information about events around the world is undeniable. It is because of the media that today we don't belong to a big planet Earth; we belong to a small global village. Furthermore, media also shapes our opinions. It is a link between the government and the people. Our conceptions of our elected officials spring from television images and newspaper stories. Most of us will never meet prime ministers or presidents, but anyone who is regularly exposed to the media will know about them. When it is time to cast our vote, we will make our decision based on the media coverage of candidates.

The media are also influential in the way they facilitate the spread of culture and lifestyle. Today, the popularity of Indian culture is an example of the media's enormous impact. It is the media which highlights the good points of our own culture through programmes such as \_India's got Talent'. What is more, the reality shows of today have given exposure and fame to the common man with talent today. Indeed, with technological advancements such as the Internet bringing even more forms of electronic media to our homes and workplaces, it is likely the media's influence will grow even stronger. Finally, the media also helps in providing justice to the common man. Who has not heard of the Jessica murder case and the case of Nithari killings? Were it not for the media, Jessica's parents would have never got justice.

As every rose is accompanied by thorns, the media too has its downside. The paparazzi can invade the privacy of famous people. Sometimes violence and vulgarity is shown and at times it can shape our opinion in negative ways. For that my counter argument is that once the person becomes famous then his private life becomes public and he has no right to crib about the paparazzi. People can choose what they want to see and technology has provided them the tools to block those channels which they don't want their children to see. Finally, God has given us brains to judge what is right or wrong. The media is just doing its job by providing us with the latest information.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate by saying that the influence of media on our lives is largely positive.

Some people think the government should pay for health care and education, but other people claim that it is the individual's responsibility. Do you agree or disagree?

Nowadays, health care and education have become the focus of the people's concern. It is a highly debated issue as to who should pay for these services. There are those who argue that the government should pay for them while others think the costs should be shouldered by individuals. Personally, I think that basic health care and primary education should be on the government but advanced health care and higher education should be borne by the individual.

It is irrefutable that it is the government's responsibility to make basic health care and primary education accessible to everyone. The reason is that a nation's prosperity very much depends on the contribution made by its well-educated citizens who are in good health. After all we all pay taxes and so we are entitled to get something back in return. Private schools and private hospitals can be available for those who want and can afford it but the free schools and free government hospitals should always be there.

On the other hand, individuals should be responsible for their advanced health care. Actually, the advanced medical and surgical treatments are very expensive. So, instead of depending on government we should take some health insurance or save in any other way with the tomorrow in mind. Higher education, too benefits the individual more than the nation. So it is quite reasonable to pay for it from one's pocket.

There are, of course, some sections of society who cannot afford their own healthcare. The government should have some system of knowing their financial status and provide free healthcare so that nobody dies for want of treatment. As far as higher education is concerned, the government can have some system of interest free loans for the needy and meritorious students.

To sum up, basic education and primary education should be borne by the government but advanced health care and education should be paid by the individual from his pocket.

Many employees may work at home with the modern technology. Some people claim that it can benefit only the workers, not the employers. Do you agree or disagree?

Working from home with the help of telephone lines, or, in other words, telecommuting has become very popular especially where internet connections are fast and reliable. I, disagree with the given statement that it can benefit only the employees and not the employers. Telecommuting is a win-win situation for both employers and employees.

There are many advantages of telecommuting to employees. To begin with, it saves time as no time is wasted commuting to and from the office. It also saves money as no spending on private or public transport has to be done. Furthermore the worker can look after family commitments like dropping the child to school etc. Although most of the work done by teleworkers is monitored, still a few minutes can be snatched at times. Finally, the tele-worker can do some side business side by side.

On the other hand there are many advantages to employers. Firstly, less office space is needed as the workers are working from home. It is a fact that land prices are exorbitant and it is very expensive to build large offices. Not only building but maintaining offices is also very costly. Then, it has been seen that employees take less sick leave and other leaves. This is also beneficial for employers.

It would be worthwhile to consider why some people opine that telecommuting is not beneficial for employers. They argue that supervising tele-workers is difficult. Statistics have proved that telecommuters take pains to work well from home as they realise the benefits it has for them.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, telecommuting benefits both workers as well as employers.

<u>The detailed description about crime will affect the people and cause many social problems.</u> <u>Some people say that the media should be strictly controlled. Do you agree or disagree?</u>

Nowadays, we are surrounded by a variety of media like the Internet, newspaper and TV, which are very informative, and in doing so give a detailed description of crime. This causes many problems in society and therefore some people opine that there should be censorship of media. I feel that the media should be very judicious in selecting what to report and how much to report. So, I agree with the statement. In this essay, I intend to support my views with my arguments.

As I see it, the news outlets should pay more attention to the affairs themselves, rather than the details of the crimes. To start with, the details of crimes make a misleading statement to the children and adolescents who are curious about the process of committing crimes, and are likely to copy the criminal actions blindly. Moreover, the excessive violence and pornographic contents can also raise the adults' criminal tendencies. In the other words, detailed crime news can generate individuals' potential desire to commit a crime, thus induce many social problems. So, there should be some control on the media.

Moreover, the detailed report of a crime does not show enough respects to the victims and their family. For example, if any murder or robbery has taken place in someone's house then if it is shown in detail on TV, the whole privacy of those people is lost. Another very strong argument in favour of censorship of media is that sometimes this detailed description can help the criminals also. For instance, when terrorists attacked Hotel Taj in Mumbai, the media reported details of the commandos' position on TV. This was also viewed by the terrorists hiding in the hotel. They changed their positions accordingly. Had there been some regulating authority the terrorists could have been caught much earlier.

However, the opponents claim that we have a right to know every detail and so media should report every detail. I still feel that it would lead to more problems. I think the media has an obligation to show the right direction to the public. It should report news in a balanced manner rather than high-lighting the details of the crime.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that although it is the duty of the media to keep us informed, the details of crime should not be shown and for that censorship of the media is a must.

Many people say that we have developed into a –throw-away culture, because we are filling up our environment with so many plastic bags and rubbish that we cannot fully dispose of. To what extent do you agree with this opinion and what measures can you recommend reducing this problem?

Environmentalists today are campaigning for "reduce, recycle and re-use" in a bid to save the world, but we as a nation, have adopted "replace" as our mantra. This and many other factors are leading to a throwaway society. In this essay, I shall discuss some steps that can be taken to solve this problem.

To begin with, modern lifestyle has contributed greatly to the increasing amount of waste and garbage we produce every day. In other words, we have turned into a materialistic and mass-consumption society where we use more and throw away more than ever before. Once new things are acquired, we dispose-off these "unwanted" things to second hand shops or just in the trash cans. The solution lies in changing our attitude. We should get old things repaired and try to use them as long as possible.

Secondly, the markets today are flooded with cheap, single-use-only things that are more in demand than high priced quality items. Our houses and closets seem to be overflowing with goods that are more in quantity and less in value. Then, there is too much packaging done by the companies in a bid to make their things more attractive. Here too, the onus lies with us. We should not buy things with excessive packaging. This will deter companies from doing too much packaging. We can also bring our own personal shopping bags instead of using plastic bags provided by stores and shops. Besides, the government can enforce stricter laws on companies to use biodegradable packaging.

Furthermore, plastics, waste metal, glass can be recycled. Companies can also contribute by developing new raw material which is recyclable and will ultimately lead to less garbage.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, individuals, business and the government can share the responsibility to reduce the amount of waste material and to save the earth. If we do not take steps to tackle this problem on a war footing, our Earth will become un-inhabitable.

Some scientists believe that studying the behaviour of 3-year-old children can tell which children would grow up to be criminals. To what extent in your opinion is crime a product of human nature or is it possible to stop children from growing up to be criminals?

Some scientists are of the opinion that hereditary characteristics are responsible for the person's temperament and hence future career. I disagree with this notion. I believe that genes do play a role but the primary determinant is nurture – education and bringing up. It is definitely possible to mould a child into any direction by proper bringing-up.

If we adopt the mindset that if parents are criminals so will the children be then we are limiting or even damaging the individual's basic right to achieve his very best. Children can rise above the gene pool and rise to great heights. Even if a child is born to criminal parents but brought up away from that environment and provided quality education, he will not be a criminal.

The debate on nature versus nurture has been raging for ages and no clear cut answer has come forward. A child prodigy can be born to ordinary parents and many intelligent parents can have ordinary children. A talented person can go unnoticed in the absence of right environment and upbringing and an ordinary person can reach great heights with proper training. So, interplay between hereditary and environmental factors must be there.

It has been seen that children born to intelligent parents also are intelligent and successful. But it is also possible that such parents provide an environment which nurtures the development of their children. When we see some programmes such as \_India's Got Talent' and \_Little Champs', we notice some extremely gifted children who are born with talent and also some who have achieved great heights with great perseverance and proper coaching.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that both nature and nurture play a part in determining the character of a person. It can also be concluded that both are inextricably linked with each other. But nurture weighs over nature and it is definitely possible to prevent children from growing up to be criminals.

Some people think that people moving to a new country should accept new culture in the foreign country rather than living as a separate minority group with different lifestyle. Do you agree or disagree?

Today, with the passage of time each and every country is on the path of development, and with this development there is a growing trend of visiting different places in different countries. It is a highly debated issue whether immigrants should do and behave as the people of the host country or should they stick to their traditional lifestyle and live as a separate minority. It is necessary to look into pros and cons of both situations before forming an opinion.

There are many benefits of adopting host countries customs. Firstly, it decreases chances of misunderstanding and embarrassment. For e.g. in the UK it is offensive to ask about pay to anyone, which is common in India. Secondly, a nation's customs and traditions are fascinating and offer a deep insight into that country. People move to other countries to broaden their horizon. So, if immigrants copy the customs of host country, they learn more about them and that too in an interesting way. Finally, visitors establish a rapport with local people because people feel respected when their customs are understood and imitated. They become a member of the host country and so they don't suffer any culture shock.

On the other hand there are many advantages of making a minority group. If a person is from a country with strong and old traditions, it will be difficult for him to adapt to the new customs. He can't break the old customs such as food habits and wearing certain types of clothes. In such cases if he retains his old customs and lives with his own community as a separate minority, he won't suffer from homesickness.

On balance, I feel that someone who is moving to another country should respect the customs, culture, traditions etc. of that country. This is necessary because a newcomer is like a guest in someone else's home. So he is expected to follow the rules of that country. However, it should not be obligatory for him to follow those customs and change himself altogether. As time passes and he gets to know the hosts better then he can decide if he wants to adopt any custom or stick to his own. After all being a cosmopolitan is the need of the hour.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, mutual understanding between both the visitor and the host is necessary to maintain harmony. A cosmopolitan society in which everyone is tolerant of each other's customs and traditions is the need of the day. After all, today, we are part of a small global village and not a big planet Earth.

Children who grow up in families which are short of money are better prepared with the problems of adult life than children who are brought up by wealthy parents. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Role of family atmosphere in a child's development is a cause of concern. However, I disagree with the notion that children of poor families are better equipped in dealing with the challenges of adult life than those of rich families. No doubt, adversity is a good teacher of life, but rich parents can also prepare their children to face the problems of adult life by good education and good nurturing.

A child of poor family has more situations to solve a problem or make a decision as both parents are working to make both ends meet and children have to look after themselves. They realise the value of money as they have to live with the barest minimum and as a result they find it less difficult later on in life when they face financial challenges. In contrast, the children of wealthy families are born with a silver spoon in their mouth. They are completely ignorant of the value of money as everything is provided for them in their youth and expect the same situation in adulthood.

On the other hand, children of rich families study in the best schools and get the best higher education. They can learn problem solving in such academic institutes. What is more, a wealthy child may be well trained by a parent who himself has a lot of knowledge of money. Such parents themselves know money management better and can pass on those skills to their children.

Life experiences also play a role. Children can have innate ability to face problems of life. They may have personality traits such as being optimistic, outgoing, confident and openminded. Due to these abilities they can solve problems in a better way.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, a poor child may learn to get along without wealth and a wealthy child may be well trained by a parent to face hurdles of life by effective education. Therefore, I disagree that the economic situation of the family has a role in problem solving skills.

The only way to improve the safety on our own road is to have stricter punishment for driving offenders. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is irrefutable that careless driving and violation of traffic rules certainly result in a large number of accidents and stricter punishments are necessary to reduce them. However, there are also certain other measures that have equal or more effectiveness in ensuring road safety.

In the first place, there are certain accidents that occur not because of traffic violations. To explain it further, poor road condition is considered a major reason for road casualties. For example, narrow roads and sharp curves often force even law- abiding drivers makes mistakes. Therefore, it should be noted that drivers alone cannot be blamed for such mishaps and giving them stricter punishments in these cases is no solution. A more effective strategy by the government would be to straighten accident prone curves and widen narrow roads. Larger number of road signs and proper traffic signals can also be effective in reducing accidents on roads.

Furthermore, poor climate condition can be a major cause of accidents. For instance, poor visibility due to dense mist and rain, slippery roads on account of snowfall cause make driving difficult and cause serious accidents in many countries. Stricter punishment for drivers is a futile exercise in handling such problems.

Modern technological innovations should be used to deal with such emergency situations.

On the other hand, reckless driving, speeding and breach of traffic rules by careless drivers have caused many accidents. Moreover, drunken and drowsy driving have also resulted serious traffic mishaps. While we admit that more stringent punishment for drivers would be an effective measure to an extent, it should not be considered the only way towards road safety.

In summary, there are certain situations where drivers are not responsible for a particular accident. Hence apart from punishing drivers with heavier penalties other effective measures should also be taken.

( taken from www.darsanaielts.blogspot.com)

Some people think that using animals for experimentation purpose is cruel, but other people think that is necessary for the development of science. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

Animal experimentation has been a debated issue for many decades. Some people believe that scientists' locking up animals in a laboratory environment is not what nature intended – and they are probably right. Others believe laboratory animals perform a great service for humankind.

For many years now, scientists have been working hard to develop cures for diseases. From time to time, new medicines and drugs are created which may be a solution to a serious illness affecting mankind. In order to determine if there is any level of danger in these drugs, these are first tested on animals. For example, who has not heard of the Thalidomide case? In 1952, a drug was used for vomiting of pregnancy. Obviously, it was not tested properly. All the children born had seal-like limbs. By the time it was known that thalidomide was responsible, it was too late and much harm had been done.

Another reason for justification of animal experimentation is that the life span of guinea pigs used for experimentation is very small, only 3-4 years and so the effect of drugs can be tested over generations. Even if humans volunteered for testing, it would not help to test whether the effect passed from one generation to the other.

The arguments against animal experimentation are that animals are also sentient beings and we have no right to exploit them for our selfish motives. Secondly, they are very different from humans and so what is tested on animals cannot be applied to humans. Finally, unnecessary experiments are done just for new cosmetics which are not even needed, which is bad.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that animals are not humans. Although the life of animals in a lab is regrettable, I much prefer a guinea pig to die than a human being. The human need must always come first. It is sad that any living thing must suffer but the use of laboratory animals in testing new products made today goes a long way toward helping humankind enjoy a better tomorrow.

In many countries, good schools and medical facilities are available only in cities. Some people think new teachers and doctors should work in rural areas for a few years, but others think everyone should be free to choose where they work. Discuss and give your own opinion.

As a big gap is there between the urban and rural areas, some people opine that teachers and doctors who are fresh out of college should work in villages for a few years. However, others believe that the choice of where to work should be left on the teachers and doctors. In this essay I shall discuss the merits and demerits of both approaches and finally give my opinion.

There are many advantages of having teachers and doctors work in rural areas. Firstly, the people in the villages will have access to medical care and education which they are deprived of normally. Secondly, it would be good for the teachers and doctors who are fresh from university to translate their theoretical knowledge into practice. In urban areas there already so many experienced teachers and doctors. Therefore, people would naturally not opt for fresh ones. In a rural setting, they would gain a lot of confidence very early on in their career. Finally, a few of these doctors and teachers may choose to live permanently in those villages to serve humanity.

On the other hand, this compulsory policy may have some negative effects. To begin with, we belong to a democratic country and everyone has a right to work where one pleases. Such enforcement may result in working passively and there will be no motivation. So the rural residents may not get appropriate treatment and service. Secondly, fewer and fewer students would choose such majors and careers and so in the long run there would be shortage of such professionals.

In my opinion, it would be better to have such a rule. It would be a win-win situation for both, rural people and the professionals. It would also help to bridge the gap between the cities and the countryside. The government can, however, make fresh teachers and doctors want to work in the rural areas by offering higher salaries and other incentives.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, sending doctors and teachers to rural areas would be an ideal situation but the government should offer some financial and non-financial schemes.

The speeding up of life in many areas such as travel and communication has negative effects on society at all levels—individual, national and global. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is irrefutable that the IT revolution and faster means of travel have affected society at all levels. However, I disagree that all these effects are negative. The society has also benefitted enormously from this speeding up of life which in other words we can say globalization.

At the individual level, we have more choices, more opportunities to travel, better job prospects and more awareness and tolerance of other cultures. Due to better communication, people are connected with their near and dear ones and distances are no longer a barrier. There has been a fall in face-to-face communication but the social network of friends that the young generation of today has is far more than ever before in the history of mankind.

At the national level, countries are getting closer and the boundaries are disappearing. Because of this fast era of today, nations are developing strong bonds doing successful trade with each other. The rich nations are opening Multi National Companies in developing countries and thus providing job opportunities to millions. This is narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor. No doubt the people working in such companies are underpaid but it is definitely better than being unemployed. Because of this the economies of the poor countries are improving.

At the global level, nations are joining hands to fight evils such as poverty, disease, terrorism and global warming. Who has not heard of the Kyoto Protocol. The major feature of the Kyoto Protocol is that it sets binding targets for 37 industrialized countries and the European community for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, the accelerating pace of life has both negative as well as positive effects. However, the positive effects are much more than negative effects.

Some people think the increasing business and cultural contact between countries brings many positive effects. Others say it causes the loss of national identities. Discuss on both sides and give your opinion.

Globalisation has resulted in more business and cultural contacts among different nations. This also means that in many ways people around the world are becoming more and more similar. This situation has both pros and cons which I shall discuss in the following paragraphs.

There are many benefits of globalisation. To begin with there are more jobs because of globalisation. Multinational companies have opened in many parts of the world providing jobs to thousands of people. Secondly, there is more efficient trade between different countries around the globe thereby improving the economies of developing countries. People have more opportunities to travel and therefore have awareness of other cultures. What is more, today people have more choices of products because of globalisation.

There are also many reasons why people say that national identities are being lost. We eat the same food, watch the same TV programmes, listen to the same music and wear the same clothes. People have also started speaking one language, English, in many parts of the world. In fact, English has become the lingua franca today.

However, I feel that this is a very narrow definition of national identities and nations are as different as they were ever in the past. Cultural identity is based on far more than just the films we watch or the clothes we wear. For example, take my own culture of India and compare it to the west. We may wear any clothes, but we never take the names of elders and call them with respect. In the west, it is quite OK to call anyone by name. In fact, they appreciate it more. I believe that after knowing about other cultures, we learn to respect our culture even more. So, some very deep rooted national identities will always be there.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that there are more advantages of increasing trade and cultural contact among nations. Whatever similarities we see today are only on the surface. Total loss of national identities can never take place.

Advertising encourages consumers to buy in quantity rather than promoting quality. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Whether it is on TV, radio or hoardings at the side of the road, advertisements have become a part of our lives. Advertising is a powerful and persuasive medium. I agree with the former half of the given statement that adverts encourage people to buy in quantity. However, I disagree that adverts do not promote quality. I shall put forth my arguments to support my views in the following paragraphs.

On the one hand, advertisements make us pile up things in the home which we may never ever use. For example, we get lured by the one-on-one scheme that companies promote just to sell their old stock in bulk. For example, recently, I bought three pairs of jeans of Levis brand because there was a two-on-one offer. What I did not realise then was that the designs were outdated and defective. Now those jeans are just occupying space in my almirah.

Because of advertisements, sometimes we buy what tempts us without the insight of what we need actually. Impressive images, videos, or captions are bound to leave an imprint on us. For example, media is flooded with the advertisements of beauty products and they all claim to make you fair in a few days. Women, and these days, even men are crazy about these things and buy these things even without consulting their dermatologist.

On the other hand, advertisements are very crucial given the fast pace of life today. The advertisements open our eyes to all the latest facilities and trends and with that give us the chance and opportunity of choosing from the wide range of products available for we have little time to make discoveries about what is required. Advertising links producers and consumers by providing relevant information of the latest products and services. Thanks to advertising, we know that there are so many nice things available. Moreover, an overwhelming majority of consumers are sensible enough to consider their options before they decide on a particular item.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that adverts promote quantity but they tell us about quality too. The onus lies on us to look into our real needs and not be swayed by adverts.

As global trade increases between different countries, many daily necessities are produced in other countries. Such goods are usually transported a long distance. Do the benefits of this trend outweigh its drawbacks? (2008 – same essay)

Globalisation has revolutionized our world in many aspects. Now, we don't belong to a big planet Earth. We belong to a small global village. Everything is available everywhere. There are many advantages and disadvantages of transporting goods over a long distance. In my opinion, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

On the positive side, transporting goods over a long distance gives us a lot of choices. We can taste a variety of fruits and vegetables from all parts of the world. For example, about ten years ago, we hardly saw kiwi fruit which is from New Zealand. But, now it has a place on every fruit stand. Earlier, we had very few shoe brands like Bata and Carona but now the market is flooded with Reeboks, Nike, Adidas and other foreign brands.

Secondly, many people get employment in this field. Small businesses have a chance to expand globally and it increases the overall economy of the country. Finally, it helps in developing good relations between countries which helps in international co-operation and peace. If countries are dependent upon one another's economic success then armed conflict would be less likely.

On the downside, importing goods can have a negative effect on local culture. This can be seen in countries such as Japan where imported food has become more popular than traditional, local produce, eroding people's understanding of their own food traditions. A second major disadvantage is pollution. When goods are transported thousands of miles by road, sea and air, it increases pollution from exhaust fumes.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, importing goods has both merits and demerits but the pros outweigh the cons.

The main purpose of public libraries is to provide books and they shouldn't waste their limited resources and space on providing expensive hi-tech media such as computer software, videos and DVDs. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

Since centuries libraries are in the service of man. These libraries are the repositories of never ending knowledge known as books. Some people opine that libraries should only provide books and not other hi-tech media such as computer software, videos and DVDs. I, however, believe that such hi-tech media should not be treated as a rival to books. Rather, it should serve as a complementary role.

Because of technology, books are now being converted into disc forms such as CDs and DVDs. Even the availability of books in the form of electronic media on NET is putting in danger the importance of the libraries. Moreover, a person can sit comfortably in his study as the availability of reference books in the form of CDs and DVDs makes him reluctant to leave his study for library.

However, one should keep in mind that a person goes to a library not only to search and get information from books but also to sit and study there. The ambience and the peaceful and scholarly atmosphere of the library help one to concentrate more on one's work and study. Thus, libraries will never become redundant. They will always be there to indicate the presence of a well-read and educated society.

Another important point is that it is very difficult to always read books from the computer monitor. Traditional books can be issued from the library and read in the comfort of your bed. Hi-tech media can be accessed only by those who are computer literate. The access to such media can be affected by power cuts and network failures. Moreover, in a traditional library you are guided by the librarians if you need any help in searching for the book.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that advancement should be welcomed in every field but the importance of the libraries for their fundamental role cannot be put aside. This tendency will add more crowns of success to the importance of libraries.

Far too little has been done to prevent animals and plants from dying out, although people have been aware of this problem for a long time. Why do people do so little about it? Give your suggestions on how to solve this problem.

It is irrefutable that people know about the endangered animal and plant species but don't take enough efforts to save them. In the following paragraphs I shall discuss the reasons why people are so indifferent towards this problem and suggest some ways forward.

There are many reasons why people are doing so little about it. Firstly, people nowadays are very busy coping with the pace of the 24/7 society that this global village is offering. They are running mad in the rat race of material comforts and working hard to achieve them. They have become victims of this consumerist society and as a consequence, have become workaholics. They don't have time to care about animals and plants. They don't even know that their luxuries are at the cost of animal and plant life.

Furthermore, they are unaware about the consequences of the extinction of animal and plant species. For instance, they don't know that if the ecological chain is disturbed, it has an impact on them only in the long run. For example, there are many bat species that are becoming extinct. Such bats help keep the insect population in control. If these bats die then the insects will increase a lot and destroy our crops. So, we will have nothing to eat. In addition, many animals, like rodents, help in the dispersal of plant seeds and in the pollination of plants. Some of these plants are important for medical research and the development of medicines.

The solutions need to be implemented on a war footing. There should be increased awareness about consequences of this phenomenon. Secondly, with funding, biologists and naturalists can use their years of knowledge to help in the breeding of various animal species. Furthermore, since people are often responsible for habitat destruction, it is only right that they use some resources to help preserve whatever important wildlife habitats are left. Trees should not be cut for housing and furniture. Instead, high rise buildings should be made and aluminium doors and windows should be used.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, people should be made aware of the consequences of animal and plant extinction and active steps should be taken to preserve these species.

Many people believe that scientific research should be carried out and controlled by the governments rather than private companies. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

There is no doubt that scientific research can provide a lot of wealth to a country. However, it is a matter of debate whether these researches should be carried out by governments or private companies. From my point of view, both the governments and private companies should be actively involved in scientific researches.

There is a strong argument why scientific researches should not be done only by the government. Government has so much else on its shoulders. It has to provide infrastructure such as transportation, hospitals and education institutes to the citizens. Then it has to support the defence services and even maintain law and order in the country.

There are some areas, however, where only the government should carry out and control scientific research. Firstly, researches into nuclear technology and national defence are very crucial. They cannot be left into the hands of private companies. Secondly, some researches are only for the advancement of knowledge. In such research the private companies have no incentive. So the government should take the leading role.

There are many areas in which private companies should participate in scientific researches. To begin with, researches are done more efficiently by private companies because they are profit driven. Every dollar is spent wisely to ensure maximum benefits and every resource is used effectively to avoid waste. Also, researches by private companies are closely associated with market needs. Private companies are market oriented so they always come up with inventions that have practical values that can increase productivity and improve life. For example, researches in cosmetics and cough medicines.

Both, governments and private companies should be active in scientific research. Some researches should be done only by the government, some by private companies and in some the resources can be shared.

It is more important for a building to serve a purpose than to look beautiful. Architects shouldn't worry about producing building as a work of art. Do you agree or disagree?

It is true that buildings should be more utilitarian than beautiful. However, I disagree that architects should not make efforts about making artistic buildings. I believe that today's architects have the expertise and the resources to design buildings which are both – beautiful and useful.

A good building should satisfy the three principles of durability, utility and beauty. It should stand up robustly and remain in good condition. It should be useful and function well for the people using it. It should delight people and raise their spirits. A good architect should strive to fulfil each of these three attributes as well as possible.

To begin with, the burgeoning population and the scarcity of land today have raised the debate whether the buildings of today should only be useful and not beautiful. However, the skyscrapers of today are the answers to both these problems. They accommodate a lot of people in the least amount of space and these skyscrapers are architectural marvels in terms of beauty.

Secondly, the natural resources are limited and it is the need of the hour to make energy efficient buildings. For example, using solar panels and other energy saving measures are the need of the day. Today's architects have been successful in designing aesthetically appealing solar panels which need less space. The climate changes that are taking place because of global warming need buildings that need less air conditioning and yet remain cool.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, it is commendable for architects to understand function, and aesthetics both. It is a big responsibility to have buildings which are both useful and beautiful and architects of today have the capability to do so.

Some people believe they should keep all the money they have earned and should not pay tax to the state. Do you agree or disagree?

I disagree with the statement that individuals should not pay taxes to the state. The government runs the country from the taxes it collects. Taxes are collected only from those who earn above a certain minimum limit. It is our moral duty to pay taxes.

Tax money collected by government is used to fund basic amenities, provide various services to citizens and for government administration and projects, running of jails and defense system, and many other operations. It is not wrong to say that "taxes run a country." Thus, it is very important for a government to make people pay taxes.

Let us analyze why people do not want to pay taxes. The main reason is their dissatisfaction with government in serving them. They blame government for things like lack of infrastructure, poverty and unemployment, but they are not completely wrong as tax revenue is misused in some or the other way in every country. In developed countries, however, because of higher satisfaction from government's functioning, citizens may be more willing to pay taxes. Another factor generating dissatisfaction is the tax structure itself. Often the tax system is complex and it drives people away from paying taxes. It is also felt that the tax rates are high and tax slabs are unequal. So they feel it is not unethical if one goes for tax avoidance or tax evasion.

Not paying taxes can drastically affect a country's revenue generation, my own country, India, for that matter. But then, it is equally desired that government come up with a fair tax structure and also make people aware where the taxes are being diverted. Even lowering the tax rates can help a country increase its tax collection as it would increase compliance among the taxpayers. Tax reform should also be fast so that no public grievance or non-compliance remains for long. A proper tax system backed up with strict tax laws can produce the best results.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that it is the duty of every citizen to pay tax and the duty of every government to use it appropriately in public interest.

<u>There are social, medical and technical problems associated with the use of mobile phones.</u> <u>What forms do they take? Do you agree that the problems outweigh the benefits of mobile phones?</u>

Mobile phone is one of the most important inventions that have brought people tremendous convenience and efficiency. Admittedly, if misused or overused, it may cause some social, medical and technical problems. However, its pros far outnumber its cons.

Mobiles have helped people remain connected with the world from wherever they are. Distance is not a barrier any more there is a sense of security if you know you have a gadget with which you can be in touch with your near and dear ones. At the time of emergencies and calamities, they are one of the most used tools for supplying immediate help.

Mobile phones also provide us with facilities like messaging, camera, recording and internet. As a matter of fact, now they can serve as a good replacement of laptop. Business transactions can also take place at any time of the day and family commitments can also be fulfilled while at work. Cell phones also serve as entertainment tools as many games can now be played and some phones have FM radio connection too.

On the downside, mobile phones emit infrared rays which directly affect the body part exposed to. According to Australian Health Research Institute, use of mobile phones can lead to ear, eye and brain cancer besides some other disorders like heart ailments. Overuse of mobiles takes away the privacy and sometimes even the peace of mind. Wherever we are, at work, at home or in a social gathering, we are hammered with unwanted calls or messages. It is a boon to roadside paparazzi for whom taking snaps is just too easy with more advanced mobiles.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, the advantages of the mobile phone far outweigh its disadvantages. Mobile technology definitely has brought a revolution and changed the way to work, to socialize and to entertain, but we must be more wise and responsible in using it.

Today, the advanced science and technology have made great changes to people's life, but artists such as musicians, painters and writers are still highly valued. What can arts tell us about life that science and technology cannot?

It is irrefutable that artists as well as scientists bring many benefits to society. The role of art as well as science is different yet inextricably linked. In the following paragraphs I intend to delve into the role of both in our lives. What is certain is that both types are valuable, priceless and irreplaceable for every society.

The contributions of artists to the society are very essential. Art can bring out people's creativity, views and personalities. For example, we learn about our history, traditions and culture through movies, songs and paintings made by artists. Art also entertains us. Another important aspect of this is that art is an ancient means of communication. Our language is a result of people's need to communicate. Appreciation of art is what differentiates us from animals.

From the other side, the contribution of scientists cannot be exaggerated. All humankind is indebted to the scientists because of their work and achievements. Scientists make our life easier. We have cars and aeroplanes to move fast from one place to another. We have microwaves and ready-to-eat foods to make cooking much easier. We have different devices that simplify all we do. Finally, scientists are making great achievements in medicines that make our life longer and happier. Nowadays people have a great opportunity to do many things faster by use of computers.

Science and technology give us better life but arts tell us how to live that life. In Science truths are proved and phenomena are explained. In art they are interpreted. We enjoy what science brings to us. But we cannot be satisfied with the material things. What we want most is the emotion from their deep hearts, which can only be obtained from art. Art cannot be valued as certain amount of money, not like the productions of science. Take Van Gogh's painting for instance. It cannot be rated by the value of dyes and canvas. The sensation in mankind's heart is priceless. That's why art isn't equal to science. Art makes people enjoy life, gives people the pleasure of living from the mental level. That's where art differs from science.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that artists nourish our souls when scientists and technology feed our minds. So, we cannot eliminate or underestimate one of them.

# In many countries, the proportion of older people is steadily increasing. Does this trend have more positive or negative effects on the society?

Thanks to improvements in standards of living and medical advances, people's life expectancy has increased to an unprecedented level. This has brought many demographic changes. Today's society can be called a graying society. This trend has both merits and demerits which I shall highlight in this essay. Overall, the negative effects are much more.

There would be many pros of living longer. In a way, it would be good for people who want to see their grand-grandchildren. Old generation would be able to share more experiences with young generations, so the youth would benefit. The families would get good support of elders and would be able to keep their culture and traditions alive for a longer time. One would get a chance to see frequent changes in technology and lifestyle and enjoy a life full of comforts for more years.

On the other hand, as the people would grow old, they would go on becoming weaker and weaker and would have to depend on their families to fulfill their needs. The families may get tired of their responsibilities in the long run. There would be a wider generation gap, and the old generation would get a culture shock. If people live long, then retirement would be at an older age and it would surely lead to unemployment problems. Moreover, they might get bored of living such a long life as there would be no goals for them.

What we have to accept is that increased life expectancy is something we have to face more and more in the future. If proper steps are not taken then it would be a big burden on government as it has to provide social security. The elderly are not working and so are not paying taxes. They are totally dependent on their families and the governments.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, even though the aging trend can bring some benefits to the society, the cons far outweigh the pros. Therefore, effective solutions should be found to reduce its adverse effects, especially on the productivity of the society.

Some people believe that air travel should be restricted because it causes serious pollution and uses up the world's fuel resources. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is irrefutable that air travel causes pollution and uses a lot of fuel, bit I disagree that air travel should be restricted. Restricting air travel would solve some problems but would lead to many other problems.

At a time when people all over the world worry about the decreasing level of fossil fuels and global warming, it is right to take action to save the planet earth. However, to simply discourage flights is not the answer. International tourism has become the backbone of many economies of the world. Many countries are earning from tourism. Many people are employed in this industry. Many businesses like hotels and leisure centres are dependent on tourists. So, if we discourage international tourism, it would create new and even worse problems. Many businesses would go broke and many people would be without jobs.

Air flight also enables intercultural exchanges between countries. The advent of cheap air fare makes it possible for people the world over to travel regularly, regardless of the purpose of the trip. Therefore, people have the opportunities to learn from different cultures and have a better understanding of countries they used to be unfamiliar with. This, in turn, enhances cultural communications between countries.

It is true that air travel consumes oil, but other modes of transportation are also causing pollution and using fuel. Discouraging private cars and encouraging people to use public transport could help save the environmental resources in a big way. Therefore it would be a very unpractical decision to restrict air travel at the cost of people's mobility, or worse, at the cost of the development of the economy. Technology could also be used to produce more environmentally friendly and fuel efficient engines.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, instead of restricting air travel, we should develop more efficient engine that produces more energy output with less fuel and fewer major air pollutants. We should also focus on limiting private vehicles and encouraging public transport.

More and more measures to improve the security in large urban areas have been introduced in many countries because of the increased crime. Do the benefits of these measures outweigh the drawbacks?

Crime and the fear of crime are very big concerns in big cities and so many security measures have been introduced to tackle crime. In this essay I intend to delve into the advantages and disadvantages of these methods. The advantages definitely outweigh the disadvantages.

One such measure is the security cameras which have become ubiquitous in many countries. Earlier they appeared only in banks and at high-security areas but now they are seen in public places such as malls, streets, stadiums and transport. Surveillance cameras have several benefits. An obvious benefit is that the police can catch criminals in the act, thus reducing crime. This has made the streets safer for ordinary people. A more important point is that criminals, particularly young offenders or petty criminals are deterred. They will not be tempted to carry out crimes, and thus society will be a lot safer. Cameras are also cost-effective and unobtrusive.

Authorities do not need to spend large amounts of money on police.

Another security measure is the computerized data collection of individuals. This also helps the police force to operate more effectively. The data can be updated regularly and data retrieval is very easy and quick. These methods are also cost effective. Other Methods like police patrolling on the roads has also been intensified. These methods bring a sense of security in the minds of people.

However, some people object to these measures. The biggest objection concerns privacy. Many people feel that they should be free to travel or move around a shop, mall, street or country without being photographed or recorded. They feel that being watched constantly is like being in a jail, and that ordinary people are losing their freedom because of these devices. Even the computerized data collection of individuals can go in wrong hands.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, there are definite advantages to using such measures, but we need to balance the need for security with respect for the individual's privacy and freedom. If this is done then definitely the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

In many countries more and more young people are leaving school but unable to find jobs. What problems do you think youth unemployment causes for individuals and the society? What measures should be taken to reduce the level of unemployment among youngsters?

Young people's situation and future prospects are of vital concern to us all. Many of them face the problem of unemployment after passing out of school. This essay shall highlight the problems caused by youth unemployment on individuals and society and suggest some ways forward. It has been rightly said – —Of all the aspects of social misery, nothing is so heart breaking as unemployment and a suggest some ways forward.

Unemployment has profound effects on the young people. Unemployment affects their psychological and social development. Some may even develop suicidal tendencies or get involved in crime. A significant proportion of young people are not in a position to make a positive transition to adulthood. For some, it will be very difficult to 'catch up', even if circumstances do improve. At a crucial period of life, they are missing out on acquiring and exercising skills, on developing a sense of their competence, on getting the positive feelings about self which come from having a sense of control over their own lives, on being given opportunities to contribute to society, and to feel that they are valued.

On the societal level also there are many effects. There is increased crime in the society which has a very detrimental effect. Young people are energetic and if their energy is not channelized in the right direction then definitely violence and crime is there in the society. Poverty, which is the result of unemployment, also leads to many problems like diminished health standards. So, on the whole, the society suffers.

The solutions are not simple. Education system should be reformed. There are many people without jobs and many jobs are without suitable people. So students should be encouraged to take up those courses which have no dearth of jobs. Government can also provide subsidies to those firms that take on unemployed people.

Government can set up industries based on agriculture and also set up cottage industries such as those of carpets, mats and soaps. Finally, government can encourage self employment by giving loans to young people who want to be entrepreneurs.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, youth unemployment is a serious issue and should be dealt with on a war footing as there are a lot of detrimental effects on the individual and society.

Some people think that teachers should be responsible for teaching students to judge what is right and wrong so that they can behave well. Others say that teachers should only teach students academic subjects. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

A well known adage from India says "Acharya devo bhava," which means teachers are next to God. Right from the ancient times, teachers are put on the highest position. It is a highly debatable topic whether teachers should be concerned with only academics or also teach manners and etiquettes to children. In this essay I intend to discuss both sides of the argument.

Teacher is like a potter who moulds the earthen vessels in whichever form he wants. A child's mind is like raw clay and is very much ready to be moulded in the shape it is guided to. A good teacher always feels responsible to develop a child's conscience. He has the potential to become a friend, philosopher and guide for his students. With this special position in students' life, he often acts as their role model. His words highly influence the minds of the students.

Students always try to imitate his actions or implement his teachings, so he has to be much careful of his behaviour. So, in that respect a teacher has a much more role than just teaching academic subjects.

Furthermore, teachers convey many good things to parents and society through students in many parts of the world. For example, in Nepal, where illiteracy rate is very high, teachers convey many valuable messages such as of personal hygiene through students. When a student goes home and tells his parents that my teacher says we should wash hands before meals, then parents listen. In such set-ups teachers are playing a much greater role than academicians.

On the other hand, those who say that teachers should only concentrate on teaching course material, argue that competition is stiff and if children lag behind in curriculum, they will never be able to catch up with their counterparts in other parts of today's global village. They opine that rules of behaviour can be taught by parents at home.

In conclusion, I believe that teachers have a much bigger role than just covering the syllabus.

One long-distance flight consumes fuel which a car uses in several years' time, but they cause the same amount of pollution. So some people think that we should discourage non-essential flights, such as tourist travel, rather than to limit the use of cars. To what extent do you agree or disagree? (similar 2008 essay)

It is irrefutable that the fuel consumed by one long-distance flight is consumed by a car in several years' time, and the amount of pollution it produces is also more. Therefore, some people suggest that non-essential flights, including international travel, should be discouraged. I totally disagree whit this statement. I feel that even though cars produce less pollution and use less fuel, still we should focus on limiting the number of cars. Discouraging flights would lead to many other problems.

At a time when people all over the world worry about the decreasing level of fossil fuels and global warming, it is right to take action to save the planet earth. However, to simply discourage flights is not the answer. International tourism has become the backbone of many economies of the world. Many countries are earning from tourism. Many people are employed in this industry. Many businesses like hotels and leisure centres are dependent on tourists. So, if we discourage international tourism, it would create new and even worse problems. Many businesses would go broke and many people would be without jobs.

Air flight also enables intercultural exchanges between countries. The advent of cheap air fare makes it possible for people the world over to travel regularly, regardless of the purpose of the trip. Therefore, people have the opportunities to learn from different cultures and have a better understanding of countries they used to be unfamiliar with. This, in turn, enhances cultural communications between countries.

What we should do is to limit the use of cars. The number of cars is increasing at a very fast pace. This is creating too many problems. Cars are using too much of fossil fuels; they are creating a lot of pollution; they are leading to traffic congestion on the roads and they are also causing accidents.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, traveling by air should not be discouraged. Instead, the use of cars should be limited.

In the last century when a human astronaut first arrived on the Moon he said: "It is a big step for mankind". But some people think it makes little difference to our daily life. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Almost every day we read something in the papers about the latest exciting developments in the space race. Many people are of the view that all the money and energy spent on space exploration and research is a complete waste because it has no effect on our daily life. I, however disagree. In the following paragraphs I shall discuss how space research has touched our lives in more ways than one.

The technology that put men on the moon, launched space shuttles and will build a space station has found its way into everyday life on earth. Common secondary uses of space research are called spin-offs. The common smoke detector used in homes was first prepared for spacecrafts as a warning system. Computer bar codes in retail stores, shock absorbing shoes used by tennis players and athletes, lightweight materials used for helmets and sporting materials and non stick coating used in pans were all first developed as part of space research.

Space technology has provided many benefits to the medical field as well. Pace makers used to treat cardiac as well as remote monitoring devices for intensive care patients and portable medical equipment carried aboard ambulances are but a few applications of space technology providing daily benefits in hospitals, offices and homes. Artificial limbs of lesser weight are also a by-product of space research and these are a blessing for the physically challenged.

Not only that, it is well known that global warming will soon transform our Earth into a boiling pot. Then it would be very essential to find alternative places to live. If we are able to find signs of life elsewhere in space it would be a jackpot for mankind.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that space exploration and research has touched our everyday lives in numerous ways. So, it definitely is a big step for mankind.

Some people think history has nothing or little to tell us, but others think that studying the past history can help us better understand the present. Please discuss the two views and give your own opinion.

History refers to all the things that happened in the past, especially the political, social, or economic development of a nation. Literally, everything, including a nation, a city, a town, a subject, a business, and even a product, has its unique history. Some individuals are of the opinion that studying past history is useless today but others believe it is very essential to know history to better understand the present. I intend to discuss both sides of the argument in this essay.

Undoubtedly, the present is the continuation of the past. Therefore, studying the past history can enable us to better understand what is going on around us. For example, if we are equipped with relevant knowledge of history, it will be easier for us to understand the evolution of mankind. It would also tell us how we progressed and reached where we are today. We would also know how technology developed step by step. History can serve us as a guide because of which we do not repeat the mistakes of yesteryears. We also get inspiration from the great men of the past through history.

Those opposed to the study of history argue that the past was very different from the present and we cannot apply that knowledge to the present. For example, they say that the French Revolution and the freedom struggle of India have no need to be learnt because those situations will never arise again. What they forget is that this knowledge makes us realise the importance of liberty and self governance.

Opponents of the study of history also claim that history has nothing to do with professionals such as architects and accountants. I believe they would be better in their professions if they know something about the history of architecture or that of accountancy. As a matter of fact, you are supposed to demonstrate some evidence of historical ability if you want to pursue almost any career.

To sum up, studying the past history can not only deepen and widen our knowledge but also help us develop the power of analysis. Thus, we are able to look at what is happening at present from a historical perspective and better understanding. It has been rightly said by Cicero :-—History is the witness of the times

The torch The teacher of life The life of memory The messenger of antiquity

Some people think that national sports teams and individual men and women who represent their country should be financially supported by the government. However, others argue that they should be funded by non-government sources (e.g. Business, scholarships, etc.). Discuss both views and give your opinion.

It is irrefutable that sports holds fascination for almost everyone and winning a game in international sports events such as the World Cup or the Olympic Games is a matter of national honour. It is a highly debatable issue whether the sports team or sportsmen who represent their country should be funded by governments or NGOs. In the following paragraphs I intend to delve into the advantages and disadvantages of both approaches.

The reason why national teams and individual athletes representing a country should be funded by the government is that, first of all, they compete against opponents from all over the globe in international sports events for the whole nation. When they break a record or set up a new record in a world-class tournament, they inspire national pride and arouse patriotism among its citizens. Moreover, they also play a diplomatic function in competitions. They act as brand ambassadors for their country and behaviour helps strengthen the relations between countries and also improve their nation's image.

Those in favour of NGOs funding the national sports teams argue that this would ease some burden off the government's shoulders. Moreover, these businesses are profit driven so they would provide the best coaching and facilities to their teams. The reason why they support a team or player is that they want to make use of their market influence to promote their products or services. So, they also get something back by doing so.

I believe that it would be better for government to support the teams because the less popular teams and athletes, who are equally important, are ignored by the businesses and organisations. Without stable financial support available, they would not be able to concentrate on training, and they would not remain dedicated to their sports. Besides, it is still controversial for some industries such as tobacco industry to sponsor sporting events.

To sum up, national sports teams and individual players standing for a nation should be financially supported by the government to achieve the desired performance.

Housing shortage in big cities can cause severe social consequences. Some people think only government action can solve this problem. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Big cities act as magnets for everyone. Therefore it is increasingly difficult for ordinary people to have somewhere to call home in big cities due to housing shortage, especially the lack of affordable housing. Some people think only government has the power to solve this problem. I completely agree with this statement.

The main reason for housing shortage in large cities is the burgeoning urban population. The situation goes from bad to worse as each year millions of job seekers rush into the city to try their lucky break and the majority of them eventually get settled down, which makes housing shortage even more serious. Careful planning of cities is required to address the issue and obviously, only the government has the power to address this problem.

Even if the population were indeed under control, we still need more apartment buildings to house people who have already worked and lived in the city without decent housing. Again, only the government can decide which old buildings should be demolished to make way for new ones and which area could be designated for residential housing development. Of course, individuals can have their voice heard, but the final decision has to be made by the government.

Another reason that causes housing shortage is those in the real estate business raise the cost of housing exorbitantly. To stop those profit-making housing developers and real estate brokers from pushing up the prices of housing, effective rules and regulations are needed, which can be done by the government. As for the housing projects for low-income families, we can only depend on the government, too.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that only the government action can solve the problem of housing shortage in big cities.

International tourism has become a huge industry in the world. Do the problems of international travel outweigh its advantages?

It is irrefutable that international tourism has taken mammoth dimensions. In fact it has become the backbone of many economies of the world. This situation has both pros and cons. In my opinion, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

International tourism can have many benefits for individuals. The most important benefit is that tourism provides regular employment for many local people who might otherwise be unemployed. They can find work in restaurants or hotels, or with tourist agencies as guides or drivers, for example, and earn regular wages. This, in turn, means that they may be able to save money and improve their standard of living. The second reason is that tourists spend money in the country and this allows local businesses such as restaurants, bars and taxi companies to flourish. In turn, other businesses, food suppliers or petrol stations, for instance, may be established in order to provide services to support the companies which cater for tourists. In other words, the whole economy of the region develops.

A third reason is that in order for tourists to be able to visit remote areas, roads, airports and hotels have to be built and local people also benefit by being able to use these new facilities. Furthermore, when communications improve, it becomes possible for other industries to move into the area, bringing with them more employment opportunities and increased prosperity. A final reason why I am in favour of tourism is that visitors from outside bring fresh ideas and different ways of doing things to the local community. Consequently, local people may learn from tourists. Likewise, visitors learn about the local people and culture, and return home with a deeper understanding of the host country.

On the other hand, that there are some problems associated with international tourism. Firstly, there is the increasing crime rate. Some locals see tourists as easy prey because, not only are they in unfamiliar territory and therefore less able to take care of themselves, but also they carry visible items of wealth, such as cameras and jewellery which can be disposed of quickly for a profit. Another major problem is health. With greater mobility comes greater danger of spreading contagious diseases around the world. Also to be considered is the natural environment, which can be seriously threatened by too many visitors.

Australia's Great Barrier Reef, for example, is in danger of being destroyed by tourists and there are plans to restrict visitors to some of the more delicate coral reefs.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that international tourism has both advantages and disadvantages. However, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

Some people prefer to provide help and support directly to those in the local community who need it. Others, however, prefer to give money to national and international charitable organisations. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

—To have enough to share; to know the joy of giving; to thrill with all the sweets of life - is living. Helping others is a very virtuous thing. There are basically two ways to help. One is by offering support to those around you who need your help and the second is through national and international charitable organisations. In this essay I intend to delve into the benefits of both approaches.

There are many advantages of direct help. Firstly, a person remains directly in touch with the needy. You can see how your money is being used. There are no mediators and so there are no chances of corruption. It has been well said that charity begins at home. Naturally, if you help those around you, the people in your locality love and respect you and you enjoy a better status in life.

There are also many advantages of helping through national and international organisations. You can work on a larger platform and provide help for global issues. A larger platform is a must if you have a lot to offer in charity. Help activities can be better spread through a larger network. You feel part of a global village. Help need not be always in the form of money. It can be in the form of services also. For example, if you are a doctor, you can provide medical aid and if you are a teacher, you can volunteer to teach in the under-developed nations.

Help in any form is good. The condition of one's country could influence your way of helping. If you belong to a developed country, where even the poorest of the poor has the basic amenities of life, it would be better to help through national and international charitable organisations but if you belong to a developing or underdeveloped country and have the resources to help, then it would be better to help those around you.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that it is human nature to help those who need it. Providing direct help and making donations through charitable organisations are just two different ways of achieving the same goal.

The best way to solve the world's environmental problem is to increase the price of fuel. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

Excessive traffic and increasing pollution are affecting every major city in the globe. To lessen such problems, some people say that governments should raise the price of fuel such as petrol and diesel. It may help to some extent but I disagree that it is the best solution to solve the problem of environment.

To begin with, the number of cars in a country directly depends on the proportion of the population affluent enough to own cars. As a result, raises in gas price could invoke hard feelings among this segment of people but would not drastically change their behaviour in using cars. Even if the number of cars on road is reduced due to higher gas cost, this is not the best way to solve traffic problems. Such policy would hurt the auto industry, place higher costs on current and prospective car owners, and be detrimental to the economy of a nation. In the long run, the final way out could be the construction of better roads and more effective use of available transport facilities.

Secondly, there is evidence that waste gas from cars is not the leading cause of air pollution. The culprit may be the discharge of polluting substances into the atmosphere due to the rapidly growing manufacturing industry. As a result, reduction of the number of cars would not return us a blue sky and fresh air. We could better handle this problem if we could increase control over industrial waste-discharge and adopt more environmental friendly materials and production equipment.

Finally, other measures like the application of cheaper and cleaner energy resources could also be a better solution. For example, we now have the ability to make cell-powered or even solar-powered cars. Such energy is completely clean and plentiful.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, it is not the best way to control traffic and pollution by increasing gas price because such action will hurt consumers and economy without achieving what it is aimed for. Measures such as construction of better transport facilities and development of new energy resources could be more effective solutions.

Some people think that students benefit from going to private secondary schools. Others, however, feel that private secondary schools can have a negative effect on society as a whole. Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

In order to choose the right type of secondary school, you need to weigh all of the options open to you. It is a highly debated issue whether private secondary schools are good or bad for society. In the following paragraphs, I intend to delve into the pros and cons of private secondary schools.

On the positive side, most of the private schools offer smaller classroom size and so the child can receive more individual attention from teachers. It is a well known fact that secondary education is very important because in most cases the career is based on secondary school subjects. Secondly, private secondary schools offer better academic and extracurricular programs. As a result there are lower drop-out rates. Finally, there is less on-campus violence in private schools as compared to government schools. This is because students realise that their parents are spending huge sums of money on their schooling and so they are more serious in studies.

On the downside, there is less diversity in private schools as compared to public government) schools. As a result children will meet fewer peers from diverse backgrounds because of the tuition fee. Secondly, private secondary schools don't conform strictly to educational regulations. So you have to do a lot of effort to select the right school for your child.

Finally, these schools are very expensive and consequently increase the gap between the rich and the poor. The children from affluent backgrounds can afford these schools and get quality education because of which they get into the best universities for higher education. The disadvantaged children of poor backgrounds find it very difficult to compete with them in all spheres of life. So, these create an imbalance in society.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, private secondary schools are providing quality education and are a boon for society. However, they should have some relaxation in fees for the meritorious students of poor backgrounds so that their disadvantages are minimised.

In many countries today there is insufficient respect to old people. What are the reasons? What problems might it bring to the society?

It is irrefutable that because of advancements in science and technology, we have a greying society today. These demographic changes have brought up the topic that there is less respect for the elderly who are now in great numbers. In this essay I intend to delve into the causes and effects of this trend.

There are many reasons for lack of respect to the aged. In the workforce, creative and energetic young people who are able to work under a lot of pressure are preferred. In the techno-savvy world of today, the elderly feel out of place. They are not earning and so the youth hold the reins of the economy. Secondly, the old have problems adapting to ever-changing lifestyles and lag behind the times and so receive insufficient respect. The elderly are like a frog in the well and want their young ones to follow their professions. The youth, however, want to walk on the un-trodden path and find new avenues for themselves. Furthermore, the elderly suffer health problems such as hypertension, diabetes and arthritis, which make them physically weak and so they lack respect.

Another big reason for the elderly receiving less respect is the fact that they find it very difficult to let go. The young belong to the global culture and their elderly constantly nag and criticize them for their ways. This is not taken in the good light by the youngsters and they start ignoring them. The young also belong to a 24/7 society where competition is very stiff and as a result find it irritating and frustrating to find time to care and respect their elderly.

Less respect to the elderly has already caused many problems in these countries. The most noticeable is that people are indifferent to each other, and individuals tend to feel agitated, worrying about their own old life in the future. As a result, the whole society is not as harmonious and vigorous as the ones where senior citizens are treated with courtesy and respect. This situation has also led to a mushroom growth of old-age homes in the cities.

To sum up, it is our duty to respect the old people and the youth should not forget that they will too age one day. But, the elderly should also learn to keep- up with the times and be flexible with their youth.

It is better for students at university to live far away from home than to live at home with their parents. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

It is a highly debated issue whether it is better for university students to live far away from home than to live at home with their parents. There are pros and cons of both approaches. It is necessary to look at both sides of the argument before forming an opinion.

There are definite benefits of staying at home. To begin with it is much more economical to stay at home than to stay near the university. If you choose to stay at the university then you either stay at the university dormitory or rent your own apartment. Both university options are more expensive as compared to home. Then you have to do your own cooking and cleaning which is not the case if you stay at home where your mother looks after all these things. You do spend some time commuting to and from the university but then you save your time on cooking and cleaning. The disadvantage of staying at home is that you may be disturbed by siblings and you have to help in household chores.

There are many advantages of staying near the university. University education is a time for you to mix with people of different backgrounds and cultures. This cultural exchange usually occurs after class hours. If you have to return home then you miss out on this golden opportunity. Secondly, there are good study facilities such as library, computer lab etc. if you are on or near the campus.

You also get to experience some independence. The downside is that it is expensive and to cut the cost you may have to share your apartment with someone you don't like.

In my opinion, it is definitely worthwhile to live at the university than with your parents even if you have to shell out some extra money for that because it is a golden opportunity to interact with people of different parts of the world and you get to enjoy the benefits of facilities like the library and sports stadiums and gyms.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that there are benefits and drawbacks of both approaches and the decision is purely subjective. However, in my opinion staying near the university is better.

Earlier technological developments brought more benefits and changed the lives of ordinary people more than recent technological developments. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Earlier technological progress had been great with many far-reaching breakthroughs, especially in the early period of the last century. However, the benefits and changes brought by the earlier technological developments to the lives of ordinary people cannot compare with those brought by recent ones.

Therefore, I disagree with the given statement. In the following paragraphs, I intend to support my opinion with my arguments.

Undoubtedly, recent technological developments have benefited and changed our life so much that we enjoy almost all the comforts and conveniences that life can ever offer. Today, we can breakfast in Japan, lunch in Singapore and dine at New Delhi. This is all because of the faster means of travel. The Internet has revolutionised communication. Today we send and receive e-mails at the click of a mouse. We chat and do video conferencing with our kith and kin in any part of the world. These are just two examples of how dramatically recent technological developments have benefited and changed our life.

Furthermore, in the field of medicine, we have gadgets to diagnose cancers and many other diseases at such early stages that almost complete cures are possible. Also, if we look at the means we use to go to work, the electrical appliances we use at home, the devices we use in offices, the facilities and equipments we use in factories, we can say with certainty that recent technology has transformed our lives beyond imagination.

Admittedly, earlier technological developments did benefit and change the lives of ordinary people from the time when they were achieved, especially after the Industrial Revolution. However, it is self-evident as to what benefited and changed people's life more, telegraph or mobile phone, Phonograph or Mp4, Steam train or the monorail?

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that recent developments of technology have certainly benefited and changed our lives more than the earlier ones did.

Some people think museums should be enjoyable places to attract and entertain young people, while others think the purpose of museums should be to educate, not entertain. Discuss both sides and give your own opinion.

Museums are places where important objects of cultural, historical and scientific value are preserved and shown to the public. This function makes them play an extremely important role in disseminating human civilization. It is a topic of debate whether the main purpose of museums is to only educate or do both educate as well as entertain.

Museums such as the British Museum, the Louver, and the National Palace Museum are regarded as a vital educational resource because they highlight the achievements that have been accomplished by all mankind throughout history. Visiting them is an eye-opening experience. One will definitely be shocked by what is on display and learn something that they did not know previously. Actually, the majority of those who visit museums expect to know more about museum pieces of art and antiquities or those reflecting the development of science and technology. Therefore, museums should focus on providing more authentic information to meet their expectations.

On the other hand, it is certainly right for museums to improve their management, service and environment to attract young people who obviously need to be encouraged to learn more about human cultural history. If museums focus only on education and do not make things interesting, then they will not be visited much and even their function of education will not be fulfilled.

Today's interactive museums are always crowded. This is because, people enjoy and learn at the same time. In the planetarium, one feels one is actually in space. This arouses curiosity to know more about the planets and satellites. However, museums should not overdo the entertainment and go astray—by which I mean museums should make it clear that they are not purely a source of entertainment, like a disco bar, cinema or amusement park.

To sum up, museums should try their best to educate people and this can be better done if they make learning fun especially for today's youth.

In order to learn a language well, we should also learn about the country as well as the cultures and lifestyles of the people who speak this language. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

Language and society are as inextricably linked as a chicken and an egg. Language is the verbal expression of culture. I strongly agree that in order to learn a language \_well' you must also know the culture and lifestyle of the people who speak that language. In the following essay I intend to support my views with my arguments.

It is true that some successful language learners have never learnt about the culture and lifestyle of the native speakers. Such learners probably have a gift for learning languages and would be successful under any circumstances with regular effort. For most people, however, learning in a social context is the key to learn the language well.

Language is much more than just a means of communication. It is an art, a science, a culture, an identity and a vision. It is a lifestyle. It is like seeing the world through different eyes. For instance, the Eskimos have 24 different words for snow like - \_aput' means snow on the ground, \_gana' means drifting snow. Snow has a greater impact on their culture than ours and so on their language. So definitely learning about their culture and lifestyle would help understand the value of these meanings.

There are dialects, nuances and idioms of a language which can only be learnt if we learn about the culture and lifestyle of the people. For example, Punjabi is the mother tongue of people who live in Punjab. It has two dialects which mean ways of pronunciation and speaking. The two dialects are quite different and can only be learnt if you spend time with those people or learn about their culture. Then there are the nuances in a language which means subtle shades of meaning which can also not be learnt without knowing the lifestyle of people. Finally it is more enjoyable to learn a language if we learn about the culture and lifestyle. We are more motivated to learn another language.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, it is definitely needed to know about the culture and lifestyle of people if you have to learn a language well. It makes learning fun and it helps to understand the dialects and nuances of the language.

Multi-cultural societies, in which there is a mixture of different ethnic peoples, bring more benefits than drawbacks to a country. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

I definitely agree with the statement that cosmopolitan societies are better for the overall progress of a country. That is perhaps why nations such as the U.S.A., Canada and Australia, which are primarily multi-cultural societies, enjoy great prosperity, stability and harmony. In the following paragraphs I shall provide arguments to support my views.

Apparently, a multi-cultural society can bring a wide variety of benefits to a nation in terms of economic, cultural and social development. To begin with, the majority of immigrants from different cultural backgrounds are high achievers, including experts, scholars, engineers, business people and other well-trained people. Their arrival means an inflow of expertise, experience, investments as well as a dynamic labour force, which are all key factors to the increase of competitiveness, efficiency and productivity of a nation's economy.

What is more, the new arrivals know very well the importance of respecting the local traditions and customs. Therefore, they co-operate and collaborate well with the natives. They work very harmoniously side by side in offices, factories and schools. In addition, with a rich blend of peoples, cultures and lifestyles, people in multi-cultural societies tend to be more open-minded and tolerant of other people's customs and religions.

However, multi-societies also have some problems. Sometimes, people from overseas will try to maintain their unique ethnic cultures with their own distinctive characteristics. These differences many seem trivial, but they can cause some conflicts that make it difficult for immigrants to become assimilated into the mainstream of the local social life. But multi-cultural societies are usually based on equality and diversity, so these problems can eventually be dealt with successfully.

To sum up, after what I have discussed, the advantages of multi-cultural societies far outweigh the disadvantages. That is the reason so many countries make great efforts to attract more immigrants from abroad.

There is an increasing amount of advertising directed at children which encourages them to buy goods such as toys and snacks. Many parents are worried that these advertisements put too much pressure on children, while some advertisers claim that they provide useful information to children. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

Advertisements are ubiquitous nowadays and especially advertising targeting children who are considered vulnerable target by companies. As a result, many parents are worried about this phenomenon. However, some advertisers claim that they provide beneficial information to children. In the following paragraphs I intend to discuss both sides of the argument.

Admittedly, in sensitive areas such as the toy industry, some censorship should be there to limit children's access to excess advertisement. Because children under a certain age lack abilities to make wise judgment as to what they really want. They are attracted by colourful pictures on advertisement and swayed by misleading information. So they pester their parents to buy those things and this can upset the budget of many families. Even the advertisements of fast foods are bad for children. Children cannot understand that the slim-trim models advertising Mac Donalds burgers hardly ever eat such foods themselves. They are attracted to fast foods and these are very detrimental for their health.

On the other hand, advertisements also provide beneficial information also. For example, the advert of Colgate toothpaste which tells that we should brush our teeth twice daily is good for children. Then there are ads about health drinks such as Complan and Bournvita which are good for children. Furthermore, advertisement also conveys positive attitudes towards life. For instance, the advertising slogan of Nike— -impossible is nothing is very motivating.

In fact, it is advertisement that presents television audiences and newspaper readers with first-hand information and boosts the economy of a country. It also informs people of the availability of new commodities and their working. Without advertisement, we would not have known that we have so many choices.

To put it in a nutshell I pen down saying that, it is imperative that regulations be imposed on advertisers which make false claims. However, advertisement is indispensable in this highly competitive market and produces much more positive effects than negative ones to the society as a whole.

Some people think that the government should decide which subjects students should study at the university, while others think that students should be allowed to apply for the subject they prefer. Discuss the two views and give your opinion.

University education is very much needed nowadays to compete in the global village of today. Some people are of the opinion that government should choose the disciplines that students have to study at university. Others opine that the choice of subjects should be given to the students. Both situations have their merits and demerits which I shall discuss in this essay followed by my opinion.

If the government chooses the subjects it would naturally be taking into account the job sector. There would be lesser unemployment as the government knows which sector has job vacancies and would suggest only those subjects. It has been seen that there are many job vacancies without qualified people and many qualified people without jobs. Therefore, the number of people working in various job sectors will be balanced and it would be more efficient for students to find jobs after graduating from the university. Secondly, it would help those students who find it difficult to decide what career to pursue.

On the other hand, if students choose the subject then they do well in it because it is of their interest. They excel in their field and when they enter the job market they do well in their field. Moreover, there are lesser drop-outs of universities which is common if students are forced to study what they don't like. This also instils a sense of responsibility in the students when they make a decision about their subject because they know that their whole future rests on that decision.

Taking everything into account, I believe that it is more preferable for pupils to select their subjects in the university themselves. The government can play a role in promoting some subjects by providing funding to those who take up those subjects.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that there are merits of both situations but on the whole it would be better to leave the choice to students to select their subjects as there would be lesser drop-outs and they would excel in their field.

It is suggested that all the young adults should undertake a period of unpaid work helping people in the community. Does it bring more benefits or drawbacks to the community and the young people?

The youth of today are generally considered to lack social knowledge and experience which are of crucial importance in their future development. To solve this problem, some people suggest that they should undertake a period of voluntary work in the local community. Personally, I think its pros far outweigh the cons.

Undoubtedly, it can be a win-win approach - that is, it will benefit both the young and the community enormously if young students and employees do a certain period of unpaid work. By helping the elderly, the sick and the disabled directly or participating in charitable activities like raising funds or offering free consultation, young people will certainly gain and accumulate some valuable first-hand experience and know more about the society.

Moreover, young people with such experiences are more likely to become the most motivated ones in academic study or at work, and eventually become responsible citizens of the society. As far as the community is concerned, it will definitely become better with so many zealous young volunteers who are ready to help.

However, there may be some disadvantages if the young provide free service helping people in need. For example, it may conflict with their normal study or work if not arranged well. Then the result may be not as desirable as what is expected. But I think this sort of problem can be easily taken care of by meticulous planning by the authorities.

To conclude, competitiveness of modern life and influence of global culture have isolated children from neighbourhood. So, such a step would be very beneficial to make today's children feel part of the community.

Some people think the main purpose of schools is to turn the children into good citizens and workers, rather than to benefit them as individuals. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

I definitely agree with the statement that the primary aim of schools is to turn the pupils into good citizens and workers rather than benefit them as individuals. I feel that schools have to fulfil both things but the primary aim is towards the welfare of the society and the benefit to the individual automatically ensues.

Schooling can do a lot for shaping children. Firstly, school is a system with so many possibilities for a child to grow into what he or she actually is. For example, teachers are able to mould children by identifying their hidden strengths, and the same strength may later make the child what he actually is in this world for.

Secondly, since children spend a sizeable amount of their time with teachers and a community of boys and girls from different faiths, statuses and family values - there is great possibility for a child to undergo a transformation into a good human being. Teachers are a great force to influence children.

Of course, learning academic subjects is the main aim for what students go to schools. Definitely, the job market requires professional knowledge the most. But it is also true that if students become good citizens and workers, they are themselves equally benefited too.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, raising children into real human beings involves several factors. Among them, the prominent one is good schooling. Schools' main function is to make students good and responsible workers and the personal benefit to students also takes place simultaneously.

A country becomes more interesting and develops more quickly when its population includes a mixture of nationalities and cultures. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

I definitely agree with the statement that cosmopolitan societies are better for the overall progress of a country. That is perhaps why nations such as the U.S.A., Canada and Australia, which are primarily multi-cultural societies, enjoy great prosperity, stability and harmony. In the following paragraphs I shall provide arguments to support my views.

A culturally and ethnically diverse country is so fascinating because there are many different lifestyles reflecting different ethnic origins in it. In a multi-cultural society one can enjoy a variety of unique traditions and customs which is very exciting and adds spice to life. One has more options when it comes to leisure activities. For example, when you want to get together with families, friends or co-workers, you can visit a Chinese restaurant serving cheese chilly and Manchurian or an Italian one serving pizza and pasta. Of course, there are more ethnic foods with exotic flavours available, all depending on your personal preferences. It is the same case with other kinds of entertainment. Even if you just walk on the street, you can see people wearing their traditional outfits of different ethnic styles.

A multi-cultural society can also bring a wide variety of benefits to a nation in terms of economic development. To begin with, the majority of immigrants from different cultural backgrounds are high achievers, including experts, scholars, engineers, business people and other well-trained people. Their arrival means an inflow of expertise, experience, investments as well as a dynamic labour force, which are all key factors to the increase of competitiveness, efficiency and productivity of a nation's economy.

What is more, the new arrivals know very well the importance of respecting the local traditions and customs. Therefore, they co-operate and collaborate well with the natives. They work very harmoniously side by side in offices, factories and schools. In addition, with a rich blend of peoples, cultures and lifestyles, people in multi-cultural societies tend to be more open-minded and tolerant of other people's customs and religions.

To sum up, when a nation has a population consisting of different nationalities and cultures, it has many unique advantages which make life there more interesting and society develops quickly. So, it has a magical attraction for so many people all over the world.

<u>As most people spend a major part of their adult life at work, job satisfaction is an</u> important element of individual well-being. What are the factors that contribute to job satisfaction? How realistic is the expectation of job satisfaction for all workers?

It is irrefutable that job satisfaction is an essential element, if not the most important one of individual well-being. Obviously, there are many factors which influence one's job satisfaction directly or indirectly. In the following paragraphs I intend to delve into the factors that contribute to job satisfaction and discuss how practical it is for workers to expect job satisfaction.

Undoubtedly, to make people enjoy what they are doing, certain basic expectations, which are the prerequisites, should be met the moment they start working. A decent income definitely tops the list of one's expectations for it's the money you earn that ensures a quality life. Money is needed for everything in life and until a person has the basic necessities of life he can never be satisfied with his job.

However, money alone cannot ensure complete satisfaction from work. Job satisfaction is also very important, which will, in turn, bring many benefits such as pay raise, promotion and also appreciation and recognition from co-workers or even the whole society. Job security is another important factor. Sometimes a secure job is preferred over a one which has a higher pay package. There are many other factors like a relaxing working environment, a harmonious relationship with colleagues and perks like bonus and free travel opportunities.

Admittedly, it is difficult, if not impossible, for all employees to become satisfied with their job completely even if what employers offer is reasonable. If there is job satisfaction, there may not be a good pay and if there are good chances of promotion then there may not be security. Therefore, both employees and employers need to strike a balance between expectations and responsibilities and make the work life more fruitful.

To put it in a nutshell, there are many characteristics of a good job and it is not practical to expect everything in one job. One has to make a compromise at some point or the other and employees should also consider what they are capable of doing before making expectations.

Some people think that good health is a basic human need, so the medical service should not be run by profit-making companies. Do you think the disadvantages of the private health care outweigh the advantages?

Private health care institutions and the government hospitals are at present two major sources of medical service for the public. However, some people suggest that medical service should not be operated by profit-oriented private companies. Personally, I don't agree with them because the advantages of private health care far outweigh the disadvantages.

Undoubtedly, private health care services can bring a lot of benefits to the people. For example, when you have any medical emergency, you get instant treatment. You don't have to wait for long hours as in a government hospital. Moreover, private health care institutions, generally, specialize in particular health care service like nursing, midwifery or dental service. These places provide friendly and personalized service and high quality professional medical treatment.

Furthermore, the competition provided by these institutes is the driving force for improvements. Because of private health care institutions, the government owned ones are forced to take measures to better their management, which eventually benefits the public in the long run. What's more, the private health care institutions are playing a big role in remote areas and rural areas where also they provide services through mobile van hospitals.

On the other hand, there are some disadvantages too. The cost of treatment in these is very high and is not within the pocket of many. Then, because these hospitals have the latest machines and employ the best doctors, the cost of running them is high and so sometimes an unnecessary battery of tests is performed which raises the cost of treatment.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that private health care is absolutely necessary. They provide the best services and so deserve to make profits. However, there should be some provision for keeping a check on unfair practices used in such hospitals.

Some people think secondary school students should study international news as one of their subjects. Other people say this is a waste of valuable school time. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

Because of the IT revolution and the faster means of travel, we do not belong to a big planet \_Earth'; we belong to a small global village which is very well connected and that is why there is a debate as to whether secondary school students should study international news as a subject. In this essay I shall discuss both views followed by my opinion.

Admittedly, the youth of today can benefit by studying international news as a subject. This would enrich their experience and broaden their horizon. From the news of any part of the world students would become aware of the social, political and environmental problems faced by that country. This could motivate them to do something for their country if they are lagging behind or even help the other nations by volunteering to help. For instance, when Tsunami struck Japan voluntary workers from all parts of the world reached out to help.

Moreover, the significance of opening international news subject is that students can have a general view of the world which could help them decide their career.

On the other hand, as secondary schools students face stiff competition nowadays it would be unfair to add the burden of another subject. Moreover,

\_international news' would have an ever changing syllabus and so would be practically impossible to introduce as a subject. Finally, in the pluralistic society of today, some news may hurt the sentiments of any particular sect of people and could give rise to conflicts.

In my opinion, international news should not be introduced as a subject. However, steps should be taken by secondary schools to keep students abreast of what is happening in the world by having a short (5 minute) session in the morning assembly in which every day a student could speak the headlines. This would keep students up-to-date without having the tension of memorising things

To, put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, international news should not be a subject but students should be made aware of the international scenario in other informal ways.

Exposure to international media such as films, TV and magazines has a significant impact on local cultures. What do you think has been the impact? Do you think its advantages outweigh the disadvantages?

The emergence of international media has really changed the face of the globe. Today we don't belong to a big planet called Earth. We are part of a small global village. Exposure to international media has had a positive as well as negative impact on local cultures. In the following paragraphs I shall discuss these impacts. Overall, the impact has been largely positive.

On the positive side, today's communications and technologies allow a more open spread of culture around the world – people in far corners of the globe are able to be aware of and share each other's culture. It is a view that sees global culture as generally positive – something that encourages diversity and a mixing of culture and has enabled people around the world to overcome national boundaries to embrace common causes. Thus, cultural globalisation in itself promotes diversity and a respect for other cultures.

Some people hold the view that internationalization of media can overpower national culture. However, this depends on how strong a particular national culture is. In some circumstances, of course, national culture is damaged by aggressively marketed foreign media imports. However, the theory that local cultures will be drowned out and completely disappear under a tide of global media does not appear to hold true at least in the case of India. This is partly because of the strong cultural identity of India. The cultural preferences of Indian viewers are so strong that foreign imports are put at a clear competitive disadvantage relative to the regional and national media produced. In fact, the international media companies have to tailor their output so as to fit into the local cultural setting.

Another positive effect that international media has had on India is that our media companies have improved dramatically under the stiff competition of global media and as a result they have found a place in the international market. This has put our culture on a higher pedestal than any other culture of the world.

To put it in a nutshell I pen down saying that the internationalization of media needs not necessarily undermine national culture. If the local culture is strong enough, it can withstand any foreign influence.

<u>Throughout the history, male leaders always lead us to violence and conflict. If a</u> society is governed by female leaders it will be more peaceful. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

In the history of mankind there have been many records of violence and conflicts in the form of wars. Some people think that if a society were governed by female leaders, it would be more peaceful. However, if we look into the past history we can get numerous examples when there have been wars and conflicts even during the rule of women rulers. So, I disagree with the statement.

If we had female only rulers, we probably wouldn't be alive today. Sure most wars were caused by men, but that is only because more than 90% of rulers were men. Female rulers have also caused wars and their fraction is a lot higher than male rulers. For example, during the Tang Dynasty, the first female ruler of China, Wu Zetian who was well-known for her tyranny and cruelty, launched a series of wars to expand the territory of the empire. This didn't happen only in China. It was Queen Victoria who invaded India, China and many other countries in close succession. Even our late Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, led India in a war against neighbouring Pakistan which resulted in the creation of Bangladesh, formerly East Pakistan.

It is understandable if you say that generally, women are more affectionate, thoughtful and gentle as compared with men. They are also less ambitious and aggressive. However, politics is decided by the interest. If you are the leader of a society, you surely have the required leadership qualities regardless of the gender. Apparently, leaders, male or female, will have to make a decision according to special interest.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, a society will not necessarily become more peaceful merely because it is governed by a female leader because, essentially, there is no difference between female and male leaders when it comes to politics.

Modern buildings change the character and appearance of towns and cities. The government should insist that new buildings be built in traditional styles to protect cultural identity. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Every city has its architectural character, but the similarities between cities are more obvious these days than in the past. However, I disagree that modern buildings should be built in traditional styles. In the following paragraphs I shall put forth my arguments to support my views.

Firstly, in most large cities, land is scarce and consequently it is very valuable. This has led to the construction of tall buildings which occupy only a small area of land while providing lots of floor space where people can live or work. We also have to meet the needs of the growing population for which tall buildings are the answer.

Moreover, there is no need for deforestation to provide more land.

Secondly, modern materials are more practical. Now we use concrete and steel instead of stone, timber or brick. Because of these things buildings can be built comparatively quickly using prefabricated materials. They do not use local materials, such as stone, timber or brick, which used to give character to those buildings.

Finally, changes are taking place in climate and energy sources are depleting fast. So we need energy efficient houses. Modern buildings use double glass front walls and POP( Plaster of Paris) ceilings which lessen the energy requirements. Moreover, now we need smaller houses as family structure is changing.

However, I believe that every city should have one or two unique buildings which give character and identity to the city. The twin towers in Kuala Lumpur or the Opera House in Sydney are examples of this approach, and I agree with this kind of initiative.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, it is the need of the day that modern buildings be built in today's contemporary styles and to give identity to a place one or two unique buildings may be there in every city.

Some people think that personal happiness is directly related to economic success. Others argue that happiness depends on different factors. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Happiness is a state of mind. Obviously, different people understand it in different ways. I believe that economic success is an essential element to happiness, but it is just one factor and that too not the most important one. Other factors like a stable family life, secure source of income and good heath are more important in achieving happiness.

Undoubtedly, to achieve personal happiness, economic success is necessary but its importance shouldn't be exaggerated. Apparently, it's sensible to say that one needs sufficient money to live in a spacious apartment, to have a private car, fashionable clothes and latest household electrical appliances, which are all indispensable for happy life.

However, we have to admit that material success alone can't ensure that one can lead a happy life. One may have a lot of money but if there are not cordial relations among family members, one can never be happy. In fact, too much wealth can lead to stress in life if children go astray because of too much wealth. A person who has the barest minimum but a very understanding life partner and obedient children can be very happy.

Good health is another factor needed for happiness. Can you imagine a multimillionaire suffering from cancer to be happy? Another big factor is a stable source of income. One can never be happy if one is not sure whether his business will pick up or his job is secure.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, economic success is important but those who cooperate well with co-workers and those who get along well with families, friends and neighbours are more likely to be happy, and it's the same case with those who pursue a variety of interests and hobbies at leisure and those who are in good health.

The world of work is changing rapidly. Working conditions today are not the same as before and people no longer rely on taking one job for life. Discuss the possible causes for these changes and give your suggestions on how people should prepare for work in the future.

It is irrefutable that the work scenario is altering at a fast pace. Working conditions are also different and the process of job-hopping is very common. This essay shall delve into the possible causes for these changes and suggest ways to prepare for work in the time to come.

To begin with, the development of science and technology has changed the structure of work. For example, people no longer need to do some heavy work by themselves. Instead, they can use machines. Secondly, competition has become intense and people have to constantly update themselves with the latest materials and methods. Sometimes they cannot compete with the new techno-savvy workforce and so have to change jobs out of compulsion.

Furthermore, we belong to an era of consumerism. Being surrounded by so many choices, people today want to buy new things and for that they do multiple jobs. In addition, the 24/7 society of today provides us the opportunity to work day and night. For instance, in earlier times, there were very few jobs which were round-the-clock jobs. But, today, globalization has brought in a multitude of options of working day and night. The line between day and night has become dim and people have become workaholics.

There could be many suggestions to prepare for work in the future. People should have a set goal in their mind and get training accordingly. Moreover, it is important to draw a line somewhere. The stress and strain of the fast modern workplace is leading many to nervous breakdowns. In the developed countries, a new term called downshifting has already come where after a certain stage, people are saying \_no' to promotions and showing contentment with less. We should also realise that if we stick to one job, then also life can be more stable and we can enjoy our leisure also.

To put in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, although work conditions are different today and we have a need to update our knowledge regularly, we can plan our life in a meticulous way and have a balance between work and leisure.

#### Essay 121

Individuals can do nothing to improve the environment. Only governments and large companies can make a difference. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

Everyone is becoming aware that the environment is a serious issue. There is bad air and water pollution everywhere and we also know that the greenhouse effect is changing our weather and that the hole in the ozone layer is causing skin cancer. However, not enough is being done to solve these problems, because most people seem to think that they can do nothing. They think that only governments and large companies can combat this massive problem. I feel that the responsibility for protecting the environment must be shared by everyone. Individuals can and should do many things to help to solve the problem.

First of all people can make sure that they are responsible in the way that they dispose of waste. If people throw rubbish like plastic into rivers and oceans, it always stays there, and causes fish and sea-birds to die. It is also important to make sure that we do not buy goods that have too much wrapping on them, especially plastic wrapping, because if we do we are adding to the huge amounts of waste.

People also need to be responsible in the way that they use water. In some countries, like Australia, an enormous amount of water is wasted for swimming pools, washing cars and so on. Most countries are running out of fresh water. If people used their cars less this would help to prevent the greenhouse effect. Everyone can try to use public transport more, or use bicycles, or even walk, instead of using their cars for even short trips.

Finally, the most important thing that individuals can do is to let their governments know that they want something to be done about the environment. It is obvious that the governments will not do anything unless the people force them to.

It is therefore clear that individuals must take responsibility for the environment, otherwise it will soon be too late, and we and the next generation will suffer serious consequences.

Maintaining public libraries is a waste of money since computer technology can replace their functions. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Since centuries libraries are in the service of man. These libraries are the repositories of never ending knowledge known as books. Some people opine that we can do away with traditional libraries because technology has given us the facility of virtual or online libraries. I, however, believe that even though technology has reduced our need to go to the libraries, our traditional libraries can never become redundant.

With the advent of new technologies in the field of computers and telecommunications, revolutionary changes have taken place in the field of Library and Information Science. The shape of traditional libraries containing a large number of printed documents is in the process of being transformed to paper less libraries containing a large number of digitized documents. The facilities offered by networking have not left libraries untouched. Modern libraries are not only digitized but networked also. This has led to the creation of virtual libraries i.e. libraries without walls through which the user has access to information at anytime, anywhere in the world by using the modern tools of communications, such as computers and Internet facilities.

However, one should keep in mind that a person goes to a library not only to search and get information from books but also to sit and study there. The ambience and the peaceful and scholarly atmosphere of the library help one to concentrate more on one's work and study. Thus, libraries will never become redundant. They will always be there to indicate the presence of a well-read and educated society.

Another important point is that it is very difficult to always read books from the computer monitor. Traditional books can be issued from the library and read in the comfort of your bed. Virtual libraries can be accessed only by those who are computer literate. The access to virtual libraries can be affected by power cuts and network failures. Moreover, in a traditional library you are guided by the librarians if you need any help in searching for the book.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that advancement should be welcomed in every field but the importance of the libraries for their fundamental role cannot be put aside. This tendency will add more crowns of success to the importance of libraries.

Some people think that schools should select pupils according to their academic abilities, while others believe that it is better to have pupils with different abilities study together. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Children are put in a particular grade according to age in our education system. It is obvious that all children are not of the same intelligence level and sometimes it becomes difficult for educators to teach them in the same class. Therefore, some people feel that there should be separate teaching for intelligent students and weak students.

If we look at the benefits, then yes, intelligent students can be taught at their pace and the sessions can be made more interesting for them and the same thing applies to the weak students. Thus, both the categories of students would enjoy learning. Moreover, different teaching tactics can be adopted in each group to give students maximum benefits. In a mixed group, many times weak students cannot cope up with the pace of studies and so come under high pressure and get de-motivated. When they are separated, teachers can handle them tactfully and bring them back the lost confidence.

Furthermore, it has been seen that sometimes the more intelligent students show disruptive behaviour. They can grasp things very soon and then disturb the others. It can become very difficult for the teacher to maintain discipline in the class.

On the other hand, weak students would automatically develop an inferiority complex if they are made to realise that they are weak in studies by separating them. In addition to that, the other group might not treat them well, which can have a direct effect on their psyche. On the contrary, when the students study in a mixed group, a sense of competition develops and weak students are motivated to study. Even intelligent students can help weak students in studies and the bond can be strengthened. This way, even weak students would not feel belittled.

In my opinion, children should not be separated as only academic abilities are not enough to judge the intelligence of the students. I would rather suggest what I had in my school, and that is extra coaching to weak students. It serves the purpose best as teachers save their time and energy and yet maintain the effectiveness.

With the increase in the use of mobile phones and computers, fewer people are writing letters. Some people think that the traditional skill of writing letters will disappear completely. To what extent do you agree or disagree? How important do you think is letter-writing?

It is irrefutable that in today's era of modern technology, many people struggle to produce letters and often avoid writing letter altogether. Nevertheless, I don't agree that this skill is gradually disappearing. In this essay I shall put forth arguments to support my view and also talk about the importance of letter writing.

Firstly, let us consider the reasons why writing letters is less frequent nowadays. This is because of modern technology. These days we are much more likely to email someone than write a letter. In addition our business communications have become more informal than in the past. As a result a less formal style of writing is more acceptable. Other forms of communication such as text messaging have reduced our need to write letters even more.

However, in my opinion, there are times when there is no alternative to writing a letter. Letters are generally more formal and carefully composed than emails. This makes them more suitable for occasions when they are likely to be kept and re-read, perhaps several times, by the recipient, as with formal letters of thanks or sympathy. In letters provide a written record, unlike telephone calls, so they are also a better way of setting out an important or complex argument, as in the official complaints or legal matters. Moreover, that time is still very far when everyone will have a computer and internet connection. Till that time letter writing can never disappear.

So, it can be seen that letter writing is a very important skill to learn because there are many parts of the world where it is very important to be formal. This is particularly true if you are involved in international business. Because of globalisation the business world is becoming more and more international and it is not always possible to pick up the telephone to talk to people. Consequently I believe that letter writing will never die out completely. And even though these letters may be written on computers rather than by hand we still need to learn and practise this skill.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that there are fewer times when we need to write letters than in the past. On the other hand, I feel there are still some important occasions when a letter is the most appropriate form of communication.

Some people think that the government should provide assistance to all kinds of artists including painters, musicians and poets, etc. However, other people think that is a waste of money. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

Many people's lives are richer because of art - music, paintings, calligraphy, pictures, sculpture, poems and dance. There are some who claim that it is important to support the artists, and others who are opposed to government funding. In the following paragraphs, I shall discuss both sides of the argument and finally give my opinion.

There are many reasons why government should fund artists. The contributions of artists to the society are very essential. Art can bring out people's creativity, views and personalities. For example, we learn about our history, traditions and culture through movies, songs and paintings made by artists. Artists are the media of diffusing tradition. All kinds of tradition are the basis of a country without which the country can't be civilised. So artists are the ambassadors of culture and play a vital role in elevating the level of civilization of the country. It is a major form of cultural abundance.

Another important aspect of this is that art is an ancient means of communication. Our language is a result of people's need to communicate. Art is what differentiates us from animals. Art is our soul and it is a source of courage. Artists also entertain us. Finally, government should fund artists because earning a livelihood from art is difficult especially in the budding stages.

Opponents of government funding on artists say that money spent on the arts could have been used for considerably more vital purposes. They have strong reasons as a nation's health and wellbeing should be paramount. The idea that elderly people are forced to wait for essential operations whilst the money required to increase available medical provision is spent on opera and ballet is plainly immoral. There are also more deserving social causes for the money that should be considered before the arts. Homelessness, unemployment, illiteracy - all of these deserve to be addressed before money is spent on what is essentially little more than entertainment.

To summarise, I would like to say that as both sides have strong arguments, it depends on the condition of the country. In developed countries where even the poorest of the poor have all the basic amenities of life, government should spend on art and artists but in countries where people are dying of starvation and diseases, other matters should be given priority.

The society would benefit from a ban on all forms of advertising because it serves no useful purpose, and can even be damaging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

Advertising in modern society is ubiquitous - on the radio, TV, the internet and in our letterboxes. While advertising has many disadvantages, the positive influence of advertising outweighs the negative. So, I disagree that there should be a ban on all advertisements.

It is true that advertising provides us with information on new products. If it were not for electronic and print advertising, many products would not be bought. In this way, advertising provides an important service to manufacturers and some consumers. Additionally, it fuels the advertising industry, creating jobs for thousands of people. In this respect it has the backbone of many economies of the world.

Furthermore, advertisements touch social issues. For example, when Amitabh Bachhan tells people to bring their children for pulse polio immunization, people listen. Then there are ads against female foeticide which are very informative. Advertisements also teach a lot about the country from where the ads come.

This is because through satellite TV we can see ads from all over the world. When we see a Japanese advert of a lady in a kimono, we come to know about the clothes of Japan.

However, Adverts also have a downside. Television commercials are a great example of this. Just as we are enjoying a TV program, a commercial break occurs, forcing us to listen. Advertising can also promote consumerism. People can become greedy for a new product and they can become discontent with what they already have. In the end, the consumer is never really satisfied, always wanting \_\_newer and better' products. Then, ads show dangerous stunts which may be copied by children and they may get hurt. Finally, some ads target children and so children pester parents to buy things which can upset the family budget.

On balance, I believe that as every rose is accompanied by thorns, ads too have their disadvantages. Overall, the advantages far outweigh the disadvantages. So we should not ban ads. The government can, however, ban some ads which show stunts or which make false claims.

<u>Consumers are faced with increasing numbers of advertisements from competing</u> <u>companies. To what extent do you think are consumers influenced by</u> <u>advertisements? What measures can be taken to protect them?</u>

Whether it is on TV, radio or hoardings at the side of the road, advertisements have become a part of our lives. Advertising is a powerful and persuasive medium. Consumers are influenced by advertisements in both positive and negative ways. This essay shall delve into the ways adverts affect the common man and suggest ways to protect people from the negative effects of adverts.

On the positive side ads tell us about the new products that are launched in the market. They also tell us about the working of these products. After seeing the ads, consumers can go to the market and select things of their choice.

On the other hand, advertisements can cause people to be dissatisfied with what they already gave and make them want more. Being exposed again and again to products which one cannot afford leads to dissatisfaction. Furthermore, not all parents are in the position to afford the goods which the children see advertised and want to possess. This often leads to feelings of inadequacy among them. In addition to this advertisements lead to materialism and people lay too much emphasis on material goods. People are prepared to work long hours or even turn to crime to get these goods.

The solution is not simple as advertising has become a very pervasive medium. To begin with, advertisements which make false claims should be banned. Then there should be consumer awareness programmes. Consumers should be warned against too much consumerism. Finally, advertisements for liquor and those ads which show stunts should also be banned.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that today we are influenced a lot by adverts, both in positive and negative ways, without adverts we would lose a valuable source of revenue which is used for the benefit of majority. Our lives would be dull without these ads and there is not much that can be done against the consumerism they promote.

Air transport is increasingly used to export types of fruits and vegetables to countries where they cannot be grown or are out of season. Some people say it is a good thing, but other people think it can't be justified. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Globalisation has revolutionized our world in many aspects. Now, we don't belong to a big planet Earth. We belong to a small global village. Everything is available everywhere. There are many advantages and disadvantages of transporting fruits and vegetables over a long distance by air. In my opinion, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

On the positive side, transporting goods over a long distance gives us a lot of choices. We can taste a variety of fruits and vegetables from all parts of the world. For example, about ten years ago, we hardly saw kiwi fruit which is from New Zealand. But, now it has a place on every fruit stand. Moreover, delivery by air is quick. Seasonal fruits and vegetables that are grown in far away countries can be delivered as soon as possible by keeping the quality and taste unchanged. Only air transport can cover so long a distance in such a short time to achieve this goal. The United States, Canada and Western Europe all import tropical agricultural products that grow in tropical climates by air.

Secondly, many people get employment in this field. Small farmers have a chance to expand globally and it increases the overall economy of the country. Finally, it helps in developing good relations between countries which helps in international cooperation and peace. If countries are dependent upon one another's economic success then armed conflict would be less likely.

On the downside, importing foods can have a negative effect on local culture. This can be seen in countries such as Japan where imported food has become more popular than traditional, local produce, eroding people's understanding of their own food traditions. A second major disadvantage is pollution. When goods are transported thousands of miles by road, sea and air, it increases pollution from exhaust fumes.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, importing foods by air has both merits and demerits but the pros outweigh the cons.

Some people believe that some unpaid community service should be a compulsory part of high school programmes (e.g. working in a charity, improving the relationship of neighbourhood or teaching sports to children) To what extent do you agree or disagree?

The youth of today are generally considered to lack social knowledge and experience which are of crucial importance in their future development. To solve this problem, some people suggest that they should undertake a period of voluntary work in the local community during their high school. Personally, I think its pros far outweigh the cons.

Undoubtedly, it can be a win-win approach - that is, it will benefit both the young and the community enormously if young high school students do a certain period of unpaid work. By helping the elderly, the sick and the disabled directly or participating in charitable activities like raising funds or offering free consultation, young people will certainly gain and accumulate some valuable first-hand experience and know more about the society.

Moreover, young people with such experiences are more likely to become the most motivated ones in academic study or at work, and eventually become responsible citizens of the society. As far as the community is concerned, it will definitely become better with so many zealous young volunteers who are ready to help.

However, there may be some disadvantages if the young provide free service helping people in need. For example, it may conflict with their normal study or work if not arranged well. Then the result may be not as desirable as what is expected. But I think this sort of problem can be easily taken care of by meticulous planning by the school authorities.

To conclude, competitiveness of modern life and influence of global culture have isolated children from neighbourhood. So, such a step would be very beneficial to make today's children feel part of the community.

Computers are increasingly used in education. In which areas do you think are computers more important and in which areas are teachers more important?

#### (Essay attempted by Gagan in exam 7.5 bands)

--Yesterday's fiction is today's reality. Computers have revolutionized all the aspects of human life especially education. Besides teachers, computers have also become an indispensible part of education. They both are required for the holistic development of a person. Here, I am going to discuss the roles of both.

Computers have completely modified the criteria of examinations through the introduction of online examinations, online debates and online counseling. Computers are more important in those areas in which repetition is needed. For example, in elementary maths and elementary language learning. Computer can be programmed to provide answers to an endless number of simple questions.

There are certain areas in which computers supersede teachers and vice versa. For instance computers help us simplify the topics through the audio and visual aids like working models, videos etc. Also they can teach us for 24 hours in a day. Laptops offer a unique feature of portability and act as teachers even outside the class room. Moreover teachers focus only on academic curriculum whereas computers, through internet, develop a general awareness about the various global issues such as terrorism, drug trafficking, global warming etc and thus broaden our field of knowledge. Computers also enable us to be well within the range of any teacher around the world. Furthermore, being human beings, teachers have a limited knowledge whereas computers with a huge collection of e-books, reference books and dictionaries offer us a complete and thorough understanding of the subject.

Nevertheless, the role of teachers cannot be refuted. They are the actual scholars in action. Although computers remain in our service for 24 hours a day but the 8 hours spend with a teacher is the quality time. A computer can efficiently check the answers but the corrections can only be made by a teacher. Moreover, only a teacher can lend a practical hand to a student. For example- only a doctor can teach his students on how to perform a surgery? It cannot be taught by a computer in any way. There are other convincing evidences for teachers such as teachers help a student develop good communication skills and other social skills. The basic characters of a good human being are also inculcated by a teacher. Furthermore, a teacher also acts as the true guide, friend and philosopher. These are the teachers which encourage a student when he fails in studies.

To put in the nut-shell, I pen down concluding that, both computers and teachers are specialists in their own areas of education. They should be looked on as two angels supplementing each other for the betterment of our children.

Many developing countries are currently expanding their tourist industries. Why is this the case? Is it a positive development?

It is irrefutable that international tourism has taken mammoth dimensions. In fact it has become the backbone of many economies of the world. No wonder many developing countries are opening their doors to tourists. In my opinion, it is both, a positive as well as a negative development.

International tourism can have many benefits for individuals. The most important benefit is that tourism provides regular employment for many local people who might otherwise be unemployed. They can find work in restaurants or hotels, or with tourist agencies as guides or drivers, for example, and earn regular wages. This, in turn, means that they may be able to save money and improve their standard of living. The second reason is that tourists spend money in the country and this allows local businesses such as restaurants, bars and taxi companies to flourish. In turn, other businesses, food suppliers or petrol stations, for instance, may be established in order to provide services to support the companies which cater for tourists. In other words, the whole economy of the region develops.

A third reason is that in order for tourists to be able to visit remote areas, roads, airports and hotels have to be built and local people also benefit by being able to use these new facilities. Furthermore, when communications improve, it becomes possible for other industries to move into the area, bringing with them more employment opportunities and increased prosperity. A final reason why I am in favour of tourism is that visitors from outside bring fresh ideas and different ways of doing things to the local community. Consequently, local people may learn from tourists. Likewise, visitors learn about the local people and culture, and return home with a deeper understanding of the host country.

On the other hand, that there are some problems associated with international tourism. Firstly, there is the increasing crime rate. Some locals see tourists as easy prey because, not only are they in unfamiliar territory and therefore less able to take care of themselves, but also they carry visible items of wealth, such as cameras and jewellery which can be disposed of quickly for a profit. Another major problem is health. With greater mobility comes greater danger of spreading contagious diseases around the world. Also to be considered is the natural environment, which can be seriously threatened by too many visitors.

Australia's Great Barrier Reef, for example, is in danger of being destroyed by tourists and there are plans to restrict visitors to some of the more delicate coral reefs. Air pollution is also caused by too many air flights.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that international tourism is both a positive as well as a negative development but advantages certainly outweigh the disadvantages.

Some people claim that public museums and art galleries will not be needed because people can see historical objects and works of art by using a computer. Do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

It is irrefutable that nowadays, because of technology, arm-chair tourism through which we can see historical objects and works of art on a computer, has gained popularity. However, I disagree, that public museums and art galleries will no longer be needed. In fact, I believe that their popularity will grow even further.

First of all, computers can never replace real public museums and art galleries. No matter how real and vivid computer images are, they are only images and can never be likened to the historical objects and works of art that we see in real or even might be allowed to touch with our fingertips. The difference can be compared to seeing the picture of a mango rather than actually eating it.

Secondly, visiting real museums and art galleries is a rewarding experience in many respects. For one thing, it is a good exercise. While we are making the trip to a museum or art gallery and then strolling about on site, we get some exercise which does a lot of good to our health. We generally go with family and friends and enjoy a lot. We also learn about the culture and tradition of the place. All this broadens our horizons which can never be done by the passive activity of seeing something on the computer screen.

Finally, I believe that after seeing these objects and museums, our craving to actually see these increases even more and so we make efforts to go and see these places. This can be proved by the overwhelming number of tourists to these places that has been increasing year after year. At certain times, especially when it is temporarily impossible for us to visit museums and art galleries in person, we can get a rough picture of what are on display on site. However, what we see from a computer screen is, after all, not exactly the same as what we see and feel with our own eyes on site.

In conclusion, arm-chair tourism is there today but museums and art galleries will still be needed

In many countries traditional foods are being replaced by international fast foods. This is having a negative effect on both families and societies. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

#### Witten by Payal in the IELTS – she scored 7 bands in writing

In this era of technology and globalization, all spheres of life have changed dramatically and food is also no exception. I agree that international fast foods and restaurants have eaten up traditional foods and cuisines and this has had a detrimental effect on families and societies. A number of arguments surround my opinion.

There are a lot of detrimental effects on families. Firstly in this torrid pace of life, people are working till their death. They have no time to prepare and enjoy traditional home cooked food. Ultimately, they switch to an easy option of restaurants. McDonalds have become a ubiquitous term in every home. Secondly, there is the influence of occidental culture over the oriental one. People are forgetting their roots. For example, in earlier times all family members used to sit together and eat, and over the dining table they shared their happenings of the day. These fast foods are eaten alone mostly because they don't appeal to the palate of the older members. As a result, family bonds and relationships are getting vague. Moreover, the art of home cooking is suffering a lot.

Admittedly, this trend has harmful effects on individuals. Undoubtedly, people are affected by health hazards like obesity and other diseases. Obesity is the root cause of many other diseases. Fast foods are rich in fats and salts which are not good for health. An obese person is more likely to suffer from diseases like hypertension and diabetes.

There are tangible consequences on society too. Broadly speaking, as people get inclined towards fast food and restaurants, local culture dies out. It is because traditional food is inextricably linked with culture. Undoubtedly, the identity of the society and nation will disappear. It will be monopolized by western societies. Also, if people are not healthy, the productivity of the nation will come to a standstill. Last but not least, fast foods promote use-and-throw culture which adds to the problem of garbage dumps, contamination, pollution and eventually many diseases.

To put into nutshell, I pen down saying that international fast foods have carved their niche and traditional food has taken the backseat. Certainly, this has adverse effects on individuals, families and societies.

The natural resources such as oil, forests and fresh water are being consumed at an alarming rate. What problems does it cause? How can we solve these problems?

The time has come for international soul-searching about the environment. The industrial revolution has changed forever the relation between humanity and nature. In this essay I intend to explore the problems caused by the increased consumption of oil, forests and fresh water, and suggest some solutions.

Talking about oil first; it is well known that it is non-renewable and so will finish very soon. Pollution is another problem that is caused by the use of oil. Oil is used in vehicles, industries and homes. Simple measures can be taken to lessen its use. At individual level we can use more public transport; we can make lifestyle changes and use fewer luxuries. At government level, people can be educated. More effort can be done to research alternate sources of energy.

Secondly, water, especially fresh water, is another big area of concern. There can be no life without water. Water is the most precious commodity today. Fresh water resources are depleting fast. At individual level we should use water conservatively and recycle water wherever possible. At government level desalination plants can be set. Strict laws can be enforced for industries against pollution of fresh water by effluents.

Finally, because of deforestation, many animals and plants, which provides us food, medicine and other valuable products, are facing extinction. We have less bio-diversity also. Moreover, when trees are cut, the soil is exposed to heavy rain and so is washed away. The soil also becomes infertile. Also, trees absorb carbon-dioxide, which causes global warming because of the increase of greenhouse gases. Afforestation should be promoted as a solution. If each one of us plants a tree and nurtures it for few months, then the day is not far when we shall have greenery all over.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate that oil, forests and fresh water are very necessary if we have to survive. So we should use them judiciously else our future is bleak.

In some countries, secondary schools aim to provide a general education across a range of subjects. In others, children focus on a narrow range of subjects related to a particular career. For today's world, which system is appropriate?

It is a highly debated issue whether students should study many subjects or only a few subjects. Both systems have their own merits. The answer depends on the students' interests and the goals of their studies and the country's requirement.

There are many advantages of a broad range of subjects. To begin with, a broad range of subjects would provide a well rounded education which is very important for the holistic development of the students. In addition, students could find out what their real interests are as they would be exposed to a variety of fields of study. Just after passing out of high school students really don't know what they would be good at. So, if they have to make decisions at that time, they would be guided by their peers or parents. If they make a wrong decision at that time then they may drop out of school or end up with low grades.

Moreover, it is ideal for those students who have many interests. They will pursue education for education sake and not just learn a trade. Consequently, when they try to find out job after graduation, their versatility will allow them to apply for a wider range of jobs.

On the other hand, there are many advantages of studying a narrow range of subjects. Such courses are basically vocational in nature. Such students find it easy to find a job in their specific field of study. Naturally, companies will be more interested in job applicants who have superior knowledge and so can make better contributions. What is more, these students enter the job market earlier and start earning. This helps them to support their families. This also allows students to focus on their interest and the subject relevant to them. A physics or chemistry student may feel out of place if he has to study ancient poetry or western literature. Finally, such students have lesser burden and so more time for hobbies.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, both systems have their own merits. So it depends on students' choice and needs of the country. One size fits all approach cannot be applied to today's world.

In the past, lectures were used as a way of teaching large numbers of students, but now with the development of technology for education, many people think there is no justification for attending lectures. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

I disagree with the view that technology has reduced the need to attend lectures. I firmly believe that going to college or university and attending lectures is as important as before and even more so. In the following paragraphs I shall put forth my arguments to support my views.

It is irrefutable that computer and internet have made possible distance education and on-line education. In this regard, computers are a boon for the handicapped, those living in remote areas and those in job. They can study any time of the day or night because of the internet. This has made education approachable for many who cannot for some reason or the other attend a college or university.

However, I still feel that technology can replace the need for going to the classroom. When students attend lectures, they learn from teachers. In learning and practice of more complex ideas, the computer is not adequate. It can tell if the answer is right or wrong but it cannot tell where the student went wrong. Tasks involving reasoning cannot be taught using computers. Moreover, teachers add their own knowledge gained through experience to that of books and other resources.

Furthermore, teachers can stimulate interest and it is an undeniable fact that interested stimulated people tend to learn more. They can keep students focussed on study. A student studying by himself may get bored and stop studying. Teachers can provide a faster and simpler way to present information to the students. They can come down to the level of a student and so are definitely better than computers. What is more, teachers are role models for students. They are scholars in action. They not only teach academic subjects, but also many social skills. Finally, when students attend lectures, they have interaction with other students which gives them a sense of competition to study more.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that there is no doubt that modern technology has added many new ways to reach education to students, but attending lectures will always hold its importance.

<u>As we are facing more and more problems which affect the whole planet, good</u> relationships between different countries are becoming more important than ever before. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is irrefutable that nowadays the whole world has become a global village and communication and trade between different countries is also becoming more frequent than ever before. At the same time, the whole planet is facing problems, such as environmental problem, terrorism and poverty and diseases. In my view, countries cannot solve these problems on their own and governments of different countries must cooperate to fight these problems.

To begin with, take environmental problems. It is a bitter truth that the Earth is facing the problem of global warming and if the whole world does not unite to fight this problem, then the day is not far when the whole Earth will become a boiling pot and life would not be possible here. The Kyoto protocol has been signed by many countries of the United Nations in which they have pledged not to make industries which emit more than 5.2% carbon dioxide.

Furthermore, there are problems like terrorism which are having a detrimental effect on our society. There are various global organizations which are working towards eradicating these issues but it cannot be possible without trust and harmony between different nations.

What is more, the poor countries are getting aid from developed countries to develop their infrastructure and develop themselves. In these countries many people are suffering from starvation and poverty which can harm the neighbouring richer nations and that is why all nations realise the importance of maintaining good relations.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that nowadays good relations between different countries are absolutely necessary nowadays to solve these critical issues.

# <u>Team activities can teach more skills for life than those activities which are played alone. To what extent do you agree or disagree?</u>

Both teamwork and individual work require different skills and teach different things. Most of our daily life depends on teamwork like doing a job and raising a family. Therefore, I agree with the given statement that team activities teach more skills for life than solo activities. In the following paragraphs, I shall support my view with my arguments.

Some important skills of life are communication skills, co-operation and conflict management skills. All these are only learnt through teamwork. In solo activities, we do not need to communicate and so we do not learn these skills. However, when we step into daily life, we realise that communication skills are the most needed skills. We also have to co-operate also with our family members, colleagues, friends and neighbours in daily life. When we do team activities, we learn co-operation also. Conflict management skills are also learnt when we do team activities. You have differences of opinion and you learn to manage tough situations very diplomatically. All these are very necessary skills of life.

Furthermore, we also learn leadership skills, decision making and critical thinking skills while doing team activities. We learn how to make our voice heard and we also learn how to accept the correct suggestions of others. Finally, we learn sportsman- spirit which is a very good trait. We learn to accept victory with modesty and defeat with grace. This is an important life skill.

On the other hand, we learn many skills of life through solo activities also. We learn a sense of competition and perseverance through individual activities. All life skills are important for us. We cannot forget that man is a social animal and cannot live alone. So, what we learn in teams can be applied more in our daily lives.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that team activities and individual activities – both teach important skills of life but team activities are definitely better teachers of life skills than solo activities.

It is known to all that the technological and scientific advances have made great changes to the range and quality of our food. Some people regard it as an improvement while others believe that the change is harmful. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Yesterday's fiction is today's reality. Such colossal developments have taken place in range and quality of food which we could not even think of earlier. It is a highly debated issue as to whether these advances are a blessing or a curse. This essay shall delve into the merits and demerits of these developments.

The proponents claim that genetic modification of foods has given us such species which need little or no insecticides and no fertilizers. GM crops do not require spraying with toxic insecticides and as a consequence environmental damage such as the indiscriminate killing of insects and the contamination of soils and rivers is avoided. Moreover, since age old times, farming methods have always involved selective breeding and methods of cross-pollination. In that sense genetic modification is nothing new.

What is more, the quality of food has also improved. For example, fish gene has been added to tomato to make it frost resistant. A nut protein has been added to soya bean to increase the protein content. Finally, technology has saved people from tedious work and in the mean time increased the production markedly. All this is needed to meet the demands of the burgeoning population.

The opponents say that GM crops are unnatural and that by creating them we are altering the natural world. A more worrying argument raised by objectors to GM foods is that they could constitute a health risk, for example by causing allergies or even by being toxic. The final objection is strictly environmental. It is argued that crops which are genetically modified to kill the pests which attack them may also kill harmless insects. This, it is claimed will have a disastrous effect on the wider environment beyond the crop themselves.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that GM crops offer increased agricultural productivity and foods of higher nutritional value, both of which are essential if the growing world population of the twenty-first century is to be fed. Indeed, these crops have the potential to improve the health of millions throughout the world while causing less environmental damage than standard farming methods used today. I think it essential that GM foods should be encouraged.

Some people think that we should invent a new language for international communication. Do the benefits of this outweigh the problems?

There are so many languages around the world, thereby discouraging people from different regions or cultures to communicate with each other. To overcome this obstacle, some people propose to invent a new language which will be used as an –international languagel among people who come from different areas. Although this proposal seems reasonable, I personally see more disadvantages than advantages of inventing a new language.

First of all, a new language would not be accepted by many people because it would be artificial and not based on any culture. In addition, people would have to spend time to learn the grammar and the words of the new language.

Secondly, promoting a new language requires financial support and a lot of time. For instance, in some countries such as China and India there are many languages because it is financially unrealistic to teach everyone in poor areas one language. Although this might be achieved finally, it will take as long as a hundred years or even more.

Another reason against having a new language is that it is bound to be divided into dialects and so the whole purpose of having one language would be lost. For instance, in Punjab, a small state of India, the mother tongue Punjabi has two dialects which are quite different from each other. So it would be unrealistic to expect one language without different dialects in the whole world.

Finally, we all know that variety is the spice of life and language is related to culture. So, if we have one language spoken in the whole world, then it would be a dreary and dismal place to live in.

To sum up, although there would be benefits such as easy trade and travel, inventing a new language for the international communication is not a good idea because of the various reasons given above. In my opinion it is totally a waste of time and money to invent a new language because its advantages cannot outweigh its disadvantages.

Some people say that it is the responsibility of individual to save money for their own care after they retire. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

I certainly support the view. One should most definitely put aside some money for the future, and not fritter away everything to enjoy the present. One should always remember that the present would one day transform into the future, and when it eventually does, it should be safe and secure. Of what purpose is enjoyment today, if it becomes the cause of misery and worry in the future? It is so easy to spend, yet so difficult to save. Wisdom dictates that one must be discreet and stingy to save for the future. Let us consider why it is so important to save.

The mortality rate has come down and the span of life is generally longer, but the period of earning is comparatively limited. Nobody knows how long he would live, but the age of retirement is generally fixed. One cannot work indefinitely. Therefore, during his earning span, he has to make sure that he puts aside enough money that will hold him in good stead in his later years, when he will be able to work no more. Further, the requirements in old age are sometimes more than a person's needs during the period of his youth.

Deteriorating health translates into higher medical bills and hospital charges. Being weak and infirm, one needs to spend more on commuting. He will need to hire assistants to help in the house.

Next come the needs of the family. One has to provide for the education and marriage expenses of the dependent members of the family, like children and even grandchildren. One has to pay one's insurance premiums, and even for the day-to-day needs of the younger members of the family, till such time as they are employed and earning.

One may incur extra expenditure on leisure activities. People generally travel more after retirement to meet their relatives and friends who may be settled and staying far away from them. Thus, there are so many needs that would surface in the future. Some may be quite unexpected and traumatic like accidents in the family, which may entail high expenditure. There would be the usual expenses on house maintenance and repair, and the payment of personal and property taxes.

Therefore, it is imperative that a person plan wisely for his future. If he has saved enough, he can sit back and enjoy peace and comfort in his later years and even witness the smile of joy on the faces of his children. If he has saved not, then the journey ahead would be dreary and dismal indeed.

Some people think that studying in a college or university is the best way for students to prepare for their future career. But others think they should leave school as soon as possible to develop their career through work experience. Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

It is irrefutable that most people believe that a university degree is the only way to get a good job. I believe this is true in certain areas whereas in other areas, it is not as useful.

To begin with many people have ambitions to become a qualified professional, and there is no doubt that becoming a doctor or a lawyer is only possible with a degree. Another advantage of graduating from a university is that it gives you more choices when it comes to choosing a job. Most employers will be more impressed by a candidate who has a degree than they would be by one who only has high school qualifications because it shows a certain level of intelligence and education, as well as the commitment and selfdiscipline that is needed in order to study a degree course for three or four years.

On the other hand there might be some benefit of starting your career early, especially if your chosen field is one which does not typically require a university education. This would apply to somebody who wants to become a car mechanic, or a fashion designer, for instance, who would not gain anything from going to university. The hands on experience you gain from your job while others are studying for a degree can give you a distinct advantage. My uncle left school at sixteen and became a wealthy and successful automobile dealer. He claims that he had learnt all he needed to know by working in his chosen field and that he could not have done any better by getting a degree.

So to conclude, it is possible to get a good job without going to university. Having said that, some professions such as the law require you to have a degree and as stated above a university degree could open more doors when looking for a job.

The unlimited use of cars may cause many problems. What are those problems? In order to reduce the problems, should we discourage people to use cars?

Someone has rightly said that – —The car has become an article of dress without which we feel uncertain, unclad, and incomplete<sup>||</sup>. No wonder, there are increasing number of cars on the road which are creating problems such as traffic jams, air pollution and longer commuting periods. In future, this trend is likely to worsen. The solution, it would seem, is for government to encourage the use of public transport in urban areas, thus decreasing dependence on the car.

One way to stimulate public transport use is to make private car use more expensive and inconvenient. The introduction of tolls along urban motorways has been successfully employed in many cities. Other such measures are high- priced permits for parking in urban areas and the restriction of parking to a limited number of cars. Faced with high costs or no place to park, commuters would perhaps be more willing to abandon their cars in favour of buses or trains.

The governments could also encourage public transport use. The construction of free car parks at suburban train stations has proven successful in quite a number of countries. This allows commuters to drive part of the way, but take public transport into the central, most congested, urban areas. Indeed, making public transport more comfortable and convenient should work to attract more commuters and decrease traffic congestion. Public transport that is convenient and comfortable retains its passengers, much like any business that satisfies its customers. The more commuters committed to taking public transport, the less congestion on city streets.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that the increasing number of cars is creating problems like pollution, accidents and traffic congestion but steps could be taken to minimize the problems.

Many countries spend a lot of money in art. Some people think investment in art is necessary, but others say money is better spent on improving health and education. Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

High impact - In many countries, government sponsorship of the arts costs millions in taxpayers' money. There are many more important things to spend money on. Do you agree?

There are some who claim that it is important to maintain the arts, and an equal number of people who are opposed to continued government funding. I will argue in favour of this latter point for a number of reasons.

The strongest point is that money spent on the arts could have been used for considerably more vital purposes. While I admit that the arts are important to a country's identity, it must also be given that a nation's health and wellbeing should be paramount. The idea that elderly people are forced to wait for essential operations whilst the money required to increase available medical provision is spent on opera and ballet is plainly immoral.

In addition to health concerns, there are also more deserving social causes for the money that should be considered before the arts. Homelessness, unemployment, single mothers, the crime rate - all of these deserve to be addressed before money is spent on what is essentially little more than entertainment.

A third factor is that some people have no interest in preserving or funding the art, feeling that they have little practical value. If the arts are so much in need of sponsorship, then perhaps this is a reflection of their lack of popularity, in which case they should not be supported. The money should go to more popular events instead.

For each of these reasons, it can be concluded that there is little reason to continue funding the arts. Yet perhaps a compromise could be reached by which those keen to maintain the arts could raise a percentage of their own funds and the government could reduce its level of sponsorship

Higher education can be funded in several ways including the following three: 1. all costs are paid by the government. 2. all costs are paid by the students. 3. all costs are paid by the student using loans from the government that must be repaid after graduation. Discuss the benefits of each option. Which is the best one?

The rising cost of higher education is a significant issue facing governments around the world. Three ways are there to fund higher education and each has its own merits. This essay shall discuss the benefits of each method and identify the best one.

To begin with, if the government pays for higher education it would contribute to a prosperous and civilized society. It is true that human resource is of great importance to every nation. Investing in higher education, therefore, helps establish high-quality labor force with great expertise in the future. Moreover, it gives students from all walks of life the equal chance to further their education.

If the student has to cover the full fees of his tuition then naturally he would be more serious in his study. The onus of getting the full value for money spent on higher education would be on the student and this would result in better graduates which would benefit the nation as a whole.

The third option in which all costs are paid by the student using loans from the government that must be repaid after graduation is the best one in my opinion because even the havenots would get equal opportunity to get higher education and as the students would know they have to repay the loan after they have finished education, the universities would not be flooded with non serious students.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that each of the above methods has its own pros but the third method in which all costs are paid by the student using loans from the government that must be repaid after graduation is the best.

Today's children are living under more pressure from the society than children in the past. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

Despite a continuing improvement in standard of living, many people believe that young people suffer more stress than older generations. I definitely agree with the statement and shall put forth my arguments to support my views in the following paragraphs.

Firstly, teenagers are exposed to more products than earlier generations as they are living in a modern consumerist society. Through films and the media they see celebrities with expensive jewellery, clothes and cars. Moreover, youth oriented advertising gives them an awareness of the latest technology such as digital music formats and mobile phones. As a result, teenagers feel pressure to acquire these items. Such stresses were not so strong during earlier times.

Secondly, pressures at school are stronger than before. Competition is very tough. Today's children have to compete with children from all over the globe. Teenagers must succeed in their studies so that they can compete for the best jobs. Parental pressure, examinations and homework are all reported as causing increased levels of strain. Such stress was not that severe in earlier times.

Finally, today's children are faced with a new type of stress. They are faced with a choice of two cultures. One culture, the global culture, is the one they want to adopt and the other is the traditional culture which they are forced to adopt by their parents. They are in a dilemma and this causes stress that has never been experienced by the earlier generations.

To sum up, consumerism and academic pressures are powerful causes of stress on today's teenagers. To add to it there is the pressure of sticking to the traditional culture. So, definitely today's children are under greater pressure than that faced by earlier generations.

Some people think it is better for children to begin to learn a foreign language at primary school than at secondary school. What's your opinion? Do you think the advantages outweigh the disadvantages?

Language is the best means of communication. In the modern globalization era it is not enough to be able to speak one language to communicate with the outside world. I strongly support the idea that children should begin learning a foreign language at primary school than at secondary school. They faster become familiar with a strange language, improve their hearing ability to understand new words as time goes by and learn new words. In the following paragraphs I will list some reasons to support my position.

Firstly, there is no doubt that a young mind readily absorbs new information. Child psychologists often mention that the most formative years of learning happen in the first few years of life. Therefore, what children are exposed to is very often retained and remembered. In this way, a child is in a good position to learn the new information associated with a new language.

Secondly, senior students are often afraid to make mistakes when they are speaking in a new language. This fear is one of the biggest barriers for a person in their efforts to speak freely. Primary school children are not afraid of making grammatical mistakes because basically they just repeat words and sentences in the way they hear them. So, they have a better chance to get used to the right pronunciation of the language.

To sum up, I think that it is very essential for children to begin learning a foreign language in their early ages. It is brings many benefits such as great pronunciation. Also, it helps a child develop and gain more knowledge which is good for a long run.

The government should pay for the course fees for everyone who wants to study at the university. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

As the modern world is becoming increasingly complex and knowledge is becoming more and more specialized there is no doubt that tertiary education is necessary both for the whole society and for individuals who want to ensure that they have a good profession. However, I disagree that the government should pay the course fees for everyone who studies at the university. In some cases it should be borne by the government and in others it should be paid by the individual.

There is no doubt that the whole society benefits. In all developing countries there has been a strong effort to raise the educational level of the society by putting as much money as possible into providing educational institutions. Universities and colleges are, however, expensive to run. Because of this, it is felt that such countries are held back in all forms of development. Without enough educated professionals such as doctors, teachers, scientists and engineers, developing countries cannot move ahead. Governments in such countries provide scholarships or free education, to as many students as they can fund, because they realize that the whole country will benefit. Many developed countries also try to offer free tertiary education because they want a highly educated population.

There are also strong arguments why government should not fund everyone's higher education. It is a fact that individuals benefit so much from tertiary education that they should be expected to pay for it. Doctors, lawyers, accountants and engineers have some of the highest incomes in most societies. People argue that the government, and therefore the tax payers, should not pay for students who will later earn more than anyone else. Moreover, most students come from the middle classes and their parents can afford to pay for their fees. There are, of course, some students who cannot afford to pay. This problem can be overcome by giving the students a loan to pay for their fees, and later, when they are earning a good salary, they repay the loan.

Finally, it is also a well known fact that if we get something for free, we don't value it that much. The university classes would be full of non-serious students who would spoil the decorum of the classes. There would also be drop-outs and students may not complete their education. In such cases a lot of government money is wasted.

To conclude, I would like to reiterate that the government should not pay the course fees for everyone who wants to study at the university. However, the government can provide funding to the poor and needy students in the form of loans which can be repaid later.

<u>Nowadays</u>, a large amount of advertising is aimed at children, so some people think there are lots of negative effects on children, and should ban it. To what extent you agree or disagree?

Advertisements are ubiquitous nowadays and especially advertising targeting children who are considered vulnerable target by companies. As a result, many parents are worried about this phenomenon. However, we cannot ban advertisements because they serve a lot of useful purposes as well.

Admittedly, in sensitive areas such as the toy industry, some censorship should be there to limit children's access to excess advertisement. Because children under a certain age lack abilities to make wise judgment as to what they really want. They are attracted by colourful pictures on advertisement and swayed by misleading information. So they pester their parents to buy those things and this can upset the budget of many families. Even the advertisements of fast foods are bad for children. Children cannot understand that the slim-trim models advertising Mac Donalds burgers hardly ever eat such foods themselves. They are attracted to fast foods and these are very detrimental for their health.

On the other hand, advertising provides us with information on new products. If it were not for electronic and print advertising, many products would not be bought. In this way, advertising provides an important service to manufacturers and some consumers. Additionally, it fuels the advertising industry, creating jobs for thousands of people. In this respect it has the backbone of many economies of the world.

Furthermore, advertisements touch social issues. For example, when Amitabh Bachhan tells people to bring their children for pulse polio immunization, people listen. Then there are ads against female foeticide which are very informative. Advertisements also teach a lot about the country from where the ads come.

This is because through satellite TV we can see ads from all over the world. When we see a Japanese advert of a lady in a kimono, we come to know about the clothes of Japan.

To put it in a nutshell I pen down saying that, it is imperative that regulations be imposed on advertisers who target children or who make false claims. However, advertisement is indispensable in this highly competitive market and produces much more positive effects than negative ones to the society as a whole. So, we should not ban advertisements.

Some people think that giving aids to the poor countries has more negative impacts than positive ones. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

I disagree that giving aid to poor countries has more negative effects. There are negative effects, no doubt, but positive effects are certainly more

Talking about the negative effects, the major one is that poor countries could become over dependant and stop making efforts of their own. This would halt the long term progress of the poor countries. Secondly, the aid given by rich countries could go into corrupt hands and not reach those for whom it was meant for. Then, the aid may not be that useful. For example, the people's need may be clothes and food but the aid may be in the form of making a bridge or something like that which people may not need. Finally, the rich countries may have their own selfish motives behind giving aid. For instance, they may provide employment but they may be underpaying and exploiting the poor.

The advantages of the rich countries helping the poor are manifold. To begin with, nowadays we belong to a global village and all countries are so interconnected that all problems that arise because of poverty – crime, terrorism and diseases will directly or indirectly affect the rich countries. It is a well known fact that terrorists can infiltrate the rich countries and cause violence and crime there. Moreover, if poor countries suffer diseases then these diseases can spread to the neighbouring rich countries. So, it can be said that it is a necessity for the rich to save the poor in order to save themselves. It has been well said by John F Kennedy that –if a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

Furthermore, there are many problems which the world is facing today, such as global warming, which can be solved by joint efforts of all countries. Such joint efforts can only be possible if the gap between the rich and poor is narrowed. This can only be achieved if the haves help the have-nots. Finally, the rich countries also have a moral duty to help the poor. They should help them on humanitarian grounds.

To conclude, I reiterate by saying that the rich must help the poor. However, it must be well researched first as to what sort of help is most needed. Help can be provided in the form of food, medicine and education.

Nowadays, we are living in a throw-away society. What are its causes and what are its problems?

Environmentalists today are campaigning for "reduce, recycle and re-use" in a bid to save the world, but we as a nation, have adopted "replace" as our mantra. This and many other factors are leading to a throwaway society, and there are many problems being caused by this which I shall discuss in this essay.

The reasons for our becoming a throwaway society are manifold. Firstly, in a quest for better living standards, we wish to own the latest equipments and gadgets. Once new things are acquired, we dispose-off these "unwanted" things to second hand shops or just in the trash cans.

Secondly, the markets today are flooded with cheap, single-use-only things that are more in demand than high priced quality items. Our houses and closets seem to be overflowing with goods that are more in quantity and less in value. Finally, there is too much packaging done by the companies in a bid to make their things more attractive.

The effects of this trend are also manifold. Pollution and filling up of the landfill sites by non biodegradable material is a great cause of concern. Global warming is taking up mammoth dimensions and unless we do something about it, our earth will become uninhabitable very soon.

To add to it, there is intense competition and rivalry among the affluent for becoming society's trend setters. This tendency has played havoc on the middle-class strata. People are working long arduous hours to earn more and more money so that they can keep up with Joneses and Smiths or else lose face. This is creating stress among people and people are losing social and moral values.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, the current abundance of choice coupled with the ease with which things are discarded as soon as they lose their newness has given rise to a throwaway society which is having a detrimental effect on the individuals and society.

# We can see more disasters and violence shown on TV .What are its causes and what effects will they exert on the individual and the society?

It is irrefutable that television news is filled with violence and suffering. Crime and violent world events are among the most frequently covered topics on TV. In the following paragraphs I shall discuss the reasons of this phenomenon and suggest some ways forward.

The most important reason for this is obviously that television channels want to increase their TRP (television rating point). If any channel has high TRP, it gets more adverts and hence more revenue. Therefore the channels have to show such sensational news. Secondly, the news channels have to show what is happening around and disasters and violence have become very common in our surroundings. Finally, people demand that they should be well informed about all things which are prevalent in society. So, media has to show all that to its viewers.

There are many harmful effects on the individuals and society. The most disturbing effect is on the children and youth. Media violence can stimulate fear in some children as it frightens them, making the effects long lasting. This can become traumatic in our children as they see it more and more. Children are starting to grow and are shaping their personality, values and beliefs. They can become aggressive or they can lose a sense of reality and fiction of what they are seeing.

Young people imitate what they see and it is logical that they see glamour in what they do when they commit violence. Consequently, the society suffers as the streets are full of violence. Too much portrayal of these also leads to immunity among the people and they are not affected by the disasters any more. Disasters like Tsunami and earthquakes don't make people shed a tear any more.

How can we lessen violence? Reducing the amount of violence on TV and in the cinema would certainly be a good start. It is a well known fact that the media possesses a lot of power to influence people. So, those in the media must be judicious about delivering news in a balanced manner that brings the story to the consumer without showing too much violence. Journalism is a profession like any other and certain standards of quality and professionalism need to be maintained. Moreover, parents should be more vigilant about what children see on TV.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that there are many reasons why media shows too much violence on TV and some steps should be taken to reduce this as it has a lot of detrimental effects on the individuals and society.

Some people think children's spending time on TV, video and PC games is good, while others think it is bad. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

While it may be disliked by many, the modern game industry is a part of our world. From its humble beginnings in the 80s, the video game industry has exploded into a 10-billion dollar empire. It is a debatable issue whether these games are good or bad. In this essay, I intend to delve into the pros and cons of these games and finally give my opinion.

There are many advantages of video, PC and TV games. To begin with, video game playing introduces children to computer technology. Secondly, some games provide practice in problem solving and logic e.g. Age Of Empires. Video games have proved to improve visual skills. They also improve motor and spatial skills. Children who play video games have better reflexes.

What is more, these modern games make learning fun. The cost of failure is lower. This encourages risk taking and exploration. If the kid gets the answer wrong or their character dies, they just start the game over and try again. Finally, some games have therapeutic applications. Watching TV also is very educative for children.

On the other hand, there are some disadvantages of these technological inventions. Firstly, overdependence on these games leads to social isolation as these are usually played alone. Secondly, some games have violent characters and seeing their violent acts leads to aggressive behaviour in children. Moreover, these games can confuse reality and fantasy. For example, when children play car racing games then they may race their own vehicles in real life which can lead to accidents. Finally, many games do not require action that requires independence and creativity.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that on the whole these games are very good and certainly their advantages outweigh their disadvantages but these should be played in moderation. Parents should limit the game playing time and see to it that home work and chores are done before playing

Some people think that criminals should be given longer terms in prison, so as to reduce the crime rate. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

There are many different opinions on the best way to reduce crime. In my opinion, long term prison is the only answer in a very few situations, but in most cases education, vocational training and rehabilitation are better.

Long terms in prison are the only answer in case of criminals who are a risk to the society, such as murderers. They cannot be made to mix with society. There are also mentally insane people such as serial killers who should be kept away from the people. In all other cases we can do without long terms in prisons.

My first argument against longer terms in prisons is that in traditional prisons, people learn a lot about crime and so when they leave prison they will commit even more crime. In other words prisons act as universities of crime. So for petty offenders like shop-lifters and pick-pockets should be given some vocational training and education. It is a well not fact that the basic causes of crime are poverty, illiteracy and unemployment. So, if we provide education and job training then we would be removing the causes of crime. If criminals are rehabilitated by some form of employment then they would certainly not re-offend.

Furthermore, the prisons are expensive to maintain. The government can spend that money on other important matters such as education and healthcare. This would ease some burden from the government's shoulders. The petty and minor criminals can also be employed in some community service projects after providing education and vocational training.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that we should hate the crime and not the criminal. To fight crime we should focus on the causes of crime. Education and job training help to rehabilitate the criminals. Longer terms in prison are not the answer to fight crime. Focus should be on reforming the criminals.

Old generations often hold some traditional ideas on the correct way of life, thinking and behavior. However, some people think that it is not helpful for the young generations to prepare for modern life in the future. What's your opinion?

Generation gap has been a debated issue since the dawn of civilization. I partially agree with this statement. Modern life has changed beyond recognition in many ways and so many ideas of the old generation are not suitable for today's life, but still there are some traditional ideas which are evergreen and hold true even today.

The elderly had a very disciplined life. For instance, they believed in sticking to one job for life. They also believed in fixed-hours job. They had a stress-free work life. Moreover, they believed that marriage was for life. Divorces were rare. They had a stable family life. These values, if followed, are good for today's generation also.

However, in many ways the ideas of the elderly are obsolete in the times of modernity. The elderly live like a frog in the well. They forget that change is progress. They also want their children to follow the same profession. They do not give importance to aptitude. Youngsters are more intellectually evolved. They want to explore the un-trodden path to face the cut-throat competition of today.

Furthermore, the young differ in dress, food and habits. These things were not available to the elderly. The elderly had lesser opportunities to come in contact with the western world. The earth was a big planet. Now it is a global village. The young speak a universal language, eat Italian pizza and Chinese food and wear a universal dress. The leisurely ways of the old are gone. The young have the speed of bikes, cars and planes. What can link them to the old bullock cart? The young today have to change to survive.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, there are some traditional ideas of the elderly that are evergreen and will hold true for times to come. But, in many ways, they are obsolete in today's time.

Unemployment is getting increasingly serious in many countries. Some people think students only need to get primary education, while others think secondary education is necessary. What's your opinion?

Nowadays, an increasing number of people cannot find jobs in many countries. Some people argue that students only need to receive primary education, while others believe secondary education is necessary. Before presenting my opinion, it is necessary for me to probe into both sides of the issue.

Those who say that only primary education should be there, feel that education has little influence on finding a job. To begin with, the competition for jobs is increasingly tough since there are more and more job seekers. Definitely, no matter what level education a person receives, he or she has to go to find a job finally, facing some competition. Therefore, the earlier one goes to find a position, the better for a person. Furthermore, they think people can acquire the technique through work instead of school. In other words, school education does not provide practical technique for factories. It is unnecessary for people to receive more education than primary courses.

On the other hand, those who believe that secondary education is necessary think that secondary education will offer more knowledge for people who plan to work, which can get them better paid jobs. However, both the two issues neglect the great impacts of education on the development of individuals.

In my opinion, it is necessary for individuals to receive as much education as possible before they go to work. Firstly, college or university education plays a key role in the development of individuals. Secondly, education will definitely enhance the competition for work. The more education one receives, the more opportunities for jobs he will have. For instance, more companies are recruiting new employees with a bachelor or master degree recently since the employment is very hard-to-get, with today's financial crisis. Last but not least, receiving more education will widen one's horizons. Some of them, maybe, set up their own business, creating a new approach to unemployment.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, although primary education is sufficient for some kinds of work, I firmly believe that people should receive higher education before they go to work.

Some people think people can exploit animals for any purpose they need, while others do not think so. What is your opinion?

The discussion about whether or not animals should be used for the benefit of humans is a very debatable one. Some individuals are of the opinion that we can exploit animals for our benefit. Others hold the opposite view. It is necessary to look at both sides of the argument before forming an opinion.

Animals have always been used by humans in many different ways, for example, as food, for work, and in research. Using animals for food reflects what happens throughout the animal kingdom where carnivorous, or meat-eating, animals kill other animals for food. Humans have achieved dominance over animals and are able to use them to work, for example in the fields or to pull carts and other transport.

Animals undoubtedly suffer during medical research, but this research may prevent humans from suffering in the future.

Many people, however, argue that it is wrong to cause suffering to animals for the benefit of humans. Meat is not a necessary part of our diet, and there are many healthy vegetarians around the world who prove this. Technology has largely replaced the use of animals in the fields and for transport. Research carried out on animals is often not valid for human cases as an animal's reactions may be very different from those of a human. There are useful alternative forms of research available now, such as the use of tissue cell cultures. More and more people are unhappy to cause suffering to animals if there is an alternative.

Conclusion 1 In my opinion, though, it is necessary to use animals for the benefit of humans. Through their use, the quality of life for humans can be improved, and this is more important than the quality of life for animals.

Conclusion 2 In conclusion, I believe that animals should not be used for human gain. It is time to concentrate resources on developing alternative sources of food and methods of research, and allow animals a pain-free existence.

An increasing number of people choose to live in big cities. What problems will this bring about? Should the government encourage people to live in small towns?

Cities act as magnets to many from rural areas. As a consequence of this migration many problems arise in the cities. This essay will discuss these problems and also give opinion on whether or not the government should encourage people to live in small towns.

A major problem is the pressure on the cities' infrastructure. For example, as more and more people crowd into cities, water delivery and sewerage disposal systems are often found to be inadequate to cope with demand. Moreover, unlicensed construction of dwellings usually leads to further problems for water and sewerage systems. Roads and transport services also suffer when they are overused. As more and more people attempt to travel, the roads quickly become overcrowded and traffic slows. Examples of this situation can be found in many cities throughout the world. Not only this, these congested roads become more and more accident prone.

Certainly, if the government encourages people to live in small towns, it would have a positive impact on the overcrowding of some cities. There would be less traffic, less people in the city centre, and this would obviously be highly desirable. In addition, there would be less strain on the services offered by the city – banks, public transportation, restaurants and the like. This would mean a reduction in queues and faster customer service.

However, the problem would be that a dramatic reduction in numbers of people in the cities would mean that many businesses would go broke. Restaurants, cafes and other service areas would suffer tremendously. What would happen is that overcrowding would occur in the small towns. More and more people offering services would spring up - restaurants, shopping centres and other businesses would be needed to service the increasingly larger numbers of people who live in that area. So, although the idea seems good in theory, it would be very impractical.

The better solution to the problem would be a careful planning of the city keeping in mind the future population predictions.

To put it in a nutshell I pen down saying the because of migration of people from rural to urban areas, many problems arise in cities but the solution is not in encouraging people to live in small towns as this would be a short sighted approach.

An American film actor once said, —Tomorrow is important and precious. Some people think individuals and society should pay more attention to the future than to the present. Do you agree or disagree?

I certainly support the view. One should most definitely keep the future in mind and not fritter away everything to enjoy the present. One should always remember that the present would one day transform into the future, and when it eventually does, it should be safe and secure. The same holds true for societies. Let us consider why it is so important to be prepared for the coming time.

The mortality rate has come down and the span of life is generally longer, but the period of earning is comparatively limited. Nobody knows how long he would live, but the age of retirement is generally fixed. One cannot work indefinitely. Therefore, during his earning span, he has to make sure that he puts aside enough money that will hold him in good stead in his later years, when he will be able to work no more. Further, the requirements in old age are sometimes more than a person's needs during the period of his youth. Deteriorating health translates into higher medical bills and hospital charges. Being weak and infirm, one needs to spend more on commuting. He will need to hire assistants to help in the house.

Next come the needs of the family. One has to provide for the education and marriage expenses of the dependent members of the family, like children and even grandchildren. One has to pay one's insurance premiums, and even for the day-to-day needs of the younger members of the family, till such time as they are employed and earning. Moreover, one may incur extra expenditure on leisure activities. People generally travel more after retirement to meet their relatives and friends who may be settled and staying far away from them. There would also be the usual expenses on house maintenance and repair, and the payment of personal and property taxes.

The societies should also think about tomorrow. Neighbourhoods should be planned nicely. Everyone should participate in community projects. Good educational institutes and health centres should be there in all areas. If only today is looked into and no planning is done for tomorrow then crime and violence would increase in society and everyone would suffer.

Therefore, it is imperative that people and societies plan wisely for the future. If one has saved enough, one can sit back and enjoy peace and comfort in ones later years and even witness the smile of joy on the faces of ones children. If he has saved not, then the journey ahead would be dreary and dismal indeed.

Some people think imported food exerts positive impacts on our lives. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Nowadays, supermarkets are stocked with food products from around the world. Some individuals are of the opinion that this imported food has beneficial effect on us. I beg to differ. I feel that the local and regional produce is better for us and will discuss why in this essay.

It is certainly the case that importing food can have a negative effect on local culture. This can be seen in countries such as Japan where imported food has become more popular than traditional, local produce, eroding people's understanding of their own food traditions. Although some would claim that this is a natural part of economic development, in an increasingly global world. I feel strongly that any loss of regional culture would be detrimental.

A second major reason to reduce imports is the environmental cost. Currently, many food imports such as fruit, are transported thousands of miles by road, sea and air, making the produce more expensive to buy and increasing pollution from exhaust fumes. Despite the fact that trade in food exports has existed for many years, I am convinced that a reduction would bring significant financial and environmental gains.

However, many jobs depend on food exports and some less developed countries may even depend on this trade for economic survival. In spite of this, the importance of developing local trade should not be undervalued.

In conclusion, I am certain that reducing food imports would have cultural and environmental benefits. What is more, the local economy should, in time, prosper commercially as the demand for local and regional produce remains high resisting the competition from overseas.

Schools offer a wide range of courses such as physical education, music, economics, philosophy, math, English, geography, physics and history. Among all these subjects, which one do you think is the most important and which one is the least important?

To decide which subject is the most important and which is the least important is a daunting task. Each and every subject has its own importance which cannot be under estimated but if I have to choose one I would choose physical education as the most important one and philosophy as the least important one.

Physical education is the most important for all students at school level. These classes improve students' health, now and in the future. They burn calories, and this helps them to maintain a healthy weight. The classes' regular exercise develops good habits for the present and the future. People who exercise as children are more likely to continue exercising when they're adults. This reduces the risk of heart disease, diabetes, and other serious illnesses.

Physical education also improves students' mental health. It can be difficult to sit in class all day. Students can exercise and then relax after their physical activity. This helps them to feel happier and more comfortable at school. The classes also include activities that help with stress reduction. Walking, stretching, and yoga are just a few of the exercises that reduce stress. When they have good mental health, they can do well in other subjects also.

The students' favourite part of physical education classes may be the opportunity to communicate with their classmates. They enjoy talking to their friends while they play games. The students also learn how to work in teams. Teamwork is an important skill that they will use when playing sports or even at their jobs in the future.

As for the least important course, I have to say that I think philosophy is not so important after all. This is a subject which can be there at the higher level for those who want to study it. That is why, perhaps, in our Indian school curricula philosophy has no place. To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, although all subjects are important, I believe that physical education is the most important and philosophy is the least important.

(for those who want to write maths as the most important)

-Maths is in everything

-Maths is the something for which the world was written Importance of maths

No single day can be spent without encountering some form of mathematics. From page numbers, to prices to today's date, maths puts things together and enables us to compare quantitatively.

To survive financially, you must use maths to allocate your resources -e.g. invest in business or stock exchange.

Maths applications in the study of science – tracking the orbits of planets and stars in galaxy cannot be done without numerical comparison.

Every discipline from archaeology to zoology benefits from the study of maths.

The number of cars keeps increasing, so road systems should be expanded. Some people think the government should pay for it, while others think the car owners should pay for it. What's your opinion?

With growing incomes, it is not surprising that everyone wants to live a lavish lifestyle. Every other individual owns a car these days. That is why road systems have to be expanded. All this requires money. That is why the debate has arisen as to who should pay for this expansion. Some opine that the government should pay while others contend that the car owners should pay. I tend to agree with the latter.

To begin with, higher cost for car owners would encourage public transport use. This would definitely be better for the environment as there would be less pollution and less usage of natural resources like petrol and diesel. People would also be encouraged to do car pooling so that the added expenses are shared. Moreover, shorter journeys may be made on foot or bicycle which would lead to a healthier nation.

In addition, it would be unfair if government pays all the money out of the taxes. In this way even those people who are not using the roads for their private vehicles would also be taxed. Moreover, government has so much else on its shoulders such as basic healthcare and education which would be advantageous for all.

Admittedly, better roads means lesser congestion, lesser traffic jams and therefore lesser pollution and faster mobility which would be better for the big businesses. Therefore, this cost should be met by the big companies and not the average taxpayer.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that expanding the road system is the need of the hour and most of the cost should be met with by the car owners and big companies and some paid by the government

People should look after their health as a duty to the society they live in rather than personal benefits. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Good health is a basic human need. The statement says that people should look after their health as an obligation to the society and not think about their own benefits. I however feel that compliance would be much more if we were to look after our health for our own interest and the benefits to the society would automatically ensue.

There are many benefits to the individual if he/she looks after his/her health. Good health means a person leads a quality life. He does not have to spend on expensive medical treatment and he has more productive life. He can work better and enjoy all the good things that life has to offer. Moreover, if a person suffers from any infectious disease and takes timely treatment then he does not spread it to others. Later on he does not stand the chance of getting re-infected by other people.

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that as a part of society, we all have an obligation to the society. If all people are healthy then the society is also healthy. A healthy society means that the government does not have to spend a lot on health. All those saved resources could be used to improve the lives of people further.

Government could spend on latest diagnostic machines and on gyms and on educating people as to how they could look after themselves even better.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that we should all look after our health. It does not matter whether it is for ourselves or the society. We are all inextricably linked to the society. If we do something good for ourselves, the society is benefitted and if we do something for society then we are benefitted.

Some people think government should ensure the healthy lifestyle. of people, but others argue that it should be decided by individuals. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

As people are moving towards modernization, they are becoming more and more aware about the benefits of a healthy lifestyle. I believe that the government should hold the responsibility to encourage people to enjoy healthy lifestyle. I shall put forth my arguments to support my views in the following paragraphs.

My first argument is that everyone does not have enough knowledge about health and some gullible people may just follow some advertisements or unreliable consultants who may give them inappropriate guidance. This increase the risk of unhealthy lifestyle and therefore government should formulate policies to guide citizens to establish healthy lifestyles.

Secondly, if government guides about healthy lifestyles, then more and more people would be healthy and this would indirectly make the economy flourish. With healthy body conditions, labourers work more efficiently, elderly suffer lesser diseases and children have better development. As a result, manufactures can produce more, the budget of social insurance can be cut down and healthy young generations will provide stability to the growth of economy.

Last but not least, if the onus of having a healthy lifestyle is left to the individuals, they may not follow it because of lack of time and money. So, the government should provide free gyms, parks and other infrastructure to support a healthy lifestyle, so that people are encouraged to adopt such a lifestyle.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, governments should promote healthy lifestyles both for the benefits of individuals and overall economy.

<u>Aircraft uses more fuel than cars and produces more pollution. Some people suggest the non-</u> <u>essential use of aircraft like international travel should be discouraged. Do you agree or</u> <u>disagree?</u>

It is irrefutable that the fuel consumed by one long-distance flight is consumed by a car in several years' time, and the amount of pollution it produces is also more. Therefore, some people suggest that non-essential flights, including international travel, should be discouraged. I totally disagree whit this statement. I feel that even though cars produce less pollution and use less fuel, still we should focus on limiting the number of cars. Discouraging flights would lead to many other problems.

At a time when people all over the world worry about the decreasing level of fossil fuels and global warming, it is right to take action to save the planet earth. However, to simply discourage flights is not the answer. International tourism has become the backbone of many economies of the world. Many countries are earning from tourism. Many people are employed in this industry. Many businesses like hotels and leisure centres are dependent on tourists. So, if we discourage international tourism, it would create new and even worse problems. Many businesses would go broke and many people would be without jobs.

Air flight also enables intercultural exchanges between countries. The advent of cheap air fare makes it possible for people the world over to travel regularly, regardless of the purpose of the trip. Therefore, people have the opportunities to learn from different cultures and have a better understanding of countries they used to be unfamiliar with. This, in turn, enhances cultural communications between countries.

What we should do is to limit the use of cars. The number of cars is increasing at a very fast pace. This is creating too many problems. Cars are using too much of fossil fuels; they are creating a lot of pollution; they are leading to traffic congestion on the roads and they are also causing accidents.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, traveling by air should not be discouraged. Instead, the use of cars should be limited.

Figures show that some countries have an ever-increasing proportion of the population who are aged 15 or younger. What do you think are the current and future effects of this trend for those countries?

Some demographic surveys have shown that the proportions of young people are rising rapidly. This may be because of any reasons such as illiteracy and poverty or wars or any other reasons. This essay shall delve into the immediate and long term effects of this trend on those countries.

The most important current impact of such a trend would be on the national economy. For instance, goods and services would need to be imported which would lead to an unstable economy. However, the future effect would be different as there would be more people within the country needing employment. Then there might arise the problem of unemployment.

In addition to the effects on economy, there would be social implications also. The government will have to invest a lot on educational institutes as more children need more schools and colleges. In addition more spending on health would also be needed. The long term result would be that the education and health infrastructure would be well developed.

If careful management of such a situation is done by the government, for instance, by providing good education and health facilities, then the future outcomes could be quite positive. The society would be younger and more vibrant. The culture of those countries would be more fast-paced than the traditional culture.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that the culture and lifestyle of these countries would be transformed if the population would be younger. Fresh opportunities and challenges would both be on the way. The trend would cause multiple possible effects and these countries should strengthen the education and health infrastructure to overcome its negative influence.

Teachers used to convey information, but now with wide resources of information, there is no role for teachers to play in modern education. Do you agree or disagree

I disagree with the view that teachers have lost their importance in education because of the wide resources such as the internet. I firmly believe that teachers are as important as before and even more so. In the following paragraphs I shall put forth my arguments to support my views.

It is irrefutable that computer and internet have made possible distance education and on-line education. In this regard, computers are a boon for the handicapped, those living in remote areas and those in job. They can study any time of the day or night because of the internet. This has made education approachable for many who cannot for some reason or the other attend a college or university.

However, I still feel that teachers can never lose their importance. In learning and practice of more complex ideas, the computer is not adequate. It can tell if the answer is right or wrong but it cannot tell where the student went wrong. Tasks involving reasoning cannot be taught using computers. Moreover, teachers add their own knowledge gained through experience to that of books and other resources.

Furthermore, teachers can stimulate interest and it is an undeniable fact that interested stimulated people tend to learn more. They can keep students focussed on study. A student studying by himself may get bored and stop studying. Teachers can provide a faster and simpler way to present information to the students. They can come down to the level of a student and so are definitely better than computers. What is more, teachers are role models for students. They are scholars in action.

They not only teach academic subjects, but also many social skills.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that there is no doubt that modern resources have changed education from a teacher-oriented one to a student-centred one, but teachers will always hold their importance and can never be replaced by any technology.

Some children can learn efficiently by watching TV. Therefore, they should be encouraged to watch TV both at home and at school. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is irrefutable that TV is a very efficient teacher. However, I disagree that children should be motivated to watch TV both at home and at school. I shall put forth my arguments to support my views in the following paragraphs.

There is no doubt that TV can be a powerful mean of delivering information and a nice part of learning process. Being an audiovisual medium more effective result can be achieved. What is seen is retained longer in the minds of children. There are some things which can be very easily taught by visual illustrations. Even boring subjects like history can be made interesting with the help of TV.

However, if TV is to be used as an educational tool then very strict monitoring would be needed as to what children watch on TV. All those talk shows and soap operas we can see every day are a complete waste of time and can even have negative effects by distracting children from their studies. Moreover, the most of so called educational programmes like National Geographic cannot replace books and academic lectures because they tend to entertain people and have not an aim to give deep and concentrated knowledge. It is highly unlikely that TV channel directors would abandon their profits and change talk shows to lectures and video lessons.

Furthermore, if children watch TV in school also then their interaction with the teacher would be limited. Teachers teach a lot of things apart from academics. They can come down to the level of the student and can also stimulate children to learn. What is more, children would read less when they learn everything from TV. Reading is an active activity as compared to TV which is a passive activity. So, it would be detrimental to the holistic development of children.

To put it in a nutshell I pen down saying that, although TV is a very good educational medium, it should be used within limits and whatever children learn from TV should also be carefully monitored by parents and teachers.

Some people think that schools should concentrate on academic classes, because they are helpful for future career. And they think music and sports classes are not useful. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

What young people should study at school has long been the subject of intense debate and this is a question that certainly does not have one correct answer.

We need to provide young people the best possible chance of doing well at school. In traditional curriculum there is a wide variety of subjects with a mix of academic and non-academic subjects. In this way a young person is formed with a rounded education. Non-academic subjects would include sports, cooking, and music. I believe this is the best form of education. A young person should learn things other than academic subjects. Sport is particularly important. Young people have to learn to love sport so that they can be fit and healthy later in life. If not we will be raising an obese and unfit generation.

I totally understand the point of view that education is so important that students must be pushed as hard as possible to achieve their best. It sounds a good idea to only expose the students to academic subjects as then they can spend all of their school hours on studying areas that will get them into university and good jobs later in life. I just feel a more rounded education would produce a better individual. We must remember too that a lot of people, maybe even most people, aren't academically minded and would benefit more from a more vocationally based education. Forcing academic studies onto them would lead to failure and the student leaving school too early.

Therefore I agree that although a wholly academic curriculum would suit and benefit some young people, I believe that for most students non-academic subjects are important inclusions still in today's syllabuses.

Some people think that university students should specialize in one subject, while others think universities should encourage students to learn a range of subjects. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

It is a highly debated issue as to whether students at university should concentrate on one subject or study a multitude of subjects. In this essay I intend to discuss the benefits of both approaches. However, I personally feel that studying a range of subjects is better for university students.

There are many advantages, for students, of studying a number of subjects. The first and foremost advantage is that if they don't get a job in their field they will be able to get any job related to their other subjects. They will not suffer unemployment and they will not be stuck to menial jobs despite being highly qualified.

Moreover, a well rounded education is very important in today's time. Without a diverse background, a graduate will not be competent in any job. For example, excellent communication skills are very important while looking for a job. For that you need a basic English class. Most jobs require problem solving skills which you get from basic knowledge of math and science. For instance, a doctor specializing in MRI scan, needs to have a good knowledge of physics – magnetism etcetera.

Another advantage is that, learning a range of subjects can add spice to the students' studies. Students may be fed up with study when they concentrate on one subject constantly. Finally, it is well known that most of the subjects are linked to each other, to some extent. With a range of knowledge, students can find different

solutions to approach the problems they encounter either at work or in life, which will definitely make them more creative and innovative in the field they specialize in.

Clearly, the students with all-round knowledge have an apparent advantage over those specializing in only one subject.

On the other hand, the only advantage of studying only one subject at university would be that it would make you a master in that field and you stand a chance of getting a high-paid job in that field.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, studying a variety of subjects is beneficial to the university students. In this case, not only can the students better themselves, but also become adaptable and flexible in the increasingly challenging and competitive world. It is advisable that students spend time learning more subjects instead of focusing on one specific subject, so that they can prepare themselves for the global society.

Some people think the cheap air flight gives ordinary people more freedom. However, others think the cheap air flight should be banned because it pollutes the air and brings many other problems. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

In today's world, we are now in a position to enjoy cheaper air flights than in the past. However, there is an argument that they should be banned due to the levels of pollution they generate. Those in favour of cheap air flight say it is advantageous in terms of freedom and the opportunities to learn from other countries. In this essay I shall examine both sides of this issue and finally give my opinion.

Cheap air flight can be beneficial in many ways. One of them is the opportunities to go overseas. Earlier, only the affluent could afford it, but now it is within the pocket of the ordinary man. Some of the discounted tickets are fairly cheap and flying abroad is no longer a dream for many. Moreover, small businesses have prospered because of the ease of travel because of these flights.

In addition to this, cheap air flight enables intercultural exchanges between countries. The advent of cheap air fare makes it possible for people the world over to travel regularly, regardless of the purpose of the trip. Therefore, people have the opportunities to learn from different cultures and have a better understanding of countries they used to be unfamiliar with. This, in turn, enhances cultural communications between countries.

The argument that cheap flight should be banned is also justified to some extent. It is generally known that aeroplanes consume a vast amount of oil and the gas emission generated by an airplane is enormous. If cheap air tickets are not controlled, the environmental impacts would only get worse in the long run. Besides, cheap air tickets at times are extremely disturbing in terms of certain conditions that go along with them. One problem is that the date and time cannot be changed once purchased. As a result, many people find it inconvenient if they are to reschedule due to emergency.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, the issue of cheap air fares is complex and there is no easy solution as both sides have merits. However, I am convinced that giving people the freedom to travel is essential, but at the same time people should be made aware of avoiding un-necessary travel. Banning such flights is not the answer.

Some people think that children should obey rules or do what their parents and teachers want them to do, but others think that children controlled too much cannot deal with problems well by themselves. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Young children are beginners. They have lots to learn and one of the biggest lessons they must learn is how to behave or act in an acceptable manner. So, they need rules. When young children have rules, they know what is expected of them.

However, the extent to which children have to follow rules is a very sensitive issue. In this essay I shall discuss the benefits of imposing rules on children and the negative consequences of having too much restriction.

Firstly, rules of behaviour create responsible and respectful children who in turn mature into respectful adults. They know the value of respect for elders. They know the importance of relationships. They know about their cultural values as well. This forms a stable society which is virtually free from vices such as prostitution and drug abuse. It would be wrong to say that having rules mars the problem solving ability of children. They, in fact, face difficulties in a more mature and disciplined way. They are not lured by peer pressure and refrain from acting on impulse.

However, if too strict rules are imposed on children then they may become rebels. They may start doing just the opposite of what is told them to do. What is more, they may show abnormal behaviour. They may fall into bad company or resort to drugs because of frustration. Finally, imposing too strict rules destroys the individuality of children. They may withdraw into a shell. This may suppress their creativity and as a consequence, they may not be able to deal with problems well by themselves.

What is important is that parents and teachers should learn where rules are needed and where it is necessary to give room to the children. Having absolutely no rules and letting children do whatever they wish to do would also be wrong. They are not mature enough to solve all problems and they have to be taught their limits.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that parents and teachers should impose rules on children but they should know where to draw the line. They should be flexible and modify the rules according to the circumstances.

With technology speeding up, more and more young people begin to use mobile phones and the Internet, but old people have little chance to be exposed to them. What ways could mobile phone and the Internet be useful to old people? How can old people be encouraged to use this new technology?

It is irrefutable that the young generation today are technophiles and are very comfortable with mobile phones and internet whereas the elderly are uneasy with the latest technological devices. This essay shall delve into how the mobile phone and internet could be useful for the senior citizens and ways to encourage them to use such technology.

Mobile phones and internet could be beneficial to old people in various ways. To begin with, we all know that a major problem the elderly face is of social isolation. Nuclear families predominate these days and even in nuclear families, children have to leave their parents to seek greener pastures abroad. Through mobile phones the elderly can connect with their kith and kin who live far away from them. For example, through the internet, they can chat with their grandchildren and also see them through web camera.

Furthermore, the elderly face a lot of health problems. Through mobile phone they can any time call the ambulance or their relatives and get timely medical help. Through the internet they can get consultation of any doctor in any part of the world by showing their digital x-ray or MRI scan. Another advantage of such technology to the elderly is that they can entertain themselves through these gadgets. They have a lot of free time and they can listen to religious hymns, visit sacred and holy places on the net which they can't otherwise visit because of failing health. They can also do net-banking, online shopping and also book their rail tickets and air tickets online.

There are a lot of ways to motivate the elderly to use these equipments. Firstly, they can be made aware of the various ways such things can help them. The government and NGOs can open free training centres to appraise them with this technology.

Grandchildren can teach their grandparents about these gadgets. Too many features on mobile phones deter the elderly from using them. So, user-friendly models could be made especially for them. Finally, these gadgets could be made available to the elderly at subsidized rates.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that there is an unending list of how mobile phones and internet could help the elderly but a little effort is required to make them technosavvy.

Some people think students should learn more practical courses like computer, but others think they should learn more about theoretical courses like geography and mathematics. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

The debate on whether theoretical subjects are more important or practical are more important has been raging for ages. Some individuals are of the opinion that pupils should be taught more practical courses like computers but others hold the view that theoretical subjects are more important. In this essay I intend to discuss both views and finally give my opinion.

Those in favour of theoretical courses say that to be practically successful we need to have a strong and solid theoretical foundation. Though practicality counts but it is like half knowledge if no theoretical knowledge is gained. Moreover, theory provides powerful tools to deal with the world around us and the body within ourselves. For example, medical theories help us combat diseases, economic theories explain inflation and unemployment, gravity theory explains the presence of planets. Even marketing which was once thought to be purely practical is based on statistical data which require maths knowledge.

Those who advocate practical courses say so because today is the era of computers and technology. They feel that such subjects have more job opportunities. What they don't take into consideration is that as far as the basic knowledge of such subjects is there it is all practical, but if you have to go into computer programming, you need to have your mathematical concepts clear.

In my opinion, both practical and theoretical subjects go hand in hand and each has their own significance. Theory and practical are interrelated. Theory is the basis of all practical knowledge. For example a person becomes a doctor in five and a half years, which has four and a half theory plus one year practical. So, for the overall development of the students a mix of all subjects should be there.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, both theory and practical subjects have their own importance. Both should be incorporated in the school curricula.

Some people support development of agriculture, like factory farming and scientific creation of fruits and vegetables, while others oppose. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

Yesterday's fiction is today's reality. Such colossal developments have taken place in agriculture which we could not even think of earlier. It is a highly debated issue as to whether the growth of this industry is a blessing or a curse. This essay shall delve into the merits and demerits of these developments.

On the positive side, farmers now have a wide range of selection, in terms of seeding, irrigation and use of pesticides and fertilizers. Secondly, technology has saved people from tedious work and in the mean time increased the production markedly. All this is needed to meet the demands of the burgeoning population.

Furthermore, genetic modification of foods has given us such species which need little or no insecticides and no fertilizers. The quality of food has also improved. For example, fish gene has been added to tomato to make it frost resistant. A nut protein has been added to soya bean to increase the protein content. Finally, factory farming, in which animals are fed nicely so as to increase their meat, is also the need of the hour.

On the downside, such technology has reduced the need for manpower and many people are now jobless. Moreover, factory farming is considered inhuman. Animals are tightly packed in cramped spaces and this may lead to many diseases. Genetic modification is also considered unnatural and as it is relatively new, people are also concerned about its long term harmful effects. Last but not least, the rich countries can use this technology and further increase the gap between the rich and the poor.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that as every garden has weeds, such developments have their pros and cons. We should know where to draw the line and take maximum advantage of this technology minimizing its harmful effects.

Some people think that in the modern society individuals are becoming more dependent on each other while others say that individuals are becoming more independent of each other. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Whether we are dependent or independent of each other is difficult to say. In some cases, we heavily rely on others but in others, we are quite self-sufficient. In this essay I intend to delve into both views and finally give my opinion.

There are times when we are dependent on others. When we are little, we are cared by our parents otherwise we would have no access to food, shelter, and clothing. At the same time, we are emotionally important to them, so they always remember they are responsible for raising us up. When we are grown up, we start to learn at schools, and then it is the teachers on whom we rely heavily. When we are employed, we need to work closely with our colleagues and our employers also depend on our productivity.

We are also independent of each other in many ways. We don't need to go to the banks. We can do net-banking sitting at home. We can do online shopping. We don't need to go and depend on salesmen. We can entertain ourselves alone by computer games and internet. We can even study at home through online education and distant education. We are not dependent on teachers for imparting education. We can book railway and air tickets online and are not dependent on booking clerks. We can eat ready to eat food available in the market. We are not dependent on somebody in our home to cook for us.

Whatever arguments we put forth in support of both views, the fact cannot be denied that man is a social animal and will always be dependent on others. This dependence may be direct or indirect. When we are seemingly independent, we are still dependent on people behind the technology. For example, when we do net banking we depend on all those software developers who have made it possible for us. When we eat ready to eat food we depend on those who cook and pack that food.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that we are all part of a society and it is not possible for us not to depend on others. This dependence, however, may be visible or invisible.

Some people think the main benefit of international cooperation is in protection of the environment, while others think that the main benefit is in the world business. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

Today we do not belong to a big planet Earth. We are part of a global village. This has lead to a greater need for international cooperation in many crucial issues such as poverty, starvation, environmental protection, terrorism and global warming. Some individuals are of the opinion that the main benefit of global cooperation has been in protection of the environment, but others hold the view that the main benefit is in international trade. In this essay I intend to delve into both views and finally give my opinion.

International cooperation does contribute a lot in environmental protection. First of all many governments have realized that it is a grave issue and have taken steps to aware the masses of the simple steps they can take to save the environment. Then, the Kyoto agreement was signed by many countries in the United Nations Charter that they would not set up any industry which would emit more than 5.2% carbon dioxide.

The role international cooperation in world business is self evident. Today, we can buy any foreign brand like Reebok and Nike in our country and our Indian brands like Videocon have touched the international market. This has brought the economy of developing countries quite close to the developed ones.

In my opinion, although a lot has been done in both areas, a lot more needs to be done in the field of environment. The steps already taken are not enough and the governments need to tackle this issue on a war-footing. The rate at which global warming is occurring will transform the whole Earth into a boiling pot one day and leave it un-inhabitable.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, international co-operation has benefited the world business much more than the environment.

The government should encourage industries and business to move out of big cities and into regional areas. To what extent do you think the advantages outweigh disadvantages?

These days with increasing urban populations, there are major problems with congestion and not only the price, but also availability of accommodation in large cities of the world. It seems that one possible solution could be to relocate large companies and factories as well as their respective employees out of these urban areas and into more rural ones. In my opinion, I strongly agree that this would have a desired effect in making cities more livable.

To begin with, the traffic problem in cities doesn't only exist from commuting employees, but also the general public travelling around the city. While this may be a fact, if the number of worker's vehicles is reduced on city streets, a large percentage of traffic will obviously decline in rush hours. For example, peak hour traffic is undoubtedly made up largely of staff from companies going to and from home.

Secondly, in regards to housing problems, populations will always continue to grow in cities and therefore inadvertently decrease the number of cheap and available apartments. This is certainly obvious, however, a large proportion of these apartments are occupied by employees from large firms and their families. If this workforce is relocated to housing estates in the country, city apartment blocks will fall in price and certainly increase in availability.

In conclusion, by relocating workers to rural areas to work and reside, heavy traffic conditions and lack of adequate accommodation in city centres will obviously change for the better. As far as I'm concerned, I agree that the government should enforce such a law in order to increase our standard of living in our hectic city life.

Our cities are becoming more and more overcrowded. In order to stop this overcrowding, we need to move large companies and their employees, out of these crowded city areas. How far do you agree or disagree with this?(Scots)

In the city many people expect to find better employment opportunities often with bigger, secure companies It is true that the world's largest companies are located in large cities. As cities become overcrowded some have suggested that the larger companies move out of the city and relocate to more remote areas. While this is a good idea, in practice it is not possible.

Moving thousands of employees from large companies out to remote areas would have a positive impact on the overcrowding of some cities. There would be less traffic, less people in the city centre, and this would obviously be highly desirable. In addition, there would be less strain on the services offered by the city – banks, public transportation, restaurants and the like. This would mean a reduction in queues and faster customer service.

The problem however would be that a dramatic reduction in numbers of people in the cities would mean that many businesses would go broke. Restaurants, cafes and other service areas would suffer tremendously. What would happen is that overcrowding would occur where the new, large organisations relocated. More and more people offering services would spring up - restaurants, shopping centres and other businesses would be needed to service the increasingly larger numbers of people who moved to the area. In addition, could a remote, country town supply the enormous quantities of housing, electricity and raw materials required to run a huge company? I think not.

Certainly relocating the employees of huge companies would assist with the

overcrowding problem in some cities. However, a new set of problems would surface. The idea of moving larger corporations out to remote areas sounds good in theory but would fail in practice.

Some people think that media should not report detail of crimes to the public. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Nowadays, we are surrounded by a variety of media like the Internet, newspaper and TV, which are very informative, connecting us to the whole world. It is a highly debatable issue whether media should report smallest details of crime to the masses or not. I feel that the media should be very judicious in selecting what to report and how much to report. So, I agree with the statement. In this essay, I intend to support my views with my arguments.

As I see it, the news outlets should pay more attention to the affairs themselves, rather than the details of the crimes. To start with, the details of crimes make a misleading statement to the children and adolescents who are curious about the process of committing crimes, and are likely to copy the criminal actions blindly. Moreover, the excessive violence and pornographic contents can also raise the adults' criminal tendencies. In the other words, detailed crime news can generate individuals' potential desire to commit a crime, thus induce many social problems.

Moreover, the detailed report of a crime does not show enough respects to the victims and their family. For example, if any murder or robbery has taken place in someone's house then if it is shown in detail on TV, the whole privacy of those people is lost. Another very strong argument in favour of censorship of media is that sometimes this detailed description can help the criminals also. For instance, when terrorists attacked Hotel Taj in Mumbai, the media reported details of the commandos' position on TV. This was also viewed by the terrorists hiding in the hotel. They changed their positions accordingly.

However, the opponents claim that we have a right to know every detail and so media should report every detail. I still feel that it would lead to more problems. I think the media has an obligation to show the right direction to the public. It should report news in a balanced manner rather than high-lighting the details of the crime.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that although it is the duty of the media to keep us informed, the details of crime should not be shown.

International travel makes people prejudiced rather than broad-minded. What are its causes and what measures can be taken to solve this problem?

It is irrefutable that international tourism has taken mammoth dimensions. Unfortunately, sometimes, international tourism creates tension rather than understanding between people from different cultures. In this essay I intend to delve into the causes of this situation and suggest some ways forward.

The most important reason why some are opposed to international tourism is that tourists may unknowingly show disrespect for local culture. For instance, we generally cover our heads in a religious place. A tourist may not do so or take his shoes inside a temple. This may offend the local people. Sometimes, youngsters may be attracted towards the western culture which the tourists bring with them and many may find this as a threat to the local culture.

Moreover, the tourist dollar may not be helping the local people. We all know that tourists stay in five star hotels and enjoy the best facilities. They may be taking two showers a day where as the local people may not have enough water to drink. This has been the case in Shimla which is a very popular hill station in Himachal Pradesh India. On top of that when tourists buy souvenirs from local artisans, they bargain a lot. The poor artisans, who look up to tourists for their livelihood, end up earning the bare minimum. Finally, tourism creates pollution, which helps nobody. We are all suffering the consequences of global warming.

The solutions are not simple. We cannot discourage tourism. It is the backbone of many economies of the world. First of all, the tour operators should take the onus of guiding the tourists about the main things of local culture. Secondly, the tourists should stay with locals as paying guests. This would be a win-win situation for both. Local people would earn and the tourist would taste the local culture. Finally, ecotourism should be promoted. For example, if an elephant ride is possible, the tourist should avoid using car. After all a good tourist is one – who takes away nothing but photographs and leaves behind nothing but footprints.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, international tourism does have a downside to it but many steps can be taken to lessen the negative effects.

Once children start school, teachers have more influences on their intellectual and social development than parents. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

I definitely agree with the statement that once children get admission in school, teachers have more impact on them than even their parents. In the following paragraphs, I intend to put forth my arguments in support of my view.

To begin with, children spend quality time with teachers. Although they spend more time with parents at home but this time is not as productive as the small amount of time spent with teachers. We all know that parents are busy with their work most of the time and even if children are around, they hardly pay any attention to them.

Teachers, on the other hand are in school for the students. All the time they are either teaching the students or guiding them in extra-curricular activities. They keep children focussed on study and as a result have more intellectual impact on them.

What is more, teachers are role models for students. They are scholars in action. They not only influence intellectually but socially. Students inadvertently follow their teachers' behaviour too. They observe how the teacher walks, talks and tackles difficult situations. At home they have parents to guide them socially, but it is seen that in nuclear families, parents hardly find time for this. Whatever social skills children learn are from TV or other activities they do at home.

Teachers also guide students for their future careers. Students follow teachers more than parents because they feel that teachers are more aware of the world around them and they have better capability of guiding them. So, they depend on teachers more than parents.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, once the schooling starts, teachers and parents both have influence but teachers influence children more.

Many people think it is important to protect the environment, but they make no effort on it themselves. Why is it and what is your opinion?

It is irrefutable that environmental damage is occurring at a very fast pace and people know that it is a global priority today to save the environment. However, when it comes to doing something, no one steps forward. In this essay I intend to delve into the causes of this phenomenon and suggest simple measures which can be taken at the individual level.

There are many reasons behind the indifferent attitude of people. The main reason is that we people don't know that we are also the cause of environmental damage. We don't realise that global warming is the result of billions of decisions. We are cutting down trees for our needs; we are using too many luxuries in the home; we are driving too many cars and we are wasting resources like fresh water. If only awareness is brought about these things then many people would take a step forward in this direction.

People are also not doing anything because they think that it is a global problem and only government action can solve it. What has to be made clear is that small measure taken at the individual level will take mammoth dimensions when mounted up. For example, in a country like India with a population of more than one billion, if each person plants a tree and nurtures it for the first few months, the result would be un-imaginable. We can all take simple steps like recycling things such as newspapers, plastics and glass. We could also walk for short distances instead of using our vehicles and for long distances we could use the public transport.

Another reason why people do little about the environment is that people have become very busy in their pursuit of wealth and fame that they have no time to think about the environment. What they don't realise that if nothing is done today, it might be too late tomorrow. The rate at which global warming is occurring would soon transform the Earth into a boiling pot and it would be un-inhabitable for us one day.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that the onus of saving the environment is not just on the shoulders of the governments and big industries. We all must come forward and do our bit to save the environment before it is too late. It has rightly been said —little drops of water, little grains of sand, make the mighty ocean and the vast land

Some people think that criminals should not be imprisoned. Instead, education and job training should replace the former to deal with criminals. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

There are many different opinions on the best way to reduce crime. The traditional solution is to punish the criminals by putting them in prison. Some hold the view that education and job training are the long term solutions to cut crime. In my opinion, prison is the only answer in a few situations, but in most cases education, vocational training and rehabilitation are better.

Prison is the only answer in case of criminals who are a risk to the society, such as murderers. They cannot be made to mix with society. Some people also say that people would not be afraid of doing crime if fear of imprisonment is not there. But I still feel that in majority of cases, we can do without prisons.

In traditional prisons, people learn a lot about crime and so when they leave prison they will commit even more crime. In other words prisons act as universities of crime. So for petty offenders like shop-lifters and pick-pockets should be given some vocational training and education. It is a well not fact that the basic causes of crime are poverty, illiteracy and unemployment. So, if we provide education and job training then we would be removing the causes of crime. If criminals are rehabilitated by some form of employment then they would certainly not re-offend.

Furthermore, the prisons are expensive to maintain. The government can spend that money on other important matters such as education and healthcare. This would ease some burden from the government's shoulders. The petty and minor criminals can also be employed in some community service projects after providing education and vocational training.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that we should hate the crime and not the criminal. To fight crime we should focus on the causes of crime. Education and job training help to rehabilitate the criminals. So, people who commit less serious crimes should not be sent to prison. Focus should be on reforming them.

Poor students or students who come from rural areas often find it is difficult to get access to the university education, so some people think universities should make it easier for them to study at. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

I agree with the statement that universities should take a step forward and provide access to education to those from rural backgrounds and those who cannot afford it. In the following paragraphs I intend to discuss why this needs to be done and suggest ways how universities can help.

The main reason why universities should help the disadvantaged sections of the society is that this would help to bridge the gap between the rich and the poor. It is a well known fact that higher education raises the level of people both socially and economically. The students of rural backgrounds may not be able to compete with their urban counterparts for entrance to universities. Competition is very stiff nowadays and cut-off rates for engineering, medical and commerce courses is very high.

Another well known fact is that university education is very expensive and is out of the reach of many. Many students from poor backgrounds do not get tertiary education for want of money and so join some job after secondary school. This is very detrimental for their future because they remain at the same level of earning for their whole lives and so cannot progress in life. Even their future generations remain underprivileged.

Universities can help in many ways. They can introduce a rural quota which can help the deserving rural students. Funding can be provided to poor deserving students. Interest free loans which can be returned after the completion of education can be provided to the students. Many leading universities are already doing all that for the needy students. Universities can also provide online and distance education courses at very nominal fees to such students.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that universities should help the poor and rural students because it will reduce inequality among the people and raise the level of the nation as a whole.

Society is based on rules and laws. If individuals were free to do whatever they want to do, it could not function. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Governments have the responsibility of ensuring the safety of their citizens by imposing certain rules and laws. Although it may restrict their freedom to a certain extent, there would be utter chaos in society in the absence of these laws.

Rules and regulations cause minor inconveniences to people but they also ensure the safety of individuals and society. It is a reality that hundreds of accidents are caused due to drunken driving. Since there are many rules against driving under the influence of alcohol, many accidents that could cause great damage to human life and property, are avoided. Those who believe that such rules interfere with their freedom pay with their own lives and that of others. The conclusion one can draw from these experiences is that people should tolerate certain inconveniences, in order to protect their lives from possible dangers.

Littering and spitting in public places is considered a serious offence in Singapore, which is dealt with serious fines. People in countries like India, that do not have such strict rules on public hygiene may not realise the value of such a regulation but this has made Singapore one of the most beautiful and cleanest countries in the world.

When people learn the benefits of certain restrictions, they would begin to appreciate such constraints on their freedom.

However, in certain case, we may find that some rules are unnecessary and ineffective. These are only rare instances and citizens have the right to raise objections against them. Any sensible government would revoke such rules and regulations if it finds them unproductive.

In general, the rules that we have are not too many but essential for the smooth functioning of any civil society. The absence of such controls would lead to chaos and confusion in public life.

Many people use distance-learning programs to study at home, but some people think that it cannot bring the benefit as much as attending college or university. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is undeniable that the distance learning mode is very useful, especially for those living in remote areas, for those who are physically challenged and for those who want to do a job while studying. However, there are many advantages in actually attending a University, which would not accrue to a person who prefers to learn through the mode of distance education. Let us see how going to a University scores over the distance-mode.

In the very first place, going to a University provides the opportunity of face-to-face interaction with the teachers. This is extremely helpful for gaining a quick grasp of a subject, especially if it is being approached for the first time. Classroom lectures are more educative and enlightening than mere reading of written courseware due to the direct interaction between the students and the teachers. The student not only masters the contents of the prescribed lessons, but also gains a deeper insight into the subject as the teacher elucidates from his own experiences. If there are any doubts in the mind of the student, the teacher can readily offer the necessary clarifications. If he has not been able to fully comprehend any particular aspect of the lesson, he can request that it be explained to him again. Each student can also learn from the clarifications provided by the teacher in response to the doubts or questions. of some other student. Students can also help each other through the exchange of ideas and information, after the class hours. Studying and working together in a group also increases the level of inspiration and quest for achievement.

Secondly, one learns in a more disciplined atmosphere. One has to attend the classes regularly and in time. This results in a more focused and systematic study. This leads to better preparation for the examinations and consequently better results. Also, one can easily access reference books and other valuable reading material from the University Library.

Apart from the academic curriculum, the student also gains by useful participation in other extra-curricular activities like sports, competitions, contests and the like. This enhanced level of participation in the activities of the university helps him to broaden his skills, and derive better emotional satisfaction. It also increases his scope of acquaintances leading to better interaction at the social and academic levels. All this helps in the sharpening of his communication skills and the overall development of his personality. He acquires more self-confidence and poise. He develops better team spirit and learns the art of working with others in a group. His perspectives on life become broader and the horizon of his thinking much wider.

Another great advantage that accrues to the university student is that of campus placement opportunities. Many reputed companies approach the good universities with offers of campus placements for their students. This is a great boon for the students, as they have the ready opportunity of direct interaction with the company managements or their recruiting agents. They are thus saved from the uncertainty and hassles of a later job hunt. Thus, a university education is certainly packed with several privileges.

Some people think that economic progress is the only way to measure a country's success, while others think that there are other factors which can be used to measure a country's success. What are these factors? And among them, which one is more important than others?

It is irrefutable that economic progress is one yardstick of determining a country's success, but there is a range of other non economic factors such as availability of nutrition, primary health care and literacy rate which can be used to judge the well being of a nation. This essay shall delve into all such factors and also pick out the most significant one.

Economic progress or, in other words, the GDP has traditionally been the benchmark for determining the growth of a country. The true measure of success, however, is to determine how much of this economic growth is reaching the weakest sections of the society. A successful measure of development should represent the life of an average person in a country. It should measure the quality of life of all citizens.

One important factor is the Primary Health Care. If people receive good healthcare at the primary level, they are happier. Their productivity of work increases and they lead a comfortable life. Another factor is the literacy rate. For example, a country like Cuba has low GDP but less than 1% of its population is illiterate. As a consequence there is less crime and hence people enjoy a peaceful existence.

Furthermore, the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) is also an index of mapping the success. For instance, Costa Rica has a low GDP, but its people are considered to be the happiest in the world. This is perhaps because it ranks 5<sup>th</sup> in the world in the EPI.

To put in a nutshell, I pen down saying that Literacy Rate is the most important factor to measure the success of a nation. GDP is just a mathematical value and does not take into consideration many of the factors that affect a person's well-being and thus a nation's well being.

More and more people work at home and study at home with the development of computer technology. Do you think it is a positive or negative development?

It is true that the Internet has become an important part of modern life. Telecommuting, which means working from home with the help of telephone lines, and, online and distance education have become very common. This situation has both, advantages as well as disadvantages.

The most important benefit is that it saves time and money of employees and students. They don't need to waste time going and coming from work or college. They save on the fare also. What is more, they can set their own timetable of work and study. On top of that, people find more time for their hobbies and family commitments. This situation also benefits the physically challenged and those living in remote areas. You can get online education from any university in any part of the world and you can work for any office in any corner of the world. So, technology has given birth to many opportunities for many people for whom none existed earlier. In this sense it is narrowing the bridge between the rich and the poor.

Another big advantage is to the environment. As less people have to move out of their homes, less petrol and diesel is used and less pollution is caused. Traffic congestion, which is a big problem in the cities, is also lessened. We all know that at peak hours, traffic moves at a snail's pace because of which people are forced to slow down the tempo of life even in this fast-paced world.

On the negative side, there is a decrease in face to face communication which is isolating us socially. Working alone from home can be very boring at times. When you are in a proper office, there is a work atmosphere which keeps you going. Moreover, I do not think it is possible for a computer to be as effective as a real teacher. Many jobs and subjects involve physical action. For example, it would not be possible to study dance or drama without contact with others. If everybody worked and studied from home, imagine how unhealthy and lazy they would become.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that technology has eased our life in many ways and this is both a negative as well as a positive development but on the whole the positive side outweighs the negative side.

International travel is becoming cheaper than before, so more and more countries open their doors to tourists. Do the advantages of the increased tourism outweigh the disadvantages?

It is irrefutable that international tourism has taken mammoth dimensions. In fact it has become the backbone of many economies of the world. This situation has both pros and cons. In my opinion, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

International tourism can have many benefits for individuals. The most important benefit is that tourism provides regular employment for many local people who might otherwise be unemployed. They can find work in restaurants or hotels, or with tourist agencies as guides or drivers, for example, and earn regular wages. This, in turn, means that they may be able to save money and improve their standard of living.

The second reason is that tourists spend money in the country and this allows local businesses such as restaurants, bars and taxi companies to flourish. In turn, other businesses, food suppliers or petrol stations, for instance, may be established in order to provide services to support the companies which cater for tourists. In other words, the whole economy of the region develops.

A third reason is that in order for tourists to be able to visit remote areas, roads, airports and hotels have to be built and local people also benefit by being able to use these new facilities. Furthermore, when communications improve, it becomes possible for other industries to move into the area, bringing with them more employment opportunities and increased prosperity. A final reason why I am in favour of tourism is that visitors from outside bring fresh ideas and different ways of doing things to the local community. Consequently, local people may learn from tourists. Likewise, visitors learn about the local people and culture, and return home with a deeper understanding of the host country.

On the other hand, that there are some problems associated with international tourism. Firstly, there is the increasing crime rate. Some locals see tourists as easy prey because, not only are they in unfamiliar territory and therefore less able to take care of themselves, but also they carry visible items of wealth, such as cameras and jewellery which can be disposed of quickly for a profit. Another major problem is health. With greater mobility comes greater danger of spreading contagious diseases around the world. Also to be considered is the natural environment, which can be seriously threatened by too many visitors. Australia's Great Barrier Reef, for example, is in danger of being destroyed by tourists and there are plans to restrict visitors to some of the more delicate coral reefs.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that international tourism has both advantages and disadvantages. However, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

Because of the global economy, many goods including what we use as daily basic produced by other counties have to be transported for a long distance. To what extent do the advantages outweigh the disadvantages?

Globalization has revolutionized our world in many aspects. Now, we don't belong to a big planet Earth. We belong to a small global village. Everything is available everywhere. There are many advantages and disadvantages of transporting goods over a long distance. In my opinion, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

On the positive side, transporting goods over a long distance gives us a lot of choices. We can taste a variety of fruits and vegetables from all parts of the world. For example, about ten years ago, we hardly saw kiwi fruit which is from New Zealand. But, now it has a place on every fruit stand. Earlier, we had very few shoe brands like Bata and Carona but now the market is flooded with Reeboks, Nike, Adidas and other foreign brands.

Secondly, many people get employment in this field. Small businesses have a chance to expand globally and it increases the overall economy of the country. Finally, it helps in developing good relations between countries which helps in international co-operation and peace. If countries are dependent upon one another's economic success then armed conflict would be less likely.

On the downside, importing goods can have a negative effect on local culture. This can be seen in countries such as Japan where imported food has become more popular than traditional, local produce, eroding people's understanding of their own food traditions. A second major disadvantage is pollution. When goods are transported thousands of miles by road, sea and air, it increases pollution from exhaust fumes.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, importing goods has both merits and demerits but the pros outweigh the cons.

<u>Memorization of information by frequent repetition, namely rote learning, plays a role in</u> <u>many education systems. To what extent do the advantages outweigh the disadvantages?</u>

There are different methods of learning. Two such methods are \_rote learning' and \_meaningful learning'. Both have their own pros and cons.

There are many advantages of rote learning. To begin with, it is very helpful where quick memorization is required, such as learning one line in a play or memorizing a telephone number. It is also needed where verbatim recall of definitions or numbers is required. We all know that we need to remember phone numbers, mathematical formulae and definitions as such. If we don't cram them then we will not be able to reproduce them when needed and if any small part is changed then the whole thing goes wrong. Rote learning is the only way to learn certain things like irregular verbs and the vocabulary of a foreign language. There is no logic behind irregular verbs and so we need to memorize them by heart. Finally, rote learning is used by many students to pass exams.

On the other hand, there are some disadvantages of rote learning. Firstly, the knowledge acquired by rote is not retained for long. If a person does not repeat information learnt by rote for few days then the whole thing can be forgotten. Moreover, information learned by rote cannot be applied in a wide variety of new problems or concepts. For example, if we learn something by rote in math then we cannot apply it in other subjects like physics. In meaningful learning the transferability of knowledge is high. Finally, it can be very boring to learn everything by rote.

Definitely, rote learning should not be the only method of learning. Meaningful learning is a must if we want to progress in life and apply our skills in varied fields. However, rote learning has its own importance in some situations. So, the education systems should incorporate both rote and meaningful learning.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, rather than viewing rote learning as something opposed to understanding, it can be viewed in a complementary role. As the left hand is to the right, so is memory to understanding and reason.

Now, a lot of charities and organisations have to publicize their activities by setting up a number of days to name the special day like National Children's day and National non smoking day. Why do they do so? What are the effects?

Charities and organisations are formed to help the needy sections of society. Generally they are NPOs or non-profit organisations. Nowadays it has been seen that they set up a number of days like \_Mother's Day' and \_No Smoking Day'. In this essay I shall discuss the causes and effects of this phenomenon.

The main reason why these NPOs do so is to raise funds for their working. This is very essential because for every activity they do to help others, they need money and other resources. When they publicise their activities, they get people's attention and so people contribute whole-heartedly. Sometimes, in times of calamities, they need a lot of funds and manual help. They need voluntary workers. For example, recently in Ladakh, a cloud-burst caused havoc. So many people lost their lives and there was so much damage of property. The Rotary Club and Jaycee Club of my hometown sent many volunteers to help. The government alone cannot be at all places. Because of such organisations people get timely help and a lot of burden is eased from the government's shoulders.

When these organisations name special days, it brings people together. With more activities opened and more days named, more and more people will focus their attention and will put their time and energy and will realise the importance of doing for others. As a consequence, community spirit increases in society. As it is nowadays, people are getting self-centred and alienated from each other. So, such days are the need of the day.

Such days keep our youth in touch with our culture and traditions. With the exposure to global culture, youth today are forgetting their traditions. To establish some days may help the young people understand the importance of such events. Such days also increase awareness of offering help selflessly. Hence, some virtuous habit may pass from one generation to the other. Finally, such days deter people from bad habits. For e.g. on National No Smoking Day, people are made aware about the harmful effects of smoking.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, charities and NPOs publicise their activities because they need funds and they name certain days so that people come together and celebrate and realize the importance of their culture and tradition

<u>Rich countries often give financial aid to poor countries, but it does not solve the</u> poverty, so rich countries should give other types of help to the poor countries rather than the financial aid. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Even though technology is developing at a fast pace and the standard of living of most individuals has gone up, billions of people still live in poverty, and in many places, the rich countries give financial aid to developing and under- developed countries. Some people consider it good. However, I beg to differ. I believe that the developed countries should give some other types of help to the poor countries and not direct financial aid.

My first argument against financial aid is that this aid may not actually reach those for whom it is meant. It may go into corrupt pockets. Secondly, it would make those people lazy as they would be getting aid without doing any work. Thirdly, the aid may be used for wrong purposes. For example, the aid may be given for development projects but it may be used to promote terrorism. Finally, if aid is given without proper research, then it may be used for projects which are not the priority of the people. For instance, the people may need health and educational institutes, whereas the aid may be used for making dams or expanding roadways.

The best way to help poor countries would be open good educational institutes, good health centres and creating job opportunities for people of the poor countries. It has been wisely said by someone that - Give a man fish to eat, and you feed him for a day. Teach a man how to fish, and you feed him for a lifetime. If people of the poor countries start earning well their standard would definitely become better and the whole country would become richer.

If rich countries open factories and multinational companies in poor countries it would be a win-win situation for both, as the poor would get employment and the rich would have to pay much lesser than they would have to pay in their country. So, more and more rich countries would step forward to help the poor. Direct financial aid would not bring such a situation.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, financial aid is not the best way to help poor countries. From my own perspective, the developed countries ought to assist the impoverished countries through other approaches.

Some people think music plays an important role in society. Others think it is it is simply a form of entertainment. Discuss both sides of this argument and give your own opinion.

Music is a unique language which is understood by everyone on this planet. It is the soul of the universe. There are different views as to the importance of music. Some say it is purely for entertainment. Others opine that it has many other functions. In the following paragraphs, I shall put forth both sides of the argument.

There is no doubt that music is a good source of entertainment. Music helps to cheer everyone up. When people come home after a hectic days work and they need some entertainment, they play music and it calms them and they feel relaxed. Music is also played in parties and ceremonies to entertain everyone. Young people dance to the beat of music and release their pent up energy.

Music also links us to our culture and tradition. The folk songs sung by our great artists like Gurdas Mann are on everyone's lips. His lyrics contain many things of our culture which are alive today because of these folk songs. Otherwise, under the influence of western culture people are forgetting their roots. Moreover, music is a lucrative profession these days. Our famous singers and musicians like Lata Mangeshkar and A.R.Rehman have earned millions from music and are famous in the whole world because of their musical talent.

Another role that music plays is of connecting people. When people go to a musical concert, they are with those people who share their musical tastes. Together, they feel the emotions that the music evokes. Music has always been a part of ceremonies because it has the ability to make people feel connected. To add to it, music improves concentration. Students can concentrate better if light music is played in the background because it kills the other disturbing noises.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that music is not just for entertainment. It has many roles in society such as connecting people to each other and to their culture, making them rich and famous and also relaxing them. Music is all around us. Right from the first lullaby that the mother sings to the cradle, to the dirge of the funeral pyre, music accompanies everything of life.

Development in technology causes environmental problems. Some people believe the solution in these problems is everyone accepts a simpler way of life, while others say that technology can solve these problems. Discuss both view and give your own opinion.

It is irrefutable that progress in technology leads to environmental problems. Some individuals are of the opinion that if people live a simple life and do not use the things that technology has brought us then these problems can be solved whereas others opine that only technology can solve these problems. In the following paragraphs, I intend to discuss both viewpoints.

Some people say that if humans stop using technology and lead a simple way of life then only we can save the environment. They argue that it is the luxuries people use which damages the environment. If people don't use air conditioners, automobiles and other such things that technology has brought us, then naturally there would be less pollution and natural resources like fossil fuels would be saved and all this would save the environment.

On the other hand there are people who say that technology alone could save the environment. They opine that now we have come so far ahead in technology that there is no going back. We cannot ask the people of the jet age to go back to the age of the bullock cart.

There are a lot of advances going on technology which are helping the environment a lot. One prime example is finding solutions to water problems in developing countries such as Africa. By pressurizing sea water to produce vapour jets and filtering them through carbon nano tubes, we can get clean drinking water from sea water – an almost inexhaustible resource. Furthermore, Japan is working to build a working space solar power system by 2030. By drawing on the colossal energy of the sun, it could meet the entire world's electricity requirements indefinitely without nuclear or GHG emissions. If successful, the impact on the world would be monumental. It would mean energy for schools, hospitals, and homes. It would mean another industrial revolution.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, technology alone can solve the world's environmental problems. We are finally entering an era where engineering and technology are making the world a better place. It would be highly unpractical to ask people to adopt a simpler way of life.

Rich countries should not employ skilled labour from poor countries, as poor countries need the workers more. Do you agree or disagree?

Rich countries depend heavily on cheap imported labour to increase their profit margin. This demand for outsourcing increased further during recession faces by USA. Although poor countries may need their skilled workers to help them develop as a nation, it is felt that overall greater benefit is seen when their skilled workers are employed by rich countries. This essay shall analyze how the employment of cheap foreign labour helps the developing countries also by giving them chances for skill development and economical growth.

Firstly, when developed countries outsource work, requiring skilled labour to developing countries, a demand is created in those poor countries which leads to the development of higher education in those poorer nations. For example, in the late twentieth century India saw a huge influx of software development work from the United States and this corresponded positively with an equal growth in the Indian tech-related education sector. This example shows that if developing countries make their skilled labour available for hire to the world, they also develop their internal infrastructure such as good educational institutes. Thus, developing countries are also benefited when an openness to foreign employment is embraced.

In addition to this, the economies of developing countries are given new avenues in which to grow when a working partnership with developed countries is established. Again, take the relationship between the United States and India as an example. Currently, English-speaking receptionists in India handle telephone support for many different American products. These employment options encourage more and more Indians to study English, which in turn creates all sorts of new opportunities for business relationships between the two countries. Thus, the idea that poor countries should close their doors to foreign interest in their skilled labour is not supported.

It has also been seen that workers from poor countries earn more from rich countries than they would from employment within their country. Most of them invest that money in their own country and this improves the overall economy of the poor countries.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that poorer countries are in most cases bettered by making their skilled labour available to developed countries. This trend is in no way detrimental to their own development.

Some think that these environmental problems are too big for individuals to be solved, while others think that individuals cannot solve these environmental problems unless governments make some action. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

It is true that our small individual actions often seem insignificant compared to the scale and complexity of global environmental problems such as pollution, deforestation and depletion of natural resources. That is why some people hold the opinion that individual action can do nothing. Others say that individuals can do something if some action is taken by governments. This essay shall discuss both views.

Individual actions, small as they may be, can prove more effective than we realize. We can avoid driving the car, and take public transit, walk, or bicycle instead. This will reduce the use of fossil fuels and cut pollution. Saving energy at home, like turning on the air conditioner only when we have to, or turning water heater down a few degrees, is also ultimately good for the environment. It has been rightly said that

-\_\_Little drops of water; little grains of sand; make the mighty ocean; and the vast land'.

There are, however, obstacles that stand in the way of individual action and intervention by governments is needed. The first obstacle is the lack of professional knowledge needed to cope with serious environmental issues like soil erosion and salinity, which require a significant amount of investigation and research. Another obstacle which makes individual action almost impossible is when an environmental emergency or accident happens such as an oil spill near the border line, which would necessitate government or even international coordination.

So, in conclusion, when it comes to environmental problems, individual actions are indispensable in the problem solving process. But the most pressing and complicated problems go far beyond an individual's capability and so require the concerted effort of the government as well as the global community.

#### Essay by Sakshi Nature provides a free lunch, Only if we control our appetite."

In the current world of increased environmental problems, its solution has become a debatable issue. Some people think that it is impossible for an individual to solve these problems whereas some opine that government should come forth with helping hand. It is explained in the following paragraphs.

First of all, we can observe so many problematic issues of environment. These are likely to be solved only if public is also aware. Some people find it too big to be solved by an individual. They think of so many problems like ozone depletion, radiation pollution and extinction of species. These problems sound very devastating. One individual alone can't help to eradicate these problems. Some think that these issues are at their extreme level so public can't contribute even to stabilize the level of such problems.

As far as, my opinion is concerned, a flower cannot make a garland. If every individual makes some efforts to reduce daily waste, use public transport for short distance travelling or leave the throw away culture then he can give his 60% contribution in remoulding the environment. We take an instance of Ganga-action plan. Under this plan, many laws are legislated. But, if every individual violates these laws then how can we think of a clean Ganga. The depletion of ozone layer and global warming can also be controlled if every common man reduces the unnecessary cars, and other machines. We are playing with laws of nature also by disturbing the food chain. One can also stop hunting just for fun. These are some ideas for an individual to extend a helpful hand

On the other hand some people think government should come ahead and do some constructive works. Many eco- friendly laws can be made like one car per family. It should concentrate on current problems which are remaining to be solved. Government should take serious steps like recycling of substances and ban on hunting of vulnerable and rare species of animals. All laws should be abided by people everywhere. Government has banned plastics bags, but these are still found in some markets. It should aware the illiterate people about it. Solar products and biogas plants must be launched.

In a nutshell, I can say that it is true that environmental problems are big enough but the proper co-operation of public and government can result in excellent consequences otherwise it will be of no use crying over spilt milk.

Some people believe that improve public health should increase the number of sports facilities; others believe that it has little effects and need other measures to improve it. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

The construction of new sports facilities are definitely needed in an environment where people's health is in a declining state. However, there are those who believe that the way to improving people's health should lie in other measures that governments have to come up with to get people to live more healthily. This essay shall discuss both views followed by my opinion.

In many countries around the world, sports facilities are being neglected. The existing ones being threatened with closure and in their place housing and commercial development is taking place. The lack of sports facilities has directly led to a sharp decline in the general public's involvement in sports activities. This is the major reason for ill health and excessive weight nowadays. If a wider range of sports and fitness facilities (swimming pools, basketball court and gymnasiums etc.) were available, then people would be more willing to spend time in these facilities to train their bodies and to improve their fitness, instead of living a sedentary life at home watching television, playing video games or using computers.

However, the building of such facilities may become a waste of time and taxpayers' money if they are built far away from where people live or if they are too expensive to use. There are scenes of empty sports grounds in many cities because it takes too much trouble to get there, and many sports clubs are receiving fewer guests because they charge unreasonably high membership fees. In these cases, the government should be spending more on advertising healthier life style instead of just wasting money on facilities that are not going to be actively used by the people. For example, it is important for people to know that little things like jogging or taking the stairs provide as many benefits as using exercising equipment in a sports club.

As good health is a basic human need and healthy individuals lead to a healthy nation, I believe that government should do both – increase the number of sports facilities as well as take other measures to improve people's health such as awareness campaigns through various media. The sports facilities should be easily affordable and accessible by the people.

All in all, the government should be spending more money on the campaigns of getting the people to be more involved in a healthier lifestyle and also spending some money on sports facilities that are affordable and within reach of the general public.

Newspapers have an enormous influence in people's opinions and ideas. Why and do you think it is positive or negative situation?

In almost every modern society, newspapers have been playing an essential role in shaping people's thoughts on a wide range of issues and are always regarded as an indispensable source of information. In my opinion, this phenomenon is both, negative as well as positive.

To begin with, all kinds of newspapers are full of information about this constantly changing world. They keep us abreast of what is happening all around us. Today, the whole planet Earth has shrunk into a small global village and it is very important to stay connected. In order to maintain their good reputation, most newspapers and magazines report actual events in a detailed way, providing not only factual information but also deep insights into complex social and political issues. In addition, their coverage and comments encourage young readers to form their own opinions on current affairs.

Not only that, newspapers also entertain us by providing us news about Hollywood, Bollywood, latest books and cartoon clippings. They are also a link between the government and the people. By writing letters to the editor, the common man can reach his voice to the higher authorities and be heard. Finally, newspapers and other media are very effective in providing justice. There is a lot of power in the pen of a journalist.

On the other hand, people should be fully aware of the downside of the journalistic dominance. More often than not, newspapers provide prejudiced and self- opinionated reports on sensitive issues, which can give rise to riots in a pluralistic (multicultural and multi-religious) society like India. On a less serious level, flooding the pages with trivial pieces of entertainment news and celebrity secrets is the usual way to sell their paper and keep people diverted from the more serious issues.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, newspapers of today are largely positive in their approach but people should also take all news with a pinch of salt and be able to judge for themselves what is right or wrong.

More and more students choose to go to another country for their higher education. Do you think the benefits outweigh the problems associated with it?

There is no doubt that going to study in a foreign country, is becoming more and more common nowadays. But while overseas study has its drawbacks, the difficulties are far outweighed by the advantages. Indeed, people who go abroad for study open themselves up to experiences that those who stay at home will never have.

The most obvious advantage to overseas university study is real-life use of a different language. While a person can study a foreign language in his or her own country, it cannot compare with constant use of the language in academic and everyday life. There is no better opportunity to improve second-language skills than living in the country in which it is spoken. Moreover, having used the language during one's studies offers a distinct advantage when one is applying for jobs back home that require the language.

On a university campus, the foreign student is not alone in having come from far away. He or she will likely encounter many others from overseas and it is possible to make friends from all around the world. This is not only exciting on a social level, but could lead to important overseas contacts in later professional life.

Finally, living and studying abroad offers one a new and different perspective of the world and, perhaps most important, of one's own country. Once beyond the initial shock of being in a new culture, the student slowly begins to get a meaningful understanding of the host society. On returning home, one inevitably sees one's own country in a new, often more appreciative, light.

In conclusion, while any anxiety about going overseas for university study is certainly understandable, it is important to remember that the benefits offered by the experience make it well worthwhile.

Some people think it is more important to spend public money on promoting healthy lifestyle in order to prevent illness than to spend it on the treatment for people who are already ill. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Of course it goes without saying that prevention is better than cure. That is why, in recent years, there has been a growing body of opinion in favour of putting more resources into promoting a healthy lifestyle. I agree that by promoting a healthy lifestyle, there will be fewer people requiring treatment and thus the amount spent on curing ill health could be reduced substantially.

As many modern diseases are a consequence of our lifestyles, one way of making savings to the health budget would be to educate people about how to prevent expensive health problems such as diabetes or heart disease. Most medical doctors today do not have the time to (nor are they paid to) teach patients how to make these changes to their lifestyle through diet or exercise. The government can take the help of pervasive media such as TV and radio to educate people.

It is understandable that when people are sick they want the best medical treatment possible, with access to the latest diagnostic equipment, expensive MRI scanners, for example. If the problem is life threatening then we demand complex operations such as open-heart surgery or organ transplants. Such procedures usually require intensive nursing care and lengthy periods of hospitalization, which are costly.

Furthermore, there are many diseases which if diagnosed early through proper screening tests can be treated very easily. For example cancer of the cervix can be diagnosed with a very simple, inexpensive outdoor test called the pap smear. If the government spends a little amount to provide such screening tests free of cast then a lot of money needed for expensive treatments could be saved later on.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that it would be definitely worthwhile to divert the health budget towards prevention of diseases. By doing so the nation would be healthier and automatically the cost of treatment would be cut down.

Nowadays, people live in the society where consumer goods are cheaper to buy. Do you think its advantages outweigh disadvantages?

Globalisation has ushered in an era of consumerism and we are flooded with choices. Certainly, this phenomenon has both pros and cons. However, I believe that the disadvantages far outweigh the advantages. I shall present arguments to support my views in the following paragraphs.

On the positive side, cheap consumer goods means they can be afforded by the majority and this in turn means mass production which is something good for the employment sector. This is definitely beneficial for the overall economy of the country. Furthermore, it reduces the gap between the rich and the poor to some extent because everyone can afford the things. For example, the market is flooded with cheap mobile phones from China which can be seen in the hands of every Tom, Dick and Harry.

On the downside, cheap consumer goods means there is a compromise with the quality and more often than not we bring home things which become useless after one or two uses. This promotes a use-and-throw culture because the repair is sometimes costlier than the actual cost of the product. These products also do not carry any guarantee with them. So, in the long run the consumer suffers.

Another big disadvantage of cheap consumer goods is to the environment. There is a lot of rubbish generated because of excessive consumerism. Unnecessary packaging is also done to make these cheap goods appealing to the eye. Often, this rubbish is not decomposed and ends up in rivers and waterways. This is definitely detrimental to the environment.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that cheap consumer goods do have their advantages but these advantages come at a heavy price to the consumer and the environment.

Caring for children is an important thing of the society. It is suggested that all mothers and fathers should be required to take childcare training courses. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Children represent both the present and the future. In recent years, there has been a surge of interest in transforming childcare into a formal subject of academic studies. Traditional childcare skills, which are passed on from one generation to another through oral and informal instruction, are not sufficient to guarantee quality care, so parents' participation in care training is advisable.

Many parents might be accustomed to the idea that childcare is all about love, but this notion is misleading. While it is easy to admit that parents are responsible to attend to children's needs, it is also important to note that children are too often insatiable. Unlike adults, they have no idea of what their behaviours lead to. For example, children are candy lovers without knowledge that candy can cause obesity and tooth damage. Parents should not respond to children's needs for candy permanently. Parents who give whatever children want, known as indulgent parents, can be blamed for their children's behaviour problems and unhealthy habits.

Childcare training teaches parents how to take a holistic approach to care for their children and prevents them from answering children's inappropriate needs

Another misconceived idea of childcare is that it is a simple process of feeding children and making them sleep regularly. Contemporary childcare is not limited to this. Equally important for this science are emotional and mental wellbeing. For example, some children's first step comes earlier than other children's which cannot be explained with simple knowledge. Childcare is a complex science that goes beyond nutrition. Whether parents have helped children improve motor skills and cognitive skills accounts for children's overall wellbeing.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that successful childcare does not lie only in love but also in skills. Children's healthy development is measured not only by physical wellbeing but also by growth in other dimensions. With these borne in mind, parents might now be compelled to join childcare training.

<u>Crime is a problem all over the world and there is nothing that can be done to prevent it. To what extent do you agree or disagree?</u>

There is no doubt that numerous problems exist in most modern cities throughout the world. Although traffic congestion, pollution and overcrowding often occur, many people believe that crime is the most serious problem in urban areas. Indeed, television and newspaper reports often tell us that crime continues to rise. However, I disagree that nothing can be done to prevent it. I believe that it is possible to tackle this serious issue in a number of ways.

One approach would be to increase the number of police. If more Police were on the streets, whether on foot or in patrol cars, criminals would be less likely to commit crimes and people would feel much safer. Having more police visible at night would be particularly beneficial.

A second possibility would be to make laws stricter and punishments more severe. This could involve increasing fines or lengthening prison sentences. If a criminal has to pay more money for doing something illegal or would face more time in prison then I believe this is likely to reduce the crime rate.

Thirdly, methods to increase security might deter potential criminals. For example, more effective alarms in houses and cars. This would reduce burglary and theft. In addition, more information about home security would also be useful. In terms of personal safety, rape alarms or even small weapons could prevent some attacks on people.

In conclusion, although crime is a major problem in most cities in the world, the situation can be addressed by adopting the methods mentioned above. In this way, the negative effects could be reduced and people living in cities would feel much safer.

The cost of air flights has reduced sharply nowadays. Do you think it is a positive or a negative development, give your reasons.(General Training)

In today's world, we are now in a position to enjoy cheaper air flights than in the past. However, there is an argument whether this is a positive or a negative development. It is advantageous in terms of freedom and the opportunities to learn from other countries. It is detrimental in terms of the pollution it creates. So, it is both, a positive as well as a negative development

Cheap air flight can be beneficial in many ways. One of them is the opportunities to go overseas. Earlier, only the affluent could afford it, but now it is within the pocket of the ordinary man. Some of the discounted tickets are fairly cheap and flying abroad is no longer a dream for many. Moreover, small businesses have prospered because of the ease of travel because of these flights.

In addition to this, cheap air flight enables intercultural exchanges between countries. The advent of cheap air fare makes it possible for people the world over to travel regularly, regardless of the purpose of the trip. Therefore, people have the opportunities to learn from different cultures and have a better understanding of countries they used to be unfamiliar with. This, in turn, enhances cultural communications between countries.

On the other hand, it is generally known that aeroplanes consume a vast amount of oil and the gas emission generated by an airplane is enormous. Therefore, the environmental impacts would only get worse in the long run. Besides, cheap air tickets at times are extremely disturbing in terms of certain conditions that go along with them. One problem is that the date and time cannot be changed once purchased. As a result, many people find it inconvenient if they are to reschedule due to emergency.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, cheap air fares have both pros and cons. I am convinced that giving people the freedom to travel is essential, but at the same time people should be made aware of avoiding un-necessary travel.

#### Individuals should not be allowed to carry guns. Do you agree or disagree.

There are some who hold the opinion that gun ownership should be restricted, as it is in many countries, and that people in general should not be permitted to keep them. There are a number of reasons to agree with this point of view, as will now be discussed.

A major reason why governments should not allow people to have guns is because of the potential for accidents. In America, for example, you can legally shoot people if you find them robbing your house, but this can lead to people dying over cases of mistaken identity. In addition, there are crimes where people act rashly or in anger, so guns that were intended for defence are often used aggressively.

There is also the intentional damage caused by guns. It is statistically evident that the number of gun-related crimes is higher in countries where firearm ownership is legal. Countries like America, for example, suffer from a disproportionately high number of fatal shootings in comparison with most other countries.

Some people, however, argue that shooting is a sport, thus being prevented from owning their own firearm is both unjust d a violation of our rights. Yet this must be balanced with the overwhelming number of people who use guns for criminal purposes.

To sum up, it is clear that the proliferation of guns leads to injury and death both intentionally and unintentionally. Although there are points to support gun ownership, they are weak in comparison with the rising tide of gun crime, a situation which will only continue to worsen.

Patrick Bourne, author of IELTS High Impact and director of IELTStestONLINE:

There are a number of strengths to this essay, but perhaps the most important is that all of the arguments are logically laid out, with one point being presented in each paragraph. The topic sentence of each paragraph is clear, and each paragraph is built with an appropriate amount of development and support for a 250 word essay.

Advances in technology and automation have reduced the need for manual labour. Therefore working hours should be reduced. To what extent do you agree?

In many production-oriented factories, machinery has evolved to such a degree that the demand for physical labour has considerably reduced, leading to the suggestion of a reduced working week. However, there are several factors that need to be considered.

Primarily, the long-term impact of shorter working weeks needs to be considered. Although less time at work may sound appealing, the reality is that people may find that they have too much free time. Fewer working hours would presumably mean less income, so a situation arises where employees have more leisure time than their income can support. This has the potential to result in feelings of boredom, frustration or anxiety, all of which have potential side-effects for society as a whole.

Connected with this comes the social factor of self-esteem. Working less is one thing; working less because robots can complete the tasks you were assigned is another. A solution that would benefit all those concerned would be to utilise the time no longer required for manual labour for something more productive. Instead of simply reducing the working week, a combination of industry and government support could allow for employees to receive further education and training, thus giving those employed in manual labour the academic tools to find different employment. Even automated factories still require technicians, mechanics and designers to maintain and improve production.

To summarise, until such time as automation has reduced the working week for all types of employee, it would perhaps be counter-productive to reduce the hours of those involved in manual labour without providing an alternative simply because they are replaceable.

Patrick Bourne, author of IELTS High Impact and director of IELTStestONLINE:

One of the strongest points in this essay is the way that the essay has been structured using a variety of linking words and phrases. The first body paragraph opens with \_Primarily', and the last sentence of the paragraph begins with the reference word \_This'. The following paragraph links with \_Connected with this' and uses linking words like \_thus'.

Some people believe that teenagers should concentrate on all school subjects. But, others believe that teenagers should focus on the subject that they are best at or that they find the most interest. Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

In today's competitive world, a broad knowledge is needed to succeed in any field. Therefore, I disagree that it is a waste of time if students study subjects which are not of their interest.

Let us first examine the reasons why some people hold the opinion that students should not have to study all the subjects and should be allowed to choose the subjects they want to study. They opine that in this case the students will probably be more enthusiastic about their study. In addition, if students are forced to study all subjects, they can easily lose interest in education. What is more, if all subjects are compulsory for studying, students will not have enough time to learn all of them properly therefore they will be constantly under a lot of pressure.

However, I believe all subjects are of great importance and for the holistic development of the students they need to study all subjects equally at school level. Later on, during admission to the colleges, students can select the subjects of their choice and can explore them further. At that age they are mature enough to decide their subjects for themselves. At school level the student may not know what his real interests are.

Furthermore, nowadays, the job market is very demanding and the recruiters select students who are skilled in various fields. Having the basic knowledge of varied subjects during school time definitely widens the horizons for the students. To add to it, it is a well known fact that most subjects are related to each other in some way or the other. For example, a basic knowledge of mathematics is needed to excel in computer languages. Finally, I believe that it is up to the teachers to develop interest of the students in any subject. For instance, during my school days, my history teacher was so good that a boring subject like history was the favourite subject of the whole class.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, students should learn all subjects at school level as they are not mature enough to know their real interests at school level and a broad knowledge is also needed for their holistic development.

If a product is good or it meets people needs, people will buy it. So advertising is unnecessary and no more than an entertainment. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Advertising in modern society is ubiquitous - on the radio, TV, the internet and in our letterboxes. While it is true that a good product will sell even without any advertisement, I disagree that advertisements are unnecessary and just a form of entertainment.

It is irrefutable that advertising provides us with information on new products. If it were not for electronic and print advertising, many products would not be bought. This is because, there is a flood of consumer goods in the market and consumers ask for those products which they have heard of or seen in the market. Therefore in the initial stages, adverts are necessary but later on only those products will sustain in the market which are really good. In this way, advertising provides an important service to manufacturers and some consumers.

Additionally, the advertising industry creates jobs for thousands of people. In this respect it has become the backbone of many economies of the world. Jobs are also created in the manufacturing industries because of adverts. As demand increases, mass production has to be done and therefore more and more people are employed.

Furthermore, advertisements touch social issues. For example, when Amitabh Bachhan tells people to bring their children for pulse polio immunization, people listen. Then there are ads against female foeticide which are very informative. Advertisements also teach a lot about the country from where the ads come.

This is because through satellite TV we can see ads from all over the world. When we see a Japanese advert of a lady in a kimono, we come to know about the clothes of Japan.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, adverts are not just a form of entertainment but they serve many other purposes as well. Even the good products need propaganda in today's competitive market.

Some people argue that companies and private individuals, rather than governments, should pay the bill of pollution. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Environmental pollution is a burning issue these days and to save our planet Earth, it has to be tackled on a war footing. Some individuals are of the opinion that businesses and individuals should pay for the bill of pollution rather than the governments. Although it seems reasonable to ask them to do so, it would not be easy. Therefore, I disagree with the above statement. In the following paragraphs, I shall put forth my arguments to support my views.

First of all, it may not be possible to say who is to blame. For instance, in my home town, there is a sugar mill, a starch mill and a textile mill. All are adding to pollution in their own way. It would be very difficult to pin point the extent to which each one has to pay for pollution. Such businesses will find loopholes to avoid heavy bills. Therefore, the government should take the onus of handling the pollution costs.

Secondly, the big companies may be unwilling to accept the responsibility of paying the additional bill of pollution by saying that they are already paying heavy taxes to the government. They could also argue that they are assisting the governments indirectly by aiding many charity organizations.

Moreover, in places where governments have tried this policy and successfully prosecuted the companies who violated the law, it took years to get the result. Therefore, it would be very unpractical to make companies and individuals to pay the bill of pollution. The governments could, however, make it mandatory for companies to set up effluent treatment plants and subsidize them greatly so as to increase compliance of the companies to set them up.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, pollution is a serious issue and the government should not leave it to the individuals and companies to pay its bill. It can however, make it mandatory for the companies to set up effluent treatment plants so that pollution is minimised.

The subjects and lesson contents are decided by the authorities such as the government. Some people argue that teachers should make the choice. Do you agree or disagree?

In almost all parts of the world, there is a national curriculum decided by the government which is followed in all schools. Some people however feel that it restricts the teachers' freedom to respond to the students' needs and so teachers should decide the school curricula. I believe that the national curriculum is good enough and has withstood the test of time but some portion of the curriculum should be left in the hands of the teachers.

Having a national curriculum merely standardises what is taught across the country, giving equal opportunity to all. If we abolish the national curriculum, anything could be taught and students would have even less equal opportunities. This would also worsen the gap between the government and private schools. It may also imply that religious schools could teach only religion and ignore science and therefore many students would not receive a well-rounded education.

On the other hand, it is also true that the national curriculum does not allow for enough local variation. It is important for children to learn the values of things such as local history, accents and dialects. We are not all the same and school should reflect that. The present problem is that the curriculum is too comprehensive. It tries to squeeze all children into the same mould.

What is actually needed is a more flexible policy to allow for individual aptitudes and interests. However, there should still be a limited core curriculum which should be decided by the government. Then the teachers should be given some freedom to offer any other subjects which the pupils and their parents want. Young people of all ages would be much more likely to thoroughly enjoy school, learn effectively, develop their individual talents, and gain a love of learning which will illuminate their whole lives. Teachers would \_walk tall' in our society and establish their proper role as guardians of the future.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that a national curriculum should be there but there should also be room for teachers to have their say wherever needed.

Some people think that computers and the Internet are more important for a child's education than going to school. But others believe that schools and teachers are essential for children to learn effectively. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Some individuals opine that computers and the internet have become an indispensable part of education and therefore schools and teachers do not play a significant role in education. Others say that for effective learning, schools and teachers are still indispensable. In the following paragraphs, I intend to discuss both views followed by my opinion.

It is an undeniable fact that teachers can never lose their importance. In learning and practice of more complex ideas, the computer is not adequate. It can tell if the answer is right or wrong but it cannot tell where the student went wrong. Tasks involving reasoning cannot be taught using computers. Moreover, teachers add their own knowledge gained through experience to that of books and other resources.

Furthermore, teachers can stimulate interest and it is an undeniable fact that interested stimulated people tend to learn more. They can keep students focused on study. They can provide a faster and simpler way to present information to the students. They can come down to the level of a student and so are definitely better than computers. What is more, teachers are role models for students. They are scholars in action. They not only teach academic subjects, but also many social skills.

Schools are places where students learn many social skills apart from academic education. There are also practical subjects which students can learn best from the teacher. For example, experiments of physics and chemistry are best learnt by the teacher guiding you at every step in the school setting. What is more, teachers in schools give assignments and regularly check them. This helps the teachers to recognise the weak points of students and guide them accordingly. All this cannot be done by the internet and computer.

On the other hand, it is also true that the internet is an ocean of knowledge. You can get information about any topic on Earth from the internet. But there is no authenticity of this information. What information to get and from where to get requires a lot of expertise. Students still need the guidance of the teachers at all stages of learning. Teachers can make even the dull and boring subjects seem interesting. So definitely students learn more from teachers.

To put it in a nutshell, I can say that, no doubt computers and internet have become important in education but the role of schools and teachers can never be undermined.

The food travels thousands of miles from farm to consumer. Some people think it would be better to our environment and economy if people only ate local produced food. What extend does the advantage outweigh disadvantage?

Nowadays, supermarkets are stocked with food products from around the world. Some individuals are of the opinion that this imported food has detrimental effect on our economy and culture and it would be better if people ate only the local produce. Certainly, the disadvantages of imported food outweigh the advantages.

On the positive side, transporting goods over a long distance gives us a lot of choices. We can taste a variety of fruits and vegetables from all parts of the world. For example, about ten years ago, we hardly saw kiwi fruit which is from New Zealand. But, now it has a place on every fruit stand. Secondly, many people get employment in this field. Small farmers have a chance to expand globally and it increases the overall economy of the country. Finally, it helps in developing good relations between countries which helps in international cooperation and peace. If countries are dependent upon one another's economic success then armed conflict would be less likely.

On the other hand, importing food can have a negative effect on local culture. This can be seen in countries such as Japan where imported food has become more popular than traditional, local produce, eroding people's understanding of their own food traditions. Although some would claim that this is a natural part of economic development, in an increasingly global world. I feel strongly that any loss of regional culture would be detrimental.

A second major reason to reduce imports is the environmental cost. Currently, many food imports such as fruit, are transported thousands of miles by road, sea and air, making the produce more expensive to buy and increasing pollution from exhaust fumes. Despite the fact that trade in food exports has existed for many years, I am convinced that a reduction would bring significant financial and environmental gains.

In conclusion, I am certain that if people ate locally produced food, it would have environmental benefits. It would also benefit the local economy because, in time, people would prosper commercially as the demand for local and regional produce would remain high resisting the competition from overseas.

Report research suggests that majority of criminals who were sent to prison would commit crimes when set free. What do you think of this case? What to be done to solve this problem?

Crime is a big problem all over the world and there are many different opinions on the best way to reduce crime. The traditional solution is to punish the criminals by putting them in prison. It has been seen that when criminals are set free from prison, majority of them re-offend. In the following paragraphs, I shall suggest some causes of this phenomenon and suggest some solutions.

To begin with, in traditional prisons, people learn a lot about crime and so when they leave prison they tend to commit even more crime. In other words prisons act as universities of crime. Secondly, after being set free some may even want to lead a good and peaceful life, but people of the community do not accept them and as a result they don't get any jobs. They are forced to re-offend because they have to fulfil their basic needs. Finally, some may commit crime again because they do not have the training or qualification to do any job.

Many steps can be taken to minimize the gravity of the situation. First of all, petty offenders like shop-lifters and pick-pockets should be given some vocational training and education. It is a well not fact that the basic causes of crime are poverty, illiteracy and unemployment. So, if we provide education and job training then we would be removing the causes of crime. If criminals are rehabilitated by some form of employment then they would certainly not reoffend.

Furthermore, community service such as maintaining parks and doing some construction work can be taken from criminals instead of just putting them into prisons. In this way, they feel they are part of the community and the community also starts accepting them.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that we should hate the crime and not the criminal. To fight crime we should focus on the causes of crime. Education and job training help to rehabilitate the criminals. So, the focus should be on reforming the criminals so that they do not re-offend.

Money for postgraduate research is limited. Some people think that financial support from governments should be only provided for scientific research rather than research for less useful subjects. Do you agree or disagree?

There is no doubt that postgraduate research can provide a lot of wealth to a country. However, it is a matter of debate whether all these researches should be funded by governments. I agree with the statement that government should fund only scientific research and the less useful research should be some private agencies.

There is a strong argument why only scientific researches should be done by the government. Government has so much else on its shoulders. It has to provide infrastructure such as transportation, hospitals and education institutes to the citizens. Then it has to support the defence services and even maintain law and order in the country.

It is, however, important to identify areas where only the government should carry out and control scientific research. Firstly, researches into nuclear technology and national defence are very crucial. They cannot be left into the hands of private companies. Secondly, some researches are only for the advancement of knowledge. In such research the private companies have no incentive. So the government should take the leading role.

There are many benefits if private companies participate in postgraduate researches. To begin with, researches are done more efficiently by private companies because they are profit driven. Every dollar is spent wisely to ensure maximum benefits and every resource is used effectively to avoid waste. Also, researches by private companies are closely associated with market needs. Private companies are market oriented so they always come up with inventions that have practical values that can increase productivity and improve life. For example, researches in cosmetics and cough medicines.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that governments should identify areas of scientific research which cannot be left in the hands of private companies and leave the other less important researches in the hands of private companies.

Some people think that students should go to college for further education. However, some others claim that students should go to learn the skills such as fixing cars or construction. What is your opinion?

When they finish school, teenagers face the dilemma of whether to get a job or continue their education. While there are some benefits to get some vocational training and do a job straight after school, I would argue that it is better to go to college or university.

The option to start work straight after seems attractive to some for several reasons. Many young people want to start earning money as soon as possible. In this way, they can become independent, and they will be able to afford their own house or start a family. In terms of their career, young people who decide to find work, rather than continue their studies, may progress more quickly. They will have the chance to gain real experience and learn practical skills related to their chosen profession. This may lead to promotions and a successful career.

On the other hand, I believe that it is more beneficial for students to continue their studies. Firstly, academic qualifications are required in many professions. For example, it is impossible to become a doctor, teacher or lawyer without having the relevant degree. Another advantage of graduating from a university is that it gives you more choices when it comes to choosing a job. Most employers will be more impressed by a candidate who has a degree than they would be by one who only has high school qualifications because it shows a certain level of intelligence and education, as well as the commitment and self-discipline that is needed in order to study a degree course for three or four years. University graduates also tend to earn higher salaries than those with fewer qualifications.

Furthermore, the job market is becoming increasingly competitive, and sometimes there are hundreds of applicants for one position in a company. Young people who do not have qualifications from a university or college will not be able to compete.

For the reasons mentioned above, it seems to me that students are more likely to be successful in their careers if they continue their studies beyond school level.

#### Television has changed the quality of life for the ordinary person. Do you agree or disagree?

There is probably no greater influence on social issues and society itself than the television. It has become arguably the greatest invention of the past century. There is no doubt that it has significantly changed the life of the ordinary man. The point to be pondered over is that as television has saturated our lives, has it always resulted toward our betterment?

With TV, we have witnessed countless historical events: Inaugurations of presidents; man's first steps on the moon; even disasters as they happen. We watch TV in the morning to receive the daily news. We eat watching it. We watch it before they go to bed. While enjoying the entertaining programs aired on television, we hardly give thought to its detrimental effects, especially on young children.

The box has made us get rid of courtesies. When we have a guest, we cannot even conceal our lack of interest and attention in what they are saying, leave alone turning the volume down or switching it off altogether. We never think twice before turning the TV on at about 12:30 in the morning at a high volume. The half-literate domestic help watches TV serials when she is free, whereas she would try hard to read the newspapers had it been a few years ago...And the list can go on.

In earlier times women spent their idle afternoons visiting their neighbours and men socialised with their friends and colleagues. In today's competitive world people are willing to work for longer hours for a better future. It's already hard for the modern urban Indian to spend time even with their family. But in spite of that, the television eats up from the few hours one gets to stay at home. Such meager interaction increases the distance between spouses, and more importantly, between children and their parents, which has been found to harm the way they grow up and form relationships. What is more, the advertisements succeed in giving rise to strong materialistic wants in people, which must be one of the reasons why our society is becoming increasingly consumerist.

Therefore, moderation is quite important to ensure that the television is used as a source of healthy entertainment and for enhancing knowledge. So, it is better to set a time limit for watching television. Children should be encouraged to participate in activities, like playing and reading books. Before allowing children to watch television programs, the parents should take into account the program reviews and television ratings. They should be encouraged to watch programs that reinforce family values. As parents are the role models for their children, hence it is equally important to limit your own television watching, to set an example for them.

To sum up, it can be said that television has changed the life of the ordinary man beyond recognition in both negative and positive ways. We must ration our TV viewing hours in order to escape its cons.

Some believe that those who are not talented in language learning should not be required to learn a foreign language. Do you think school should require students to learn a foreign language?

Learning other languages is very worthwhile and beneficial. In the "global village" that the world has become over recent decades, it seems to make more sense than ever to be familiar with and competent in speaking several different languages.

However, I still firmly believe that it should not be forced upon everyone to learn a foreign language.

To begin with, the acquisition of a second language develops skills such as communication, cultural awareness and global citizenship by overcoming language barriers. A second language can also inject confidence in children by helping them develop global understanding. Many young people travel the world soon after leaving school and there can be no doubt that their experiences would be enhanced by being able to speak the native language in countries they visit. It would also open up all sorts of career opportunities that they would not have otherwise. Learning new languages is said to increase a person's brain power too.

Nevertheless, it would be entirely unreasonable to expect all children to learn at least one foreign language. There are many who just would not be able to cope academically with learning other languages. This naturally includes children who are developmentally disabled and may be attending special schools or in special units at mainstream schools.

There would also be other children who would be unable to cope with linguistic studies though - even if they were of average intelligence. I believe it's possible that some would be totally demoralized and humiliated by any pressure to do so. If they can just get a basic grasp of reading and writing their own language then that has to be regarded as an adequate achievement.

On the whole I think being exposed to other cultures and having the opportunity to learn at least one other language in school is a healthy, positive and enriching experience. Nevertheless, it should never be forced upon those for whom it is simply unfeasible.

A hundred years ago, people think that human race is steadily improving in every area of life. Now it seems this is not certain in that situation. In which areas do you think we have made important progress nowadays? In which areas do you think we still need to make progress?

it is irrefutable that the world we live in today has changed beyond recognizable limits to what it was a hundred years ago. It has all been possible due to the growth of science and technology. This essay shall look into some areas in which we have made progress and the areas in which we still have a lot to do.

Let us first consider the growth in medical science. We have discovered newer cures and medicines for many diseases which were earlier considered untreatable. Even the surgical techniques adopted today are safer and quicker. Organ transplantation surgeries have given life to many.

Furthermore, there have been revolutionary developments in the transport and communication sector. Air travel has become safer and faster. Road and rail transport have also achieved newer heights. Communication technology has shrunk the planet Earth to a global village. People are now constantly in touch with each other through the mobile phone and the internet. The internet is an ocean of knowledge. Even the manufacturing technology has made mass production available and everything is available to everyone in all corners of the world.

However, there are still many sectors where we have to work further. Treatments for many types of cancers and AIDS have yet to be found. Alternative sources of energy have yet to be widely recognized and adopted. Ways to reduce pollution and thus put a halt to global warming have yet to be made. Many frontiers of outer space have yet to be explored. Effective ways to destroy nuclear waste have yet to be found.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that we have made a lot of progress in the last hundred years but there are still many areas in which we have to work further.

Nowadays sending children to boarding school (either in other countries or in their own countries) is becoming increasingly popular. Why is it? Is it a positive development?

Boarding schools have been extensively debated - some consider them great boosters of a child's all round development, and some as instruments of neglect of children's emotional needs. Nowadays boarding schools are becoming very popular. This essay shall probe into the causes of this phenomenon and also discuss whether this trend is good or bad.

People send their children to boarding schools for a number of reasons. Some parents who work overseas or travel frequently choose to put their children in boarding school because they know how inconsistent they will be in parenting or in providing for the needs of their kids. Other parents choose boarding school for their children as a way for them to experience more of the world and to learn how to interact with diverse people from a young age. Still other parents put their children and teens in boarding school if they are having trouble disciplining their kids or keeping them out of trouble. Finally in this age of dual-income nuclear families, a child's life and development often takes place in rather unsuitable circumstances and boarding schools can be a great place for children to be in.

Seen in such a light, the option of a boarding school is very good. After all, these schools are not just about studies - they also give a child time and exposure to a lot of other things like sports and art. Also, children in such schools are more likely to have stronger bonds with their friends, since they spend a lot of time together.

Of course, there are drawbacks such as homesickness. Moreover, children in residential schools have fewer day-to-day interactions with their family, and significantly less time to spend with their parents during their formative years. As a result, many parents who placed their kids in boarding schools fail to develop a close bond with their children.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that we cannot say whether the trend is positive or negative. It depends on an analysis the child's needs and the circumstances of the family. Also, it is generally advisable not to send a very young child to boarding school.

The development of technology changes the way people connect with each other. In which way the development of technology change the types of relationships that people make? It has positive or negative effect on the relationships?

Technology has revolutionized the concept of communication. It has brought in the market many gadgets to facilitate communication. This has led to a considerable change in the type of relationships that people have and largely these changes have been positive although there are some negative changes also.

The most significant impact of technology on communication is that the speed of communication has increased manifold and the cost has been cut drastically. In the pre-information technology days, a document often required re-typing on the typewriter before the final version. Sending the letter across to someone else required a visit to the post office and a postage stamp. Faster methods such as telegrams had severe limitations in text, and remained costly. Computers and the internet have made easy the process of creating and editing documents and applying features such as spell check and grammar check automatically. Email allows sending the document to any part of the globe within seconds, making telegrams, and even ordinary letters mostly obsolete.

The accessibility of communication has also improved because of the low cost. Relationships have become better because people are connected to each other all the time and there is little chance of misunderstanding because of communication gap. Finally, technologies such as the internet help spread the net of communication by tracking down old friends, shedding light on new business opportunities, and the like.

On the downside, the possibility of high quality communication from anywhere in the world to anywhere else at low costs has led to a marked decline in face-to-face communications and to an increased reliance on verbal and written communication over electronic mediums. Communication has become concise and short, and the adage —brevity is the soul of witl finds widespread implementation, though unintentionally. The small keyboards in mobile phone and other hand held devices that make typing difficult has resulted in a radical shortening of words and increasing use of symbol and shortcuts, with little or no adherence to traditional grammatical rules.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that as every garden has weeds, similarly the effect of technology on communication has a downside. Overall the positive effects far outweigh the negative effects.

Some people tend to take temporary jobs (they only work for few month of year), for they have time to do other things. Do the advantages outweigh the disadvantages?

In a time when jobs are few and employers receive hundreds of resumes for one vacancy, temporary jobs are gaining popularity. Although temporary jobs have both advantages and disadvantages, the pros definitely outweigh the cons.

To begin with, temporary work is relatively easy to get. If the candidate's credentials match the temporary job requirements he might be called upon to fill the position. Secondly, doing temporary work will give a job candidate much needed work experience. Most companies require two to three years experience, which puts recent graduates at a loss. Doing temporary work will give them that experience.

Another benefit to doing temporary work is that, should a vacancy become available within the company, the temporary worker will have first knowledge of it and can apply before the job gets posted on-line or handed over to employment agencies. Should a temporary worker excel in his current job, chances are he might be asked to stay on with the company on a full-time basis. Furthermore, by going from company to company, a temporary worker gets a lot of exposure. He doesn't just learn one job, in the course of his employment he might gain experience in different fields.

Moreover, by doing temporary work, a worker will also be exposed to different kinds of environments. In addition, a temporary worker will get exposure to different kinds of personalities. By learning to work with different kinds of people, a temporary worker can sharpen his people skills. Last but not least, if a temporary worker needs some time off, he can just make himself unavailable for a while until he is ready to take on the next assignment.

On the downside, a temporary job does not have job security and you may be fired any time. You also do not get the perks and benefits that regular full time employees get. There may be gaps in your employment from time to time.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that disadvantages of temporary jobs are far less than the advantages. For some people, a temporary job is just temporary until they find something full-time, while for others it is a way of life.

Many people go abroad to travel to see what other countries look like. However, the places all around the world are looking more and more similar. What do you think is the cause of this similarity? Do you think the advantages of this effect outweigh the shortages of it?

It is irrefutable that because of globalization, similarities between countries are more obvious these days than in the past. In this essay I shall discuss the causes of this similarity and also discuss whether this trend has more advantages or disadvantages.

The major reason is that in most countries, land is scarce and consequently it is very valuable. This has led to the construction of tall buildings which occupy only a small area of land while providing lots of floor space where people can live or work. Buildings of this type are made of concrete and steel and can be built comparatively quickly using prefabricated materials. They do not use local materials, such as stone, timber or brick, which used to give cities their individual character. In consequence, many cities now look very much the same and you might not know whether you were in Australia, China or Germany when you are on the street. This has led to a loss of architectural diversity but it is helpful to save the environment because less land and less wood is used.

Another cause of similarity is that the international outlets like Reebok, Nike and Levi's can be seen everywhere. Food outlets like MacDonald and Starbuck's etc can be seen in almost all corners of the world. People wearing the same type of clothes can be seen everywhere. Although it is regrettable that countries look similar, I tend to feel that this is unavoidable.

On the whole, the advantages are much more than the disadvantages and when people go to other countries for tourism, they still enjoy a lot because communication is much better nowadays; people understand other cultures much better and have become more open in their outlook of life. Moreover, every place has a few buildings which give that place its own uniqueness.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that the advantages of countries looking similar are much more than the disadvantages and the huge rush at the international airports is proof enough that people are not deterred by this similarity among countries.

Some people think that family life and parents have great influence on children's development, while others consider that external influence plays a more important role in children's life, discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Human development is a complex interplay of many factors. Some individuals are of the opinion that family life and parents have the most significant role in a child's development whereas others opine that friends and other environmental factors such as TV have a more important role. It is necessary to look at both arguments before forming an opinion.

Parents have direct interactions with the children. They provide a sense of identification to the child. These have their greatest effect on intellectual development and character traits. They also play a very important role in the socializing process of the child. Right from the bed time stories to the behavioural habits parents play a very important role in making a child a responsible citizen. They know their child's temperament better than anyone else. They can provide critical input better than anyone else. That is why it is believed by some that parents have the strongest role in a child's development.

Friends, on the other hand, are important in order to help children grow emotionally and socially. Children find out who they are by comparing themselves to others. They learn about attitude, character and personality. Building good relationships boosts a child's self esteem and they find comfort in those friendships when things get tough such as losing a pet or facing family problems. Therefore, friendships are essential to assure children develop a healthy psyche. When kids are surrounded by friends or have one close friend, they have better self esteem, feel a sense of well being and experience fewer social problems.

In my opinion, we cannot generalize as to what has more significance. In the early years family generally has more impact but in adolescence external factors may impact more. It appears that the power of the peer group becomes more important when the family relationships are not close or supportive. For example, if the parents work extra jobs and are largely unavailable, their children may turn to their peer group for emotional support.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that behaviour is affected by a complex interaction of many different factors such as parents, peers and environment. All these are inextricably linked in the development of children. There is individual variation and therefore it is difficult to generalize which factor plays the most significant role.

Individuals and countries cannot help everyone who needs help in the world, so they should only be concerned about their own communities and countries. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Some people opine that we cannot help everyone in the world and it would be better if we help the needy in our own communities and country. I disagree wholly with the first part of the statement that individuals and countries cannot help everyone who needs help in the world. I believe that in today's era of globalization there are many national and international organisations through which we can extend a helping hand to anyone in any corner of the world.

However, I do agree that we should help our own communities and country's people first if they need help.

If one's own country is developing or under-developed and the people around need help then priority should be given to help those around you first. There are many advantages of direct help. Firstly, a person remains directly in touch with the needy. You can see how your money is being used. There are no mediators and so there are no chances of corruption. It has been well said that charity begins at home. Naturally, if you help those around you, the people in your locality love and respect you and you enjoy a better status in life.

If one belongs to a prosperous country where even the poorest of the poor has all the basic amenities of life then it would be commendable to help through national and international organisations. You can work on a larger platform and provide help for global issues. A larger platform is a must if you have a lot to offer in charity. Help activities can be better spread through a larger network. You feel part of a global village. Help need not be always in the form of money. It can be in the form of services also. For example, if you are a doctor, you can provide medical aid and if you are a teacher, you can volunteer to teach in the under-developed nations.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that it is human nature to help those who need it. If your own country's people need help then they should be helped first. Otherwise it is good to help people in other parts of the world.

The environment problems facing today's world are so great that there is little ordinary people can do to improve the situation. Government and large companies should be responsible for reducing the amount of damage being done to the environment. To what extend do you agree or disagree?

Climate change is a phenomenon affecting all people in all walks of life, from individual citizens to whole countries and huge multinational companies. Some people opine that individual action can do nothing to prevent the damage to environment and that only governments and large companies con help minimize the damage to environment.

There are those who say that the majority of the damage is wrought by big businesses. By imposing restrictions on emissions and by strictly monitoring waste disposal from factories, plants and businesses, governments would go a long way towards preventing climate change. It is thought that governments around the world should come up with solutions to help prevent imminent environmental disaster. Proponents of this view claim that individual action is irrelevant in the face of massive, wide-scale prevention policies set and controlled by governments.

On the other hand, there are a growing number of people who believe that individual action combined with governmental and business action will do a lot more to prevent climate change than if individual citizens were not involved. In a world of six billion people, if everyone thought about the amount of water they use, how they dispose of their rubbish, whether or not something needs to be thrown away or if they can, in fact, re-use certain items then we would be giving the problem of climate change and its prevention a massive boost.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that individual citizens cannot sit back and say it is someone else's responsibility to protect the environment; we must all play our part - individual citizens, governments and big businesses alike.

Some people say that professional workers such as doctors, nurses and teachers who make greater contribution to the society should be paid more than those people in the field of sports and entertainment. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

The high incomes of celebs in the field of sports and entertainment have always been a matter of dispute. I disagree that doctors, nurses and teachers should be paid more than these celebrities. I shall put forth my arguments to support my views in the following paragraphs.

No doubt that doctors, nurses and teachers are making a great contribution to society but the contribution of these celebrities is also no less. They provide us entertainment and inspiration and they also bring name and fame to our country. They are role models for the society and people follow them and listen to them.

My second argument is that they have a very short career span. Most of the people in the sports and entertainment field start their career at the age of 19-20 and retire by 33-35 years. A doctor, teacher or nurse does not ever retire if he does not wish to. For example, my uncle is a doctor and even at the age of 94 he goes to his clinic for two hours every day. Whatever these celebs earn is during these few years and after that they face struggle. Of course, there are exceptions such as the great legend Amitabh Bachhan but such examples can be counted on finger tips.

My final argument is that these celebs sacrifice their personal life completely and so they do deserve these high salaries. They cannot enjoy the common things of life like the common man does. They are always followed by the paparazzi and their children too always need security. This is too much price to pay for the high salaries they receive.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that people in the field of sports and entertainment well deserve their high incomes. Their services to the society are as important as, if not more, the services of doctors, teachers and nurses.

Some people think that introducing new technology can improve people's quality of life in the developing countries. However, others believe that free education should be offered. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Education and technology are instruments for accelerating development in the developing countries. The issue of debate is whether new technology should be provided in developing countries or free education should be offered. I believe that a combination of education and technology has to be given.

Those in favour of providing free education say that these countries need education before anything else. For the majority of underdeveloped countries, the quality of life is deteriorating despite several decades of development efforts. The gap between the developed and underdeveloped countries is therefore widening by the minute. It is very imperative that swift steps be taken to bridge this knowledge gap without which the economic and social disparity will widen even more rapidly. A good educational system should focus on laying the best foundation of knowledge and skill that are laid during the first years of education. What these countries need is good education and training that can match the technology revolution.

Supporters of technology say that most educational institutions in these countries lack quality educational materials. Library collections have become out of date and the laboratory equipment is most often old. Therefore, it would seem almost impossible for these countries to setup efficient educational systems without the availability of multimedia and information technology.

What is more, students can use technologies to access courses not available at their school; rural students can complete their studies without leaving their communities, and adults can take advantage of a more flexible study schedule. Cultural development will also benefit as knowledge-bases of art, culture and history can be easily created, made widely accessible and easily updated.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that the best possible thing to do would be to provide both education and technology simultaneously. It would also be a much cheaper alternative to provide education with the help of technology.

Nowadays, people always throw the old things away when they buy new things, some people claim that the broken things should be repaired and used again. What factors cause this phenomenon? What effects the phenomenon leads to?

Modern culture is a consumerist one. It is also known as \_disposable culture' or \_use and throw' culture. In this essay I shall deal with the causes and effects of this phenomenon.

The most important reason leading to this phenomenon is the consumerist society we belong to today. We are flooded with choices and we want to buy the latest models of things and the latest fashion of clothes. Even the buying capacity of the average person has increased because of developing economies. Secondly, in order to buy more and more things, people have become workaholics and therefore they don't find time to get things repaired. Finally, the manufacturing companies are compromising quality when they are doing mass production of things. So the things stop functioning very soon and sometimes the repair is costlier than the product. So, naturally, repair has taken a back seat.

The most serious effect of this phenomenon is on the environment. Our landfill sites are filling up with non bio-degradable wastes. It is also leading to pollution. Destroying used plastic is becoming a major problem everywhere. Even the recycling of plastic needs a lot of electricity. Conventional methods of generating electricity add to pollution. Disposing of a lot of waste materials such as heavy metals like lead and mercury and poisonous gases also adds to pollution. It is said that the earth can satisfy everybody's need but not everybody's greed. The amount of energy used in manufacturing and disposal of consumer goods is also leading us to a brink of energy crises.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that there are many causes and effects of this use and throw culture and steps must be taken on a war footing by the individual and government if we want to save our environment for our coming generations.

An increase in production of consumer goods results in damage of the natural environment. What are the causes and possible solutions?

Today we live in an era of continuously increasing consumer demand. This rate of consumption is increasing at an alarming rate. This essay shall deal with the causes of increase in production goods and how it affects the environment and suggest some ways forward.

The first and foremost reason for the increase in production of consumer goods is the <u>burgeoning population</u> of today. More people lead to more demand. Secondly, because of globalization people are flooded with <u>choices</u>. When they see a new product they want that too. What is more, the buying capacity of people has gone up because of developing economies. Finally, the manufacturing industries are producing cheaper consumer goods by compromising with quality. These are affordable by the common man but the quality is so bad that they cannot be repaired. Mostly they <u>have to be discarded</u> after some time of use.

The most serious effect of this phenomenon is on the environment. Our landfill sites are filling up with non bio-degradable wastes. It is also leading to pollution. Destroying used plastic is becoming a major problem everywhere. Even the recycling of plastic needs a lot of electricity. Conventional methods of generating electricity add to pollution. Disposing of a lot of waste materials such as heavy metals like lead and mercury and poisonous gases also adds to pollution. It is said that the earth can satisfy everybody's need but not everybody's greed. The amount of energy used in manufacturing and disposal of consumer goods is also leading us to a brink of energy crises.

The solutions are not easy. Steps have to be taken on a <u>war footing</u>. People have to be made <u>aware</u> of the disastrous consequences of consumerism. People should buy only what is absolutely necessary. As far as possible <u>biodegradable materials</u> should be used as raw materials and excessive packaging should be avoided. Industries should be encouraged to use <u>alternative sources of energy</u> during production.

<u>Quality</u> should not be compromised with. This would definitely help in reducing the useand-throw culture. Finally, <u>waste disposal methods</u> should be very good. Strict action should be taken against those industries which dump their effluents indiscriminately.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, consumerism is rampant nowadays and it is having a detrimental effect on our environment but steps can be taken to minimize the bad effects of excessive consumerism.

Young people are often influenced in their behaviours and situations by others in the same age. This is called —peer pressure". Do the disadvantages outweigh the advantages

No man is an island' – goes the adage. We are all surrounded by others – our peers – people our age who have experiences and interests similar to ours. We make dozens of decisions everyday and are influenced by each other's choices and behaviours. Similarly, young people are influenced by peers because they want to fit in, be like peers they admire, do what others are doing, or have what others have. No one is immune to peer pressure. Peer pressure can be both, positive as well as negative but mostly it is positive.

On the positive side, peers set plenty of good examples for each other. If peers are committed doing well in school or doing their best in a sport then they can influence those around them to be more goal-oriented, too. Secondly, peers who are kind and loyal can influence others to build these qualities in themselves. What is more, peers can help each other make decisions such as what courses to take and even how to handle a family argument. Peers often give each other good advice. Peers might get each other involved in clubs, sports, or religious groups. One's world would be far less rich without peers to encourage or to offer moral support when one needs it most.

On the negative side sometimes, peers may pressurize each other into doing something wrong, such as shoplifting, taking drugs or drinking or taking dangerous risks when driving a car. Nearly everyone ends up in a sticky peer pressure situation at some point. Young people are going through a lot of stress in their life as it is the time when the most crucial decisions of life have to be taken such as pursuing a career or choosing a life partner. It is very easy at such times to succumb to negative peer pressure.

Responding to peer pressure is part of human nature — but some people are more likely to give in, and others are better able to resist and stand their ground. I firmly believe that the stress of resisting unhealthy peer pressure can be buffered by good family relationships and a high self-esteem. So, the onus falls on the parents to give a stable family atmosphere and talk to their children about peer pressure. Explain what a powerful force it can be, and tell them that the excuse that "Everyone did it" will never be accepted and that they will be held responsible for their actions.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that peer pressure is inevitable and it can be positive as well as negative. However, if parents teach their children how to handle negative peer pressure, it can be largely positive.

Some people think parents should read or tell stories to children, while others think parents need not do that, as children can read books, watch TV or movies by themselves. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

It has been rightly said that \_There have been great societies that did not use the wheel, but there have been no societies that did not tell stories.' The question of debate is whether parents should read or tell stories to children or whether children should come to know about stories themselves by reading books or by watching TV or movies. In this essay I intend to discuss both views followed by my opinion.

There are many benefits of reading bedtime stories to children. First of all, it encourages family bonding. In this day and age of hectic lives and busy schedules, reading together is a simple and enjoyable way for parents to take time out and focus on the family. Children also feel wanted and loved. What is more, it moulds children into becoming readers, and this significantly increases the child's potential for academic success as well as lifelong success in general. It also helps children master language development as by listening to stories, children learn pronunciation and vocabulary. It also builds listening skills, increases a child's attention span, and develops the ability to concentrate. It develops children's ability to express themselves more confidently, easily, and clearly in spoken and written terms. It develops and fosters a child's natural curiosity.

Furthermore, it develops creativity and a child's ability to use his own imagination. It expands children's horizons by exposing them to new situations, and teaches them appropriate behavior. Reading children's stories to children provides the best opportunities for true teaching moments as most of these stories have morals. Reading picture books develops a young child's appreciation for the arts through exposure to many different styles of art and illustrations.

On the other hand, some opine that children should themselves read stories from books or watch them on TV and in movies. This would be much easier for the parents who are too busy nowadays, but then all the above benefits would not ensue. What is more, parents can start telling stories to children much before children can themselves read. Watching TV does not help the child to develop imagination and this may be detrimental in the long run. Moreover, it would be difficult to monitor what children are actually learning.

To sum up, I pen down saying that it is always better for the parents as well as the children, if parents read aloud to their children. This would give them quality time together and loads of other benefits which I have discussed above. I pen off with a famous quote of Robert Mackee —Stories are the creative conversion of life itself into a more powerful, clearer, more meaningful experience. They are the currency of human contact.

Some people think typical teaching of a teacher and students in the class will not exist by the year 2050. Do you agree or disagree?

Technology is progressing at an exponential pace and this makes it very difficult to predict what the schools and the teacher-taught relation of 2050 will be like. However, I do agree with the given statement that the typical teaching of a teacher and students in the class will not exist by 2050.

Education will be driven by technology and learning will be able to happen anytime and anywhere. Students will also be able to make choices in how they learn the content. Learning will be based on individual interest and need. It will no longer be the \_one size fits all' approach. Technology will serve as a means to the resources that students will be able to utilize in order to broaden their learning.

Teachers will become facilitators of knowledge and no longer the only experts because of the rapid and constant changes and additions to information that can be found. For example, the amount of medical knowledge doubles every eight years; it is said that half of what an engineering student learns in their first year is obsolete or revised by the time they graduate. The teacher will still guide students through learning but it will be impossible for teachers to have all the knowledge with technology that is capable of finding more than can be learned. The teacher will still be needed to help students learn where to locate information and help students evaluate sites and resources for validity.

Specialists in technology will need to be part of the educational environment to constantly enrich the learning environment for students. Each child will have a portable computer and textbooks will not exist. Teachers will use tablet PCs and projectors to call up images at the front of the classroom at the touch of a button, with the old sound of chalk on a blackboard being replaced by the hum of desktop computers.

To sum up, I pen down saying that despite all the new technology in 2050, school would still remain a social occasion and teachers would still be there even if their way of imparting knowledge would be driven by technology.

Individual greed and selfishness has been the basis of the modern society. Some people think that we must return to the older and more traditional values of respect for the family and the local community in order to create a better world to live in. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Dwight D. Eisenhower has rightly said that -A people that values its privileges above its principles soon loses both. Therefore, I agree with the given statement that we must revert to the golden times when we valued traditions and respected the elderly and our neighbourhoods so that we have a happier world and a happier tomorrow.

Today we live in an era of technology in which the whole Earth has shrunk and become a global village. Everybody is connected to everybody through telephone lines and the internet but the warmth of relationships has taken a back seat. Most people have more than enough wealth, comfort and freedom but their hearts desire even more. To satisfy their hearts greed people have become workaholics and as a result have no time for family and friends. People have become selfish, isolated and indifferent. Each person is busy in his own quest for more. To add to it, the youngsters who are at ease with the new technology think that the elderly are good for nothing and that is why they don't respect them.

On the other hand, life in the past was slower and simpler. People loved and respected each other. Family members had a lot of face-to-face contact with each other. Older members of the family were well looked after and their advice was valued. Divorces were very rare as marriage was considered a sacred institution. Moreover, community gettogethers were often organized and people knew the farthest neighbours. Nowadays, the next-door neighbours are also not recognized. There were lesser worries and tensions.

Living in this modern toxic world, we are all slowly being poisoned to death. Therefore, it is clear that the traditional value-based society is a better world to live in. We cannot return from the age of the jet plane to the age of the bullock cart but we can certainly return to these traditional values to try to create a modern world which has both, material wealth and prosperity and also respect for the family and local community.

Some people think foreign visitors should be charged more than local people when they visit the cultural and historical attractions in a country. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

International tourism has become the backbone of many economies of the world and these countries rely heavily on the tourist dollar. That is why some people opine that foreign visitors should be charged more than the domestic tourists. Although these people have their arguments for their opinions, personally, I disagree with this practice.

It is a common in many Indian tourist places to see rate tables such as the following:- Taj Mahal, Agra: Indian Citizens Rs 20, Foreigners Rs 970; Fatehpur Sikri, Agra: Indian Citizens Rs 50, Foreigners Rs 485. The increase in prices is due to the fact that the Indian rupee is much weaker than currencies of many European countries and other developed nations. Therefore, such tourists can afford to pay without feeling the pinch, and the upkeep of historical monuments is done through this money. Secondly, foreigners are accustomed to prices being much higher in their home countries. For example, entry to the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art is US\$20 (Rs 886). In that context, the Taj – an acknowledged wonder of the world, with centuries of tradition and some of the most striking architecture ever created by man – is very reasonable at Rs 970.

There are many reasons to oppose the above view. Firstly, it is unfair and leads to discrimination. Come to think of it – if an Indian visiting a foreign country has to pay similar high rates, what would be the reaction? On the one hand we brag about \_Atithi Devo Bhava' (meaning that guest is like God), and on the other hand we fleece these tourists by charging them astronomically high rates. What impression of our country would these tourists take home with them?

Another reason to oppose the above view is that foreign travelers may never come again and this could deter their friends and all others who get this negative information. As it is, the international tourists spend a lot by staying, wining, dining and traveling in the foreign country and so it would be a big loss to that country in the long run.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, it is not good to charge foreign tourists more than local tourist because it would be unfair and it would be a short sighted approach of earning the tourist dollar.

Some think that children should start school as early as possible, while others believe that they should start school at the age of seven. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

#### Version 1

Education is very important for everyone. Some people think that children should begin their formal education at a very early age whereas others opine that they the age of seven years is the best for young people to commence educational studies. I agree with the latter view for several reasons, which I will explain below.

It is irrefutable that children who begin to study at a very early age have more chances to succeed in the future. It is a well known fact that the younger an individual is; the easier it is for him to acquire new knowledge and information. Such children get a head start in learning which will definitely give them an advantage in their later school years. They gain more knowledge and experience which are priceless and valuable.

However, I think that every child must have his or her childhood. Children should learn through playing and communication with their friends and parents. Childhood comes but once in life and should be spent as much as possible with parents. I think that such basic qualities as kindness, self-confidence and just a good sense of humour cannot be gained from studying.

Another important aspect of this is that children at their early ages need more exercise because at this age the development of their body is a very essential aspect. The stress of school and homework stifles the growth of many children. As it is, there are very many years of schooling for children even if they start at seven.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that children should have their careless childhood with no responsibilities. Moreover, I am sure that playing helps them develop not only their bones and muscles but their ability to make decisions, analyze things, make conclusions, which is very good for their future.

#### Version 2

Education is very important for everyone. Some people think that children should begin their formal education at a very early age whereas others opine that they the age of seven years is the best for young people to commence educational studies. I agree with the former view for several reasons, which I will explain below.

It is irrefutable that children who begin to study at a very early age have more chances to succeed in the future. It is a well known fact that the younger an individual is; the easier it is for him to acquire new knowledge and information. Such children get a head start in learning which will definitely give them an advantage in their later school years. They gain more knowledge and experience which are priceless and valuable.

Another advantage with students beginning their school studies earlier involves their use of time. Unfortunately, many younger children waste a considerable amount of time at home Their activities are often counter-productive 'time-fillers' such as watching cartoons on TV and Video and other general time wasting activities at home. On the other hand, when students attend school, they are purposefully engaged in activities that stimulate their minds and encourage them to develop and improve.

Students who go to school at an earlier age give themselves the best possible chance to discover their natural talents. They may be good at science or mathematics or music and by starting school earlier, they are able to explore and build a stronger foundation upon these skills than if they had waited until age six or seven. They can build upon the successes enjoyed at an early age.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying it is clearly a good idea for younger children to attend school at an earlier age.

Environmental problems are too big for individual countries and individual persons to address. In other words, we have reached the stage where the only way to protect the environment is at an international level. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

Climate change is a phenomenon affecting all people in all walks of life, from individual citizens to whole countries and huge multinational companies. Therefore, I disagree with the notion that the only way to address the environmental problems is at international level. I firmly believe that this colossal problem can only be handled if all individuals contribute; all governments take steps at national level and also join hands at an international level.

Many steps can be taken at the national and international level. By imposing restrictions on emissions and by strictly monitoring waste disposal from factories, plants and businesses, governments would go a long way towards preventing climate change. Furthermore, governments around the world should come up with solutions to help prevent imminent environmental disaster. The Kyoto Agreement in the 1990s tried to create international consensus to limit industrial emissions of gases. Many countries which are part of United Nations signed this agreement according to which they would not allow any industries to be set up which emitted more than 5.2% carbon dioxide.

Some people claim that individual action is irrelevant in the face of massive, wide- scale prevention policies set and controlled by governments. On the other hand, it is also a fact that individual action combined with governmental action can do a lot more to prevent climate change than if individual citizens were not involved. In a world of six billion people, if everyone stopped wasting water, disposed of their rubbish properly, started accepting recycled material and stopped succumbing to consumerism then it would go a long way in solving the problem of environment.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that individual citizens cannot sit back and say it is someone else's responsibility to protect the environment; we must all play our part - individual citizens and governments at the national and international level.

In most of the societies, the role of mother and father differs. What are the causes of this difference? What will be the parental roles in future?

(IELTS essay that came on 4th April 2009, India. (Essay was written by Aastha and she scored 7.5 bands in writing)

Families are the building blocks of the society. Parents play an incredible, crucial and indispensable role for the development of children. Fathers and mothers both have an individuality and are equally responsible for the growth of the child physically, mentally and emotionally. But still most of the societies have a different thinking that their role differs. So here I would like to discuss the reasons of these differences.

In most of the societies especially the remote areas and villages people believe that role of mother s just to give birth to a child and look after child's schooling, eating and home works and father is the one who brings the money for bread and butter and doesn't have to do anything with the child's care. Due to this women are deprived of working out and even the education. First and foremost reason for these differences is the people are illiterate and 60% of the people are still below the poverty line. They are not aware of the good and bad things. Secondly, they follow the old fuddy-duddy customs and traditions.

Thirdly I believe that in these old fashioned societies people don't have family planning, birth rate is high so women are forced to sit at home and feed the children. And all the burden of child's development comes on her shoulders and men have nothing to do except working and earning money. Just imagine if he is asked in which class his child studies he has to thinks so hard and even then he doesn't recollect. If women go out and work then older people get skeptical and scold them as they are narrow minded.

But in the future the scenario will change. We are living in an era of globalization and westernization in 21<sup>st</sup> century. We are influenced of western culture. Nowadays people are educated, literate and aware of things and broadminded. Parents understand their responsibility and work equally for the holistic development of the child. And in the future conditions will improve a lot. Parents will plan the things for the bright and shiny future of their children. And they will be united and the child will not be deprived of the fathers love. Both will work so that they can do savings in the future for their child and presently in urban areas things are like this only.

So in the end to put it into a nutshell, I pen down saying that both the parents play an important role for overall development of child. The word parent is incomplete if anyone is missing. Like with a single hand we can't clap, similarly if a single parent is there, the child's development is incomplete. And we should remember – man has made these superstitions and old customs and we humans can only lessen them.

Unity has a power so we all should stand together to aware those societies and make an egalitarian society in the future to make our children better individuals.

Some people believe that women should play an equal role as men in a country's police force or military force, such as the army, while others think women are not suitable for these kinds of jobs. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

Increasing numbers of women are choosing to work in the police and armed forces nowadays and have showed their mettle in these fields. Some individuals opine that women should be able to work shoulder to shoulder with men in these fields. Others disagree and say that women are not suited for such jobs. In the following paragraphs I intend to discuss both views.

Nowadays we are heading towards an egalitarian society in which all should have equal rights. Therefore, women should have the same right as men to choose their profession. People should be chosen for jobs based on their skills, qualification and character. So if a woman has enough ability to join armed forces, she should be welcome to become a soldier or a police officer. Gender should not come in the way of the selection process.

On the other hand some people say that women lack physical strength and therefore they are not fit to be in the army or police as these jobs require physical strength. I would however, argue that it would be wrong to say that women are less able than men in certain jobs. In fact, women may be better at controlling a situation by communicating more effectively. Police and military jobs require more than just physical strength. Teamwork, leadership and communication may be just as important.

It could be argued that even physical strength can be increased by effective workouts and muscle training. Women who join such jobs do undergo rigorous training and are no less than men when they are on the job. It is also a matter of personal choice. More and more men are now entering fields such as nursing and

teaching which were earlier thought to be a woman's domain. So, it should come as no surprise if women choose to enter the police and armed forces.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that women should have the same role as men in police and armed forces. It is the need of the times.

Some people think that men and women have different qualities. Therefore, some certain jobs are suitable for men and some jobs are suitable for women. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is understandable that some people believe that the physical and genetic differences between men and women equip them for different activities and skills. However, in today's scenario both men and women are working shoulder to shoulder in all jobs. Men are successfully working in caring jobs such as nursing and teaching and women are proving their mettle in the army and police force. Therefore, I disagree with the above notion.

Because women have babies, they have traditionally worked in the home in most cultures. In addition, employed women have tended to dominate the so-called 'caring professions' such as teaching, nursing or social work, and this has reinforced the idea that women are particularly suited to such jobs.

However, as more and more women in different countries get jobs outside the home, it is clear that they are able to perform jobs that were traditionally only held by men. With high levels of education, even the highest positions in science, politics or law, for example, can be held successfully by women. Therefore, those who claim that the sexes can do the same jobs equally seem to have a good point, especially in terms of intellectual work.

There is also increasing scientific evidence that individual differences between people may be more important than gender differences. In other words, some women may be physically stronger than some men, while some male individuals may be more sensitive, or more caring than some women.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that in the modern world individual men and women can be trained to develop similar abilities. Differences in aptitude and talents are greater at the individual level than at the gender level.

Air travel can only benefit the richest people in the world. Ordinary people can get no advantage with the development of air travel. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

I disagree with the statement that air travel has advantages only for the wealthiest people and there are no benefits for the vast majority of the middle and lower class people. I shall put forth my arguments to support my views in the following essay.

There is no doubt that a few years ago, air travel was only for the upper strata of society. However, nowadays, most of the airline companies are offering economy class tickets which are affordable by the common man. On top of that, they have schemes by which if one buys a ticket well in advance then the cost of ticket is even lower. So, the given statement is not justified in today's scenario.

Even if we go with the notion that only the rich can travel by air, then also the ordinary man is benefitted in various ways. When rich tourists come to visit a place, they spend a lot in hotels, tourist places and also in the shopping centres from where they buy souvenirs. Many people are employed in the tourism industry. Even if they cannot travel themselves, their source of income is directly or indirectly dependent on these tourists who travel by air. For example, in India, during the tourist season, many guides, rickshaw wallas and taxi drivers earn enough to last them a whole year.

Moreover, it is a well known fact that, as tourists come, the governments spend on infrastructure such as stadiums roads and hotels. All these are used by the common man. Finally, the common man gets opportunity for culture exchange even without himself travelling by air. When other people come he learns about their culture and gives them the good points of his culture.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that air travel benefits all people and not just the most affluent.

Some people think that politicians have the greatest influence on the world. Other people, however, believe that scientists have the greatest influence. Discuss both of views and give your opinion.

It is irrefutable that both scientists and politicians have made great contributions to the societies worldwide and it would be difficult to say whose influence is greater. In the following paragraphs, I would highlight the role of both, politicians and scientists in our lives.

Politicians are elected by citizens to work for the betterment of the masses by enforcing regulations to maintain social harmony and law and order in the country. They represent the common man and do their best so that no one is devoid of their fundamental rights. They also represent their countries in matters where global co- operation is needed. They have the power to change the standing of their nation in the whole world. For example, the economic policies of our Prime Minister, Manmohan Singh have brought India way up in the eyes of the whole world.

On the other hand the contribution of scientists cannot be under estimated. They have made great progress in the field of medicine. Today, there is a cure for many fatal diseases such as cancers. Scientists all over the world are toiling whole- heartedly to find a cure for problems such as AIDS. It is the contribution of scientists that we have electricity and the automobile. The contribution of scientists in the field of communication has shrunk the whole planet Earth into a global village. The satellite TV and the internet have brought the world into the common man's bedroom.

Because of scientists' contribution, education has reached the remotest corners of the world, thereby reducing the gap between the rich and the poor. Scientists are working on fighting global warming. They are working on space tourism and exploring other planets for evidence of life.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that no doubt, politicians are very important for people but the contribution of scientists is much more. They have converted yesterday's fiction into today's reality.

The gap between the rich and the poor is becoming wider, the rich more richer, the poor even more poorer. What problems can the situation cause and give the solutions?

In this day and age, the gap between the affluent and the needy has increasingly widened. Such situation can be found not only between the developed and developing countries, but also among people of the same country. In this essay, I will analyze some possible problems caused by this and suggest some ways forward.

The most significant problem is that a vicious cycle emerges from which the poor find it difficult to come out. In order to make both ends meet both parents have to work for supplementary income and the children are left in the house unattended. Their future becomes blurred as they don't get quality education. This deprivation of the children is very high in ultra poor families.

Furthermore, poverty and conditions resulting from poverty such as lack of education leads people to lawlessness and violence (e.g. robbery, theft, kidnapping, rape, murder, gang war, and drug addiction). Their pent-up desires for the finer things in life find a common outlet in the commission of crimes. The underdeveloped economies of Asia and even America are full of high crime rates due to poverty.

Finally, the rich-poor gap alienates the poor in a discriminated manner. This invites the onset of revolution or terrorism. The political history of the global community such as in Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, Indonesia, and Philippines is abundant in poverty- related evolution of these events.

The solutions are not simple and steps should be taken on a war footing. The governments' effort could improve this situation. To begin with, luxuries should be taxed heavily. A balanced taxation should be there and the taxation administration should be improved to ward off fraud and evasion of taxes. Penalties against tax fraud and evasion should be more severe. Policymakers also need to focus on pushing up the bottom rather than dragging down the top. Free or highly subsidized education should be provided to the needy. The problem of youth unemployment should be dealt with by creating job opportunities. Self employment should be encouraged by promoting small scale industry. At the global level, international aid for poor countries is crucial for mitigating this phenomenon. International organizations, such as United Nations and World Bank, should provide support to developing countries in both technical and financial fields enabling them to improve infrastructure and strengthen industries.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, the increasing gap between the rich and the poor should not be ignored as it causes political and social instability in the country and effective steps should be taken to close this gap. It has been rightly said that - Inequality is not just bad for social justice, it is also bad for economic efficiency<sup>6</sup>.

Many people believe that today there is a general increase in anti-social behaviour and lack of respect for others. What might have caused this situation? How to improve it?

It is unfortunate that in the midst of vast progress in every field of life there is also a growth in the anti-social behaviour and people have become less respectful of each other. In the following paragraphs, I shall analyze some causes of this phenomenon and suggest some ways forward.

Today we live in an era of technology in which the whole Earth has shrunk and become a global village. Everybody is connected to everybody through telephone lines and the internet but the warmth of relationships has taken a back seat. Most people have more than enough wealth, comfort and freedom but their hearts desire even more. To satisfy their hearts greed people have become workaholics and as a result have no time for family and friends. People have become selfish, isolated and indifferent. Each person is busy in his own quest for more. To add to it, the youngsters who are at ease with the new technology think that the elderly are good for nothing and that is why they don't respect them.

The changing family structure is another big cause of this phenomenon. Earlier, people lived in joint families and the grandparents were there to supervise the children. Now there are nuclear families in which both parents go out to work and children are left unattended in the hands of pervasive media like the TV and the internet. No one monitors what they watch and they see the programs full of violence and crime which makes them anti social. The pressure of consumerist society and peers also breeds anti social behaviour. To add to it, the values of traditional culture are being lost and people are following the global culture which is also considered anti social by the orthodox elderly.

There are many solutions to this problem. To begin with, people have to learn to strike a balance between work and family life. Government should also fix the maximum hours a worker can work per week so that exploitation is not there in the job market. People should revert back to the old joint family system. This would be in the benefit of all. The children would learn moral values and the elderly would be well looked after. Negative effects of excessive consumerism should be taught to the people. Media can play a big role in highlighting the good points of the traditional and the western culture so that the people can adopt good social values.

Neighbourhood associations should be set up to connect people to each other.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, anti social behaviour and mutual lack of respect in today's times can be dealt with by taking simple measures and individuals and governments should collectively take these steps.

Most countries want to improve standard of living through economic development, however, others think social value is lost as a result. Do you think the advantages of economic development outweigh the disadvantages?

Economic development is one of the crucial measurements to evaluate the degree of social wellbeing in a society. In the race for achieving economic benefits man has to pay the price of loss of social values. Nonetheless, the pros of economic advancement outweigh its cons.

It is irrefutable that by the development of economy people can improve their quality of life. For example, in USA even the poorest of the poor has the basic amenities of life such as food, clothing and shelter. All the citizens enjoy high level of social welfare and they enjoy free medical care and free education. Even in countries like India and China, because International Companies have created many jobs and as a result, economic development has accelerated even further.

On the other hand, as every rose is accompanied by thorns, similarly in the quest for economic growth, social values have taken a back seat. People have become greedy and selfish and have no time for each other. Young generation has started following global culture and therefore they have forgotten moral values and do not respect their elders. People have become workaholics and so find it difficult to strike a balance between work and family life.

What is more, people resort to unethical means to enjoy their economic prosperity. In other words, economic growth causes people to seek other undesirable excuses to obtain satisfaction. Even in the business world, colleagues are not co-operative as in earlier times. As a result, the relationship of the people in the society is much worse than that in the past. Money-oriented society is not a very pleasant society to live in. No wonder, in the developed countries many people are downshifting and refusing promotions to give time to their family and society.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, economic development is a good thing and the people enjoy a better standard of living but there is some loss of social values. The onus is on the individuals to strike a balance between work and leisure to get all the advantages of economic development without the loss of social values.

<u>A report indicated that many children between 7 and 11 spend too much time watching television and/or play video games. How does the problem affect the children, their families and society? What measures can be taken to control it?</u>

Laurence J. Peter has rightly said that \_Television has changed the child from an irresistible force to an immovable object.' After coming home from school, children spend a lot of time in watching TV and playing video games. In the following paragraphs, I shall discuss the effects of this excessive TV viewing on the children, their families and society and also suggest some ways forward.

7-11 years is a crucial period of childhood after which children step into adolescence. This is the time when children develop the maximum, physically as well as mentally. The more time children spend on watching TV and playing video games, the less time they have for studying, exploring, playing and interacting with parents and friends. In addition, excessive TV viewing can result in obesity as kids are in- active and tend to eat junk food while watching TV. They are turning into couch potatoes. What is more, there is a lot of violence on TV which should not be watched by children. Communication has come down drastically within the family and even among children of the neighbourhood.

It is irrefutable that TV is one of the best ways to entertain and inform and even playing video games introduces children to technology which is the need of the hour. However, all this is good in moderation as there are lots of active ways of entertainment such as playing games or doing sports, which are actually much healthier. Moreover, children need interaction with the family and society for their holistic development.

The solutions are simple but the onus is largely on the parents. They should give quality time to their children and ration their TV viewing hours. Even the time to play video games should be set properly. Outdoor activities should be encouraged and neighbourhood societies should be formed where children can play outdoor games with each other. Parks should be maintained properly so that children have a safe place to play outdoors.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that television and video games, in moderation, can be a good thing. However, excess of everything is bad and therefore I believe parents should set viewing limits to ensure their children do not spend too much time watching TV.

Studies suggest that children spend more time watching TV than they did in the past and spend less on doing active or creative things. Why do you think it is the case? What measures and methods can be used to tackle with it?

Laurence J. Peter has rightly said that \_Television has changed the child from an irresistible force to an immovable object.' After coming home from school, children spend a lot of time in watching TV instead of playing outdoor games and pursuing other creative hobbies like in the olden days. In the following paragraphs, I shall discuss the causes of this phenomenon and also suggest some ways forward.

The first and foremost cause of this is that due to the satellite TV, this medium is available all the time. So much so, that some channels are exclusively dedicated to children. This has made it very easy for the parents who use TVs as baby sitters. Secondly, parents are busy to cope with the demands of the fast paced life of today and after coming home after a hectic days work do not have the energy to spend time with their children. In earlier times, there were very few programmes for children and because of slower life, even parents spent time with children.

Furthermore, earlier there were joint families and grandparents were there to look after children and encourage them to play in parks. Nowadays, there are nuclear families and children are left alone which makes them spend time by watching TV. Finally, the cities have become concrete jungles and there is no place for children to play outdoor games. On top of that, the climate changes brought about by global warming make it difficult to pursue outdoor games.

The solutions are simple but the onus is largely on the parents. They should give quality time to their children and ration their TV viewing hours. Even the time to play video games should be set properly. Outdoor activities should be encouraged and neighbourhood societies should be formed where children can play outdoor games with each other. Parks should be maintained properly so that children have a safe place to play outdoors.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that television and video games, in moderation, can be a good thing. However, excess of everything is bad and therefore I believe parents should set viewing limits to ensure their children do not spend too much time watching TV and pursue other creative activities like they did in the earlier times.

It has been suggested that everyone in the world want to own a car, a TV and a fridge. Do you think disadvantage of such a development outweigh advantages?

Today we belong to an era of materialism and everyone wants to have more and more in life. Things like a fridge, TV and car were the luxuries of yesteryears and have become the necessities of today. There are many advantages and disadvantages of this phenomenon but the disadvantages definitely outweigh the advantages.

On the positive side, the quest for material possessions is what keeps the society going. People work hard to fulfil their needs and achieve their goals. It is everyone's right to own the comforts of life. Secondly, because of the demand for such things, the national economy is boosted. Manufacturing units provide round-the-clock employment to thousands of people to produce things in bulk. Mignon McLaughlin has rightly said that, —Be glad that you're greedy; the national economy would collapse if you weren't.! What is more, when demand is more and mass production is done, then the cost of the things is cut down and the consumer is ultimately benefitted.

On the downside, this is leading to stress and strain in the lives of people. People have become workaholics and are missing out on the joys of family and social life. Sometimes, people even adopt unethical means to get these things and this leads to crime and violence. There is no harm in owning things such as a car, TV or fridge, but things turn bad when this simple materialism turns into over-materialism and people start wanting a TV in each and every room of the house and a car per person of the family. Our neighbours have a triple storey house and there is a refrigerator on every floor just for their comfort. People fail to draw the line between necessity and indulgence and this creates all problems. They fail to realize that - "If you live for having it all, what you have is never enough."

The most significant disadvantage of excessive materialism is on the environment. Manufacturers promote their products through ads and people are lured into buying new things even without need. It is a bitter truth that a society in which consumption is artificially stimulated in order to keep production going is a society founded on trash and waste, and such a society is a house built upon sand. For example, new models of TVs and refrigerators are introduced every other day and people just go and buy them even if they need those things or not. The disposal of old ones is adding to global litter and is destroying our environment.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, there is no harm if everyone wants to own a fridge, a TV and a car but it would be much better if we give importance to the word \_a' and instead of everyone the word should be every family.

Technological progress in the past century has its negative effect, despite its remarkable contribution. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Technological progress began in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century and the 19<sup>th</sup> century but that brought about more benefits than harms but the technological progress of the 20<sup>th</sup> century has crossed all boundaries that human beings could ever envisage. I definitely agree with the statement that technological progress has its dark side also despite its stupendous contribution.

The most significant progress in the 20th century is in the field of Information Technology. It has brought a revolution in the field of communication. Distances are no longer a barrier and the whole big planet Earth has become a global village. However, the same technology when used by terrorists can cause havoc in the life of humans. For example, who has not heard of the 26<sup>th</sup> November terrorist attacks in Mumbai, India? All the planning was done by terrorist with the help of the latest communication technology.

In the field of transport, we have superfast jet planes and international tourism has become the backbone of many economies of the world, but this has also lead to environmental pollution and excessive consumption of fossil fuels which is a non- renewable energy source. It has been rightly said that —Modern technology, owes ecology, an apology. What is more, in the quest for an unending source of energy, progress has been made in the field of nuclear technology but the construction of a nuclear power plant can also cause major threat to human life if a radiation leak occurred.

Technological progress has left no place untouched. Even in homes, people have the microwave ovens, dishwashers and washing machines to make life simpler but what is seen is that people have lost moral values and face to face communication has taken a back seat. In offices, computers finish work in minutes which earlier took days to complete but it has been seen that the expectation for work has also risen and men have had to become workaholics. Automation has made possible mass production but unemployment has also risen.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, technological progress has both pros and cons and the onus lies on us to use it for our benefit only otherwise it can become a boomerang for humanity and ultimately destroy our planet.

In today's society, more and more work is done by machines. Do you think the positive effects of the development overweigh the negative effects on individuals and society?

Modern technology has equipped us with machines. There are positive and negative effects of these machines on the individual and the society which I shall highlight in this essay. Overall the pros outweigh the cons.

On the positive side, machines are faster, more convenient and energy saving. Households and industries are much facilitated with machines. Personal use of machines gives people more free time to spend with family and pursue hobbies. Likewise, industrial use of machines reduces manpower for work and increases output. In the words of Oscar Wilde – -The fact is, that civilization requires slaves. The Greeks were quite right there. Unless there are slaves to do the ugly, horrible, uninteresting work, culture and contemplation become almost impossible. Human slavery is wrong, insecure, and demoralizing. On mechanical slavery, on the slavery of the machine, the future of the world depends.

On the negative side, machines reduce the need of manual work which can lead to unemployment especially in the developing countries. What is more, insufficient knowledge of machine handling and operating is detrimental to uneducated workers and they end up getting injuries or disabilities while working with machines. Technical failures can also disturb the whole working system and lead to losses. Other negative effects of machines are on the health of individuals especially the housewives who rely heavily on machines for the household chores. Machines are a failure where creative work is required. For example, the unique and original work done by many artisans can never be reproduced by any machines. It has been rightly said that a machine can do the work of a thousand ordinary men but no machine can do the work of one extraordinary man.

Overall, the positive effects of machines outweigh the negative effects on the individual and society. However, in developing countries, in order to meet the employment needs of the population, a balance has to be maintained between manual work and mechanization.

Many people who leave school hold a negative attitude towards learning. Why does this happen? How to solve the problem?

It is a harsh reality of today that many students are not satisfied with their education at school and have a negative attitude when they leave school. In this essay I shall discuss some reasons for this phenomenon and suggest some ways forward.

The first and foremost reason is that even after having graduated from school they are not sure of getting a suitable job. They see examples of their seniors around them who are still struggling to find jobs and even those who have found jobs are being underpaid and exploited.

Another reason for their negative attitude towards learning is that their course of study was forced upon them by their parents and their aptitude was not taken into consideration. For example, a student who wants to make his career in the field of music is forced to study engineering cannot be expected to be positive about his studies.

Another important reason is that the teacher-taught relation is very strained these days. The ugly claws of commercialism have crept into the field of education. Education has become a business and the student is the customer. Teachers are biased towards the rich or the brilliant students and this is very detrimental for the education process.

There could be many ways to address this situation. Firstly, while selecting courses, the students' aptitude should be taken into consideration. Parents also need counselling in this matter. Secondly, the infrastructure of the educational institutes should be improved which includes the faculty also. The pay scale of the teachers should be so lucrative that the best people want to enter this profession. Finally, there should be more stress in teaching a wide range of subjects rather than a narrow range so that when the student enters the job market there are a variety of choices for him to work in.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, there is no doubt that most students hold a negative attitude towards learning but the problem can be addressed in many ways.

An increasing number of people change their career and place of residence several times during their life time. Is this a positive or negative development?

The world is changing rapidly. People today face numerous challenges in achieving a meaningful and fulfilling life. One job for life is over. Old methods of career development no longer apply. No wonder, many people to change their careers and places of residence many times during their lifetime. This situation is largely a positive one.

There are some strong benefits that can come from a career change. One of the major reasons for changing careers is money; which can help to lessen the financial burden of an individual or family. Secondly, this general education that is formed through a career change will be beneficial in the future. Individuals with a wider range of job experiences and skill sets will be seriously considered for new job openings. Moreover, those who have a wide range of careers under their belt will also have more job security. If they lose their job, they can seek out jobs in different career fields, as opposed to one career field.

What is more, a change in career can be a liberating experience, for it frees people to consider a variety of professional and personal avenues that were previously closed to them because of their work attachments. Some choose to return to school to pursue courses of study that can lead into whole new careers, while others use their skills and experience to take a position similar to their previous one, but in a fresh environment. Many others choose to open their own small business. A person may finally discover a career which gives him the maximum job satisfaction.

There are also many advantages associated with the change of residence which comes along with a career change. Change of surroundings and new exciting experiences are useful for self-education and development of a person. Besides, these changes usually bring positive emotions, which help to fight stresses and have overall good effect on health. It is also very beneficial for the person's family as this change gives them the opportunity to make new friends, enjoy new cultures and experience new climates. In other words, it adds spice to life.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, changing careers and place of residence several times during a lifetime may bring some challenges in life but overall it is a positive development.

Nowadays more and more young people hold the important positions in the government. Some people think that it is a good thing, while others argue that it is not suitable. Discuss both these views and give your opinion.

Running a nation is an arduous task and in the present times more and more young people are holding top positions in government offices. Some people opine that this situation is good where as others are sceptical about it. In the following paragraphs, I intend to discuss both views followed by my opinion.

There are many advantages if young people hold the positions of power. To begin with, they are enthusiastic and zealous. They have a great vision and the spirit to take the nation forward. They are not confined to conventions and are willing to try new things. They are ready to face challenges. Secondly, they are better physically which enables them to fulfil some tough jobs.

What is more, young leaders could be a source of inspiration for the youth to step forward and do something for the benefit of the country. Finally, the young have a clean track record and the younger leaders are less prone to corruption and similar asocial activities than the old ones whose aim is to be in the seats of power somehow. Only youth has the innocence which can drive the motor of our country.

On the other hand, some argue that it is not proper to give the reins of the nation in raw hands. They feel that the young are impatient and lack social experience. Any of their hasty decisions may have serious consequences. They believe that the important posts should be in the hands of the more experienced sexagenarians and octogenarians. What they fail to see is that an emerging nation may not be able to cope with their conventional style of functioning.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, in the present scenario, it is better to let the emerging youth take the nation forward by offering them important posts in the government.

Some people think it is not necessary for adults to receive education in class. Self- study is a good way for them to study more effectively. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

When adults choose to study, it is mostly for self-enrichment, for enjoyment or selfimprovement, not to work toward a vocation or degree. They have two options in front of them. One is to do self study through various resources such as the internet or libraries and the other is by enrolling in regular classes. I do agree that self study is more convenient for adults; however, the most effective approach would be to do major part of the study on one's own and top it up with a few days in the classroom.

With the help of the Internet self-study can be a very useful way to learn anything nowadays. There are thousands of resources available on the Internet that can help one to traverse the ins and outs of any subject. Many sites also offer video tutorials. By utilizing the vast amounts of teaching resources as well as authentic materials, such as official online sites of some universities, one can really develop one's skills independently. Besides the Internet one can purchase textbooks or borrow books from libraries that can help in learning about any subject. Finally, self study requires very little finances and one can also look after family commitments.

There are some disadvantages of self study. To begin with, it is difficult to remain focused on study and one can get bored or distracted very soon. The teachers in the classroom setting can keep one focused on study. Secondly, while doing self study, there are chances that one can study incorrectly. Nonetheless, for adults self education is much more convenient as the classroom may not be in an approachable location or the timing may not suit them.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, as that there are many barriers to adult education such as time, money and family commitments, I agree to quite some extent that self study is a good way for them. However, I would also like to say that the ideal approach would be to have a blend of self study and classroom learning.

The movement of people from agricultural areas to cities to work can cause serious problems in both places. What are the serious problems and what measures can be taken to solve this problem?

The world is steadily becoming more urban, as people move to cities and towns in search of employment, educational opportunities and higher standards of living. This situation can cause serious problems in both, villages and cities which I shall discuss in this essay and also suggest some ways forward.

In cities, there is a lot of pressure on the resources such as land, water and infrastructure like public transport, places, health care, law and order etc. There is an increased demand for land which pushes the property prices. This also leads to encroachment of pavements and creation of slums. There is increase the demand and consumption of water. Limited access to drinking water poses serious health hazards and easy spread of water borne diseases across the masses. Health hazards resulting from urbanization are also connected to air pollution, as well as crime, traffic and lifestyle. The increase in urbanization throughout the world has been accompanied by a sharp growth in urban traffic and the public transport system of the urban cities is choked.

In villages, as more land exits farming, the local agricultural economy may suffer. Closer proximity to urban consumers and new output venues allow farmers to adapt their agricultural operations to higher value or specialty crops, such as fruits and vegetables. This has also led to an industrialization of farming and modern methods are being used to meet the demands of the increased population of cities. The small scale farmer has suffered as a result.

The solutions are not simple. What must be understood is that we cannot stop urbanization. Urbanization is synonymous with progress. Growth of cities is not bad; unplanned growth is bad. Careful planning of cities with the future in mind is required. This will reduce the creation of slum areas. Small-scale urban agriculture, intensive commercial peri-urban agriculture should be promoted. This will meet the food needs. Finally, strengthened and improved rural-urban linkages can make important contributions in improving the situation. If cities and villages are linked well with efficient public transport, many people would not shift to cities.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, urbanization can cause problems in both rural and urban areas but steps can be taken to combat the situation.

The major cities in the world are growing fast, as well as their problems. What are the problems that young people living in cities are facing with? Give solutions to these problems.

The world is steadily becoming more urban, as people move to cities and towns in search of employment, educational opportunities and higher standards of living. Urbanization creates opportunities and challenges on one hand and gives rise to different types of stresses and problems on the other. Rapid urbanization is coupled with the fact that nearly half of this population is below the age of 25. This essay shall deal with the problems faced by the youth in the cities and also suggest some ways forward.

The main problems faced by youth and everyone else in the rapidly expanding cities are because of pressure on the resources such as land, water and infrastructure like public transport, places, health care, law and order etc. There is an increased demand for land which pushes the property prices. This also leads to encroachment of pavements and creation of slums. There is little basic infrastructure for youth to access, ranging from parks and community centres, to basic services such as health, training and education. That is why there is an increase in crime and drug addiction.

Furthermore, there is increase the demand and consumption of water. Limited access to drinking water poses serious health hazards and easy spread of water borne diseases across the masses. Health hazards resulting from urbanization are also connected to air pollution, as well as crime, traffic and lifestyle. The increase in urbanization throughout the world has been accompanied by a sharp growth in urban traffic and the public transport system of the urban cities is choked. The youth in particular are severely stressed by these problems.

The problems faced by youth need to be tackled on a war footing. After all our youth are our most important resource and the time has come to address their problems. Youth can be engaged, not as leaders of tomorrow, but as leaders of today, through methods such as youth led development, and through international agencies working with local government to create safe and positive spaces in the cities in which youth are increasingly living in. The youth need to have safe urban based places in which they can call their own, where they can receive important information on issues such as HIV AIDS prevention, where they can receive job and entrepreneurship training, where they can practice and meaningfully engage in local governance, and where they can most importantly meet and co-exist peacefully with other youth.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that rapid urbanization has brought many problems for our youth but their problems can be addressed by engaging the youth in local governance and providing them proper education and job training so that they do not fall victim to the stress of urban life.

In some countries, small town-centre shops are going out of business because people tend to drive to large out-of-town stores. As a result, people without cars have limited access to out-of town stores, and it may result in an increase in the use of cars. Do you think the disadvantages of this change outweigh its advantages?

In recent years, because of urbanisation, a mushroom growth of large shopping malls has been seen in the suburbs of the cities and towns. Many people are worried that this phenomenon may lead to the increase in use of cars and this would not be good for the environment. Looking at the advantages of having large shopping malls in the outskirts of cities, I believe that the disadvantage of increased use of cars can be overlooked.

There are many benefits of having shopping malls in the out-of-town sites. To begin with, we all know that that the suburban land costs much less and therefore the rents and other operating costs of these shopping complexes is much less. Lower operating cost directly leads to lower prices. Secondly, the shopping centres in these areas would be definitely bigger because of more availability of land and so consumers will have more choices as more variety could be displayed.

Furthermore, it would help ease urban traffic and housing pressures the city centre. The city centres are already too congested and opening big shopping centres here would worsen the situation. We all know that rapid urbanisation is taking place and more and more people are shifting from the villages to the cities. If these shopping centres are on the outskirts of cities, they would be nearer to the neighbouring villages and many of them would not then need to move to cities as some comforts of the cities would be nearer to their homes.

Another big advantage would be that because of these shopping centres, more businesses would also relocate from the over-congested city centres to the suburbs and this would also help to lessen the overcrowding within the cities. It has also been seen that when people have to go far to do shopping, they plan it well so that they don't have to make very frequent visits and so it does not add a lot to the use of the car. Small town-centre shops are facing some challenge, no doubt, but they still have their place because of the personal touch and their ease of accessibility.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, having shopping centres in the suburbs definitely has more advantages than disadvantages.

In many cities, planners tend to arrange shops, schools, offices, and homes in specific areas and separate them from each other. Do you think the advantages of this policy outweigh the disadvantages?

City planners incorporate urban development to facilitate tourism, growing populations, and the citizens' needs for modern public facilities. In this quest, they arrange shops, educational institutes, offices and residential complexes in specific areas which are separate from one another. There are advantages and disadvantages of this policy but overall the advantages are much more.

The first and foremost advantage is that such planning helps in organizing traffic. Such places are also generally well linked by public transport because public transport is also part of urban planning. When all offices are in one location then people using their own cars can also do car pooling. For example, if five persons of one residential complex have to go for work in one area, then each one can take his car for one day in a week. It would be a win-win situation for both the people and the environment.

This would also keep the residential areas free from noise and traffic and worth living in. The cost of land in residential areas also remains less as they can never become commercial areas. Effective green spaces such as parks can also be maintained with this careful planning. What is more, if all shopping is confined to one area then such places can also attract tourism. For example, sector 17 Chandigarh is a well known shopping centre and is an attraction for tourists. Finally, such planning is cost effective because it is cheaper for the government to concentrate water supply and sewerage disposal in restricted areas.

On the other hand, there are some disadvantages. It encourages the use of cars because people have to cover long distances to go for shopping or to their work places. This is not good for the environment. It also wastes a lot of time of the students because they have to spend lot of time commuting to and from school. Some areas may be very near to schools and some may be very far off which is not suitable.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, careful urban planning is the need of the day. Shopping complexes and offices should be in separate areas and away from the residential areas. However, each residential area should be fed by one school nearby so that students are benefitted. Overall, the pros of city planning outweigh the cons.

Mobile phones have made life easier: anyone can use a mobile phone to answer/make work calls or home calls at any place 7 days a week. Do you think this development has more positive effects or negative effects on the individual and society?

Mobile phones have revolutionised the concept of communication. They have a big role in transforming the society into a 24/7 society. This development has its pros and cons but the advantages definitely outweigh the disadvantages.

On the positive side, mobile phones have simplified our lives. Today, we are well connected with our family and friends all the time. Earlier, if a person was late from work, his family would be worries about him till he returned home safe and sound. Today, one can inform his kith and kin of one's whereabouts. Today, if something goes wrong with your vehicle and you are stranded on the road then you can immediately call someone for help.

Nowadays, the shopkeeper does not miss an important customer just because he had to go home for five minutes for some urgent work. Even in offices which require fieldwork, a person can take advice from his seniors any time and fro anywhere. Some businesses, in fact, thrive on the mobile phone.

On the downside, cell phones can take away your calm and quiet. A person with a mobile phone cannot draw the line between work and leisure. If you don't answer the mobile phone or keep it switched off in your off-duty hours, then you are considered rude and if you answer, then your family life is in jeopardy. What is more, if you listen to a mobile phone while driving then you can cause accidents. Finally, the ads which come on cell phones can be very bugging especially when you are in the middle of an important meeting.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, mobile phones actually make our life simpler and more convenient. It is in our hands to know where to draw the line and use them to our benefit only.

Some countries have introduced a law to limit working hours for employees. Why is this law introduced? Do you think it is a positive or a negative development?

There are countries in the world such as USA, Canada, Australia and many more where a person cannot work for more than 40 hours a week. In my opinion, it is a positive development. In the following paragraphs, I shall discuss why this law was introduced and my arguments to support my views.

This law was mainly introduced with a view to protecting the economic rights of the workers, and preventing exploitation. It is seen that in places where there is no such law, employees are exploited and instead of a normal working from 9am to 5pm, they are made to sit in offices from 9am to 9pm at no extra pay. Many other benefits of this law such as improvement in the physical and mental health of the employees and better family relations automatically followed.

This law is beneficial because, in this fast moving world of today, people have become workaholics. In order to satisfy their material desires, they are forgetting to draw a line between work and family. If working hours are fixed, then they have enough time for their family life and leisure. Secondly, overworking leads to stress and can lead to nervous breakdown in extreme cases. People also find time for their regular exercise if working hours are fixed.

Furthermore, having a limit on working hours also helps solve the problem of unemployment. More number of people working for a fixed number of hours is better than lesser number of people working more number of hours. What is more, it has been proved by researches that having a limit on the working hours, increases the output and productivity of employees. This could be a win-win situation for both, the employer and employee. Finally, it can be said that chances of exploitation of employees is much less if there is a limit on the working hours.

Some people oppose this law by saying that it is an infringement of rights. They say that if a person has the ability to work more, he should be allowed to work.

Sometimes a person may need more money for his personal needs and so it is unfair to not let him work more. Nonetheless, it has been seen that in countries where such laws are there, people have a better life, better working conditions, lesser degree of unemployment and better productivity of employees.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, this law was imposed in the benefit of employees and employers and it has many advantages.

In some countries, it is illegal for companies to reject job applicant for their age. Is this a positive or negative development?

Age discrimination occurs when a decision to hire is made on the basis of a person's age. There could be a reluctance to hire young workers on the basis of lack of experience, or there could be a bias against older workers. I believe that this is a positive development. In the following paragraphs, I intend to support my views with my arguments.

My first argument is that age is not necessarily an indication of inferior ability or potential. Therefore, treating a person less favourably purely on the basis of their age is very unreasonable and unfair. If a particular elderly worker truly has, say, less concentration or manual strength than a younger worker, and this makes him less qualified for the particular job, then employers can still make their decisions based on his relative lack of suitability for the job – not on his age. Age by itself should not be a determinant.

Secondly, age discrimination reduces productivity because job and advancement opportunities are inefficiently matched to workers and talent is wasted. Higher participation rates among older workers lead to better matching of jobs to people, increased employment rates, and enhanced competition among workers that will stimulate the labour market in the longer run. What is more, if the elderly are discriminated against on the basis of age then it would cause a strain on public resources because the ageing population is largely a dependent population.

Finally, discrimination discourages potentially talented job seekers from applying. As a result, employers lose by having a smaller pool of workers to choose from. In societies that celebrate youthfulness above all else, even highly qualified professionals resist from applying for new openings after the age of 50. In some cases, the fear of age discrimination has led to an increasing demand for cosmetic surgery.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, having a legislation against age discrimination while hiring is a positive development because it is fair, it adds to economy and employers have more choices while recruiting.

Pollution and other environmental problems are resulting from a country's developing and becoming richer. Some think this cannot be avoided. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

All the things that human beings have designed and devised for comfort have some kind of repercussion for the environment. The industrial revolution was the main cause of environmental damage. However, I disagree that this cannot be avoided. I think it is possible to achieve progress without damaging the environment. Fortunately technology has advanced enough that environmental damage is no longer necessary for further progress.

It is irrefutable that in our quest for development and becoming richer, we have harmed some of our environment. Most of the things we use require some kind of energy to manufacture, operate and maintain. Disposing-off these things is very difficult too. Most of the energy that we use is polluting the environment. Renewable energy forms a very small part of what is used on a significant scale. Effluents from large factories are being dumped indiscriminately and landfill sites are filling up with non-biodegradable wastes. All this is being done in the name of progress.

Nevertheless, I still refute the statement that the damage to the environment is inevitable. I think it is possible to achieve progress without damaging the environment. For instance, we know that there are renewable sources of energy which are lesser polluting. Already there are people who are designing houses that do not require air conditioning even in the extremes of temperature. For example, they are using prefabricated material such as aluminum for doors and windows.

There are people who are trying to ensure that dependence on modern conveniences remains a luxury and does not become an absolute necessity. I feel that if there is awareness, we can achieve progress literally in its true meaning and without losing any single bit of our environment.

The answer lies in the green technologies which increasingly use renewable resources of energy. We should also remember the three -Rs - reduce, reuse and recycle. In this way we can achieve an ecologically sustainable development. In order for progress to cause minimum damage to environment, sustainability has to be worked at.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, earlier we could say that - Industrial Revolution = Progress = Environmental Damage; but fortunately technology has advanced enough that environmental damage is no longer necessary for further progress.

Scientists say that junk food is harmful to people's health. Some say the way to ask people to eat less fast food is to educate them, while others say education does not work. Discuss both sides and give your own opinion.

It is irrefutable that junk food is harmful to people's health. It contains a lot of fats and salts which are detrimental to health. Therefore some people say that people should be educated and made aware of its harmful effects. However, others opine that education does not help in making people eat less junk food. In the following paragraphs I intend to discuss both issues and finally give my opinion.

Some opine that educating people about the harmful effects of junk food can help in reducing its use. The fact is that people don't actually know what goes in the making of fast food. Fast foods are high in calories and low in nutrition. These foods are rich in harmful substances such as fat, salt, and sugar. Preservatives are also added in junk food. All these things can cause heart diseases, cancer, diabetes, and obesity. Obesity is one of the major problems in the world today. It is very important to reduce eating Junk foods for the healthy life. So, if people are warned about their bad effects, they would eat less of it. This can be done with the help of media such as TV which is ubiquitous nowadays.

On the other hand some believe that educating people won't help because junk food is very cheap, tasty and readily available. After a hectic days work no one is in a mood to spend time in the kitchen and so junk food is very convenient. It is also not very expensive and children love it. What is more, fast food outlets spend a lot to lure people with their ads. What people don't realize is that the celebs they use in these ads hardly ever eat such food themselves and if they do, then they also spend hours working out in the gym every day.

After considering the convenience of fast foods, I believe that educating people would not help. It would be better if these fast food outlets were educated about making fast food healthier. Strict rules should be laid down against using trans-fatty acids and saturated fats. Whole wheat breads could be used instead of white breads. Use of preservatives should be lessened and juices should be served along with such foods instead of carbonated drinks.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, fast food is harmful but still people eat it. Therefore, educating people would not help. Measures should be taken to improve the fast food. After all, all fast food is not bad.

Some people have benefited from modern communications technology, but some people have not benefited from it at all. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Modern communication technology has developed beyond imagination. We have the cell phones, the Internet and the satellite TV as few of the examples of modern communication technology. I disagree that it has not benefited some people. I believe that some form of modern communication technology has touched the lives of every person on Earth. In the following paragraphs I shall put forth arguments to support my views.

The most pervasive of all communication technologies is the TV. Television has come a long way since the black and white box that Philo Farnsworth invented in 1927. Modern technology has changed the television into a magic box. The satellite TV of today broadcasts programmes from all over the globe. Not only that, television has become ubiquitous today. There is hardly any household which does not own at least one TV. It has reached the remotest places and people of all age groups enjoy it. Therefore we can say everyone has benefited from it.

Next, we can take the example of the cell phone. Today, cell phone can be seen in the hands of every Tom, Dick and Harry. Because of the connectivity it offers, even the elderly, who were supposed to be technophobes, have started using the cell phone. Today, everyone is connected to their kith and kin at any time of the day and night and from any corner of the Earth. Even in times of network failure, text messages can always be sent. There is no doubt that the latest 3G and 4G enabled phones are still used by a small minority because of their cost factor but the simplest ones are available at throwaway prices and within the reach of the common man.

Talking about the internet, there is no doubt that it still has to touch the lives of many, still it is fast catching up with the other means of communication technology. Even the developing and underdeveloped countries have started realizing its importance and have started providing this technology to their inhabitants so that they can catch up with the rest of the world.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, there is hardly any person nowadays who is not touched by the modern communication technology in some form or the other. It may appear that few people are untouched by this technology but directly or indirectly it has benefited every person on Earth.

Some people think that robots are very important to human's future development, while others think they are dangerous and have negative effects on society. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

Robots are artificially created intelligent electro-mechanical devices. They are designed by human beings to assist in performing some activities that are considered tiresome and boring and at times risky. Some individuals opine that these robots would be pivotal in the future development of mankind. However, others are skeptical and fear that these robots will have negative effects on society. In the following paragraphs, I intend to discuss both views.

To begin with, robots speed up the production process and are very good in repetitive tasks. For example, it is a well known fact that the leading products made in the developed countries like Japan are made by the help of intelligent machines or robots. What is more, robots can be operated 24 hours per a day which can also raise the productivity of the companies. Secondly, in the field of medicine, robots have been used to do complicated surgeries. For instance, in robotic eye surgery there are no tremors in the hands of robots and therefore the scope of serious errors is much reduced with the help of robots.

Robots can also work in extreme conditions where humans are helpless. For example, robots helped a great deal in the rescue operations due to the tsunami and were used in nuclear environments to close the reactors of Fukushima. Robots will change the way we live in many ways by lifting more and more tasks off our shoulders. Robots can help us to do household duties like cleaning our house or washing dishes. This way, we have more time to do useful work, or spend the time with family or friends. Robot toys can play with children and help them in their development. Home security can be done by a robot, which can keep his attention up constantly and look out for unfamiliar situations like a fire or burglar.

However, there are some who think that robots may negatively affect people's life and also be extremely dangerous. There could be increase of unemployment in the future. It is expected that robots could replace many people at their working place. One of evidence for this is that few robots have already started to teach children at schools, others have been working as servants for several families. And it is clear, that some employers will choose cheap robots instead of humans, as they would work round the clock and also not take sick leave or coffee break.

In the near future, robots will join in our lives in various ways, and play a role of growing importance. Robots will make our lives easier and increase our general living comfort. We have created the robots and we should know where to draw the line in their use so that we get the best out of them minus their disadvantages.

Nowadays, some workplaces tend to employ equal numbers of men and women workers. Do you think it is a positive or negative development?

Traditional male dominated workplaces are decreasing nowadays and some workplaces are giving jobs to equal number of men and women. I believe that this is a negative development. In the following paragraphs, I shall put forth my arguments to support my views.

My first argument is that reserving half the seats for women could lead to negative discrimination against men. Both men and women should have the same right to choose their profession. People should be chosen for jobs based on their skills, qualification and character. Gender should not come in the way of the selection process. Having a fixed quota would mean that some qualified men might be denied a job while some unqualified women would be given one.

Secondly, considering today's scenario, this quota might go against women. It has been seen in the recent years that more and more women are opting for higher education. For example, thirty years ago, in a typical class of any medical college, girls were far less as compared to girls. Today, the situation is reversed. This means that today some workplaces could be dominated by women. So, having a reservation in the workplace could mar the chances of deserving women. With high levels of education, even the highest positions in science, politics or law, for example, can be held successfully by women. Women have proved their mettle in many jobs traditionally thought to be the domain of men. Who has not heard of our IPS officer Kiran Bedi? Therefore, such a quota is not needed by the women of today.

Finally, it could be said that having a quota would not ensure moving towards an egalitarian society where all are considered equal. Those who tend to discriminate against women would find some other ways to discriminate such as by underpaying the women at the same posts as men.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, the trend of employing an equal number of men and women in the workplace is a negative development because it could lead to negative discrimination against men, it may boomerang against women and it is not needed by the women of today.

<u>Nowadays some individuals behave in an anti-society way, such as committing a crime. In</u> <u>general, it is the society to blame. What causes the anti-social behaviours of individuals?</u> <u>Who should be responsible for dealing with it?</u>

It is unfortunate that in the midst of vast progress in every field of life there is also a growth in the anti-social behaviour. People commit crimes and have become less respectful of each other. In the following paragraphs, I shall analyze some causes of this phenomenon and suggest some ways forward.

Today we live in an era of technology in which the whole Earth has shrunk and become a global village. Everybody is connected to everybody through telephone lines and the internet but the warmth of relationships has taken a back seat. Most people have more than enough wealth, comfort and freedom but their hearts desire even more. To satisfy their hearts greed people choose unethical means such as committing petty and serious crimes. People have become selfish, isolated and indifferent and do not think twice before doing anything wrong. Each person is busy in his own quest for more.

The changing family structure is another big cause of this phenomenon. Earlier, people lived in joint families and the grandparents were there to supervise the children. Now there are nuclear families in which both parents go out to work and children are left unattended in the hands of pervasive media like the TV and the internet. No one monitors what they watch and they see the programs full of violence and crime which makes them anti social. The pressure of consumerist society and peers also breeds anti social behaviour. Finally, unemployment is a cause of this phenomenon. The youth have a lot of energy and if it is not harnessed in the right direction can make them go astray and commit crimes. Therefore, it is essential that they don't suffer from the menace of unemployment.

The individuals themselves, the society and the governments should deal with this situation together. There are many solutions to this problem. To begin with, people have to learn to strike a balance between work and family life. Government should also fix the maximum hours a worker can work per week so that exploitation is not there in the job market. People should revert back to the old joint family system.

This would be in the benefit of all. The children would learn moral values and the elderly would be well looked after. Negative effects of excessive consumerism should be taught to the people. More and more employment opportunities should be created for the unemployed youth. Self employment can also be encourages.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, anti social behaviour and mutual lack of respect in today's times can be dealt with by taking simple measures and individuals and governments should collectively take these steps.

Some people think that it is necessary to travel abroad to learn about other countries, while other people think that it is not necessary to travel abroad because all the information can be seen on TV and the Internet. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

It is irrefutable that nowadays, because of technology, arm-chair tourism through which we can see all the information on television and the internet, has gained popularity. However, I disagree, that travelling abroad will no longer be needed. In fact, I believe that the popularity of foreign travel will grow even further due to publicity these places get because of TV and the internet.

First of all, computers can never replace real places. No matter how real and vivid computer images are, they are only images and can never be likened to the historical objects and natural wonders that we see in real or even might be allowed to touch with our fingertips. The difference can be compared to seeing the picture of a mango rather than actually eating it.

Secondly, visiting other countries is a rewarding experience in many respects. For one thing, it is a good exercise. When we make the trip to a foreign country then we visit the places of interest there, we get some exercise which does a lot of good to our health. We generally go with family and friends and enjoy a lot. We also learn about the culture and tradition of the place. All this broadens our horizons which can never be done by the passive activity of seeing something on the computer screen. At the same time we also get a chance to spread the good points of our own culture also.

Finally, I believe that after seeing these countries on TV or the internet, our craving to actually see these increases even more and so we make efforts to go and see these places. This can be proved by the overwhelming number of tourists to these places that has been increasing year after year. At certain times, especially when it is temporarily impossible for us to visit other countries in person, we can get a rough picture of what those countries are like. However, what we see from a computer screen is, after all, not exactly the same as what we see and feel with our own eyes on site.

In conclusion, arm-chair tourism is there today but international travel will still be needed.

Tourism is an excellent way to develop a country, but it can also cause harm. How can countries ensure that tourism benefits the development.

It is irrefutable that tourism has become the backbone of many economies of the world. In fact many countries rely on the tourist dollar for their development. This has also led to damage of the natural environment and at many places the tourist places have been so much littered that they have ceased being a tourist attraction any more. In a way tourism is killing tourism. In the following paragraphs, I shall discuss ways in which countries can ensure sustainable tourism.

The first step towards sustainable tourism would be that tourists benefit the local residents of the host country rather than the owners of the five star hotels where they normally stay. The governments and tourist companies could educate the local residents to make a part of their homes as lodges for the tourists. This way the tourists could stay as paying guests and the local people could earn. This would be a win-win situation for both – the tourist and the locals and there would be more chances of culture exchange.

Another cause of concern which goes against tourism is that tourists litter the place by throwing plastic bottles and wrappers of eatables here and there. For this the governments could ensure that dust bins are placed at regular intervals and are also evacuated regularly. Neat and clean rest-rooms should be provided for the convenience of the tourists. The government should also limit the number of tourists according to the capacity of the tourist place.

Furthermore, it is sometimes the case that tourists don't respect the local culture and therefore the local people do not welcome them. This can be taken care of by the tour guides and tour operating countries to educate the tourists about the important and sensitive parts of the local customs. For example, when tourists visit religious places in India, the tour guides could tell them to take off their shoes outside.

Then, some degree of pollution is inevitable as tourists travel by air, but while travelling locally, the tourist could use a non polluting source such as a rickshaw. They could even opt for an elephant ride instead of an automobile where available. This would ensure that even the common man would welcome them with open arms. After all, the development of a country includes better standards of living for the common man.

Finally, it is in the hands of the tourist to promote eco-tourism and take some responsibility of the environment. It has been well said that, \_a good tourist is one who takes away nothing but photographs and leaves behind nothing but footprints'.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, there is a negative side of tourism but it can be checked with some simple steps taken by the governments, tour companies and guides, the local people and the tourist himself.

Some people think governments should spend money on measures to save languages with few speakers from dying out completely. Others think this is a waste of financial resources. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

The United Nations estimates that approximately 6,500 languages are spoken in the world today. By the end of this century, many linguists estimate that over half of those 6,500 languages will be gone. Some opine that efforts should be made to save these languages, but others believe it would be wastage of money. In the following paragraphs, I shall discuss both views before forming an opinion.

The reason why the possibility of a language dying raises so much concern for sociolinguists is that language is directly related to culture. It is said that, -When a language dies, a culture dies. Secondly, these languages are a significant part of their speaker's identity. Beyond preserving culture and using language as a part of the speakers' identity, a very practical reason for wanting to save a dying language is that archaeologists and anthropologists can get a wealth of information about a society from its language. If a language dies out, so does our access to direct knowledge about its customs, folk tales, and vocabulary for describing the world.

On the other hand those opposed to saving a dying language say that languages that lose their communicative purposes and are abandoned by speakers should disappear from the public arena. The truth of —when a language dies, a culture dies does not imply the truth of when a language is saved, a culture is so saved. They say that change of culture is a normal part of the law of change and we should welcome this change. They believe that the only thing that can be achieved by saving a language is for intra-linguistic studies and nothing more.

Furthermore, they feel that what actually kills languages is the choices of the speakers. The moment the speakers of a language realize that their language does not have a global functionality, they begin to abandon it. In today's global village, it is far more convenient to have a few languages. There is better communication and also better job prospects worldwide with fewer languages. Even the technology of today is more comfortable to learn with fewer languages. So, such languages that have limited potential at the global stage, and they thus come under threat or even die, it would be better to let them die. There is no need to preserve them.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, the idea of saving threatened languages sounds good but it is difficult to sustain because the speakers have a right to shift to another language. Once this happens, there is no logical basis for saving a past linguistic behavior. What is more, globalization will continually lead to language shift. This trend is not likely to abate. Therefore, it is a waste of resources to save endangered languages.

# (11<sup>th</sup> June 2011 India)

In several years many languages die out. Some say it is not important because if we speak fewer languages life would be easier. Do you agree or disagree?

The United Nations estimates that approximately 6,500 languages are spoken in the world today. By the end of this century, many linguists estimate that over half of those 6,500 languages will be gone. Some opine that it is futile to save these languages because it is more convenient to have fewer languages today. I agree with this view.

The reason why the possibility of a language dying raises so much concern for sociolinguists is that language is directly related to culture. It is said that, -When a language dies, a culture dies. Secondly, these languages are a significant part of their speaker's identity. Beyond preserving culture and using language as a part of the speakers' identity, a very practical reason for wanting to save a dying language is that archaeologists and anthropologists can get a wealth of information about a society from its language. If a language dies out, so does our access to direct knowledge about its customs, folk tales, and vocabulary for describing the world.

However, languages that lose their communicative purposes and are abandoned by speakers should disappear from the public arena. The truth of —when a language dies, a culture dies does not imply the truth of when a language is saved, a culture is so saved. The change of culture is a normal part of the law of change and we should welcome this change. The only thing that can be achieved by saving a language is for intra-linguistic studies and nothing more.

Furthermore, it is irrefutable that what actually kills languages is the choices of the speakers. The moment the speakers of a language realize that their language does not have a global functionality, they begin to abandon it. In today's global village, it is far more convenient to have a few languages. There is better communication and also better job prospects worldwide with fewer languages. Even the technology of today is more comfortable to learn with fewer languages. So, such languages that have limited potential at the global stage, and they thus come under threat or even die, it would be better to let them die. There is no need to preserve them.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, the idea of saving threatened languages sounds good but it is difficult to sustain because the speakers have a right to shift to another language. Once this happens, there is no logical basis for saving a past linguistic behavior. What is more, globalization will continually lead to language shift. This trend is not likely to abate. Therefore, it is not important to save endangered languages.

# <u>Competitiveness is a positive quality for people in most societies. How does</u> competitiveness affect individuals? Is it a positive or negative trend?

The world is changing very fast; big will not beat small anymore; it will be the fast beating the slow. These words hold true for today's global village in which we live in a 24/7 society. In the following paragraphs, I shall discuss the effect of competitiveness on individuals. I believe that competitiveness is good, but over- competitiveness in which one uses unethical means to reach the top is bad.

At the individual level, competitiveness provides incentives for people to improve themselves. People set goals for themselves and try to achieve them by hard work and perseverance. These goals are based on others achievements. They try to break records and put their heart and soul to excel in all fields. This is what keeps them going. Then they become inspiration for others who also work hard for getting name and fame. If there was no competition, people would become lazy and there would be stagnation in their lives. This would result in dull individuals and lackluster societies.

It is this competitiveness which is the basis for the Olympics and other such international and national events. Individual competition translates to national and international level during such events. For example, when Abinav Bindra won the first individual Olympic gold medal in shooting, he not only made a name for himself but also for the whole of India. Therefore, competitiveness leads to the progress of the individuals and societies as a whole.

On the other hand, it is important to realize that trying to be number one and trying to do a task well are two different things. One should not hold the delusion that one's advancement is accomplished by crushing others. Over-competitiveness, in which a person uses unethical means to win such as taking drugs before any sporting event to increase performance or hurting others to win, is bad.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, competitiveness is good and leads to the progress of individuals and societies but only as long as it remains a healthy competition. If unethical means are used or it leads to stress and others are hurt in the process, then it is bad.

The government should control the amount of violence in films and on television in order to decrease the violent crimes in society. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is irrefutable that the films and TV programmes today are filled with violence and as a result violence is increasing in our societies. I agree that censoring such programmes and films, some amount of violence can be decreased. In the following paragraphs, I shall put forth my arguments to support my views.

Reducing the amount of violence on TV and in the cinema would certainly be a good start to decrease violence among people. It is a well known fact that the media possesses a lot of power to influence people. So, those in the media must be judicious about delivering news in a balanced manner that brings the story to the consumer without showing too much violence. Journalism is a profession like any other and certain standards of quality and professionalism need to be maintained.

There are many harmful effects of such programmes on the individuals and society. The most disturbing effect is on the children and youth. Media violence can stimulate fear in some children as it frightens them, making the effects long lasting. This can become traumatic in our children as they see it more and more. Children are starting to grow and are shaping their personality, values and beliefs. They can become aggressive or they can lose a sense of reality and fiction of what they are seeing.

Moreover, young people imitate what they see and it is logical that they see glamour in what they do when they commit violence. Consequently, the society suffers as the streets are full of violence. Finally, too much portrayal of these also leads to immunity among the people and they are not affected by the disasters any more.

Disasters like Tsunami and earthquakes don't make people shed a tear any more.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, having a check on the violence in TV programmes and films, would certainly be a good start to decrease the violence and crime in society.

Some people think that too much money has been spent looking after and repairing old buildings, so we should knock down old buildings and build modern ones instead. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It has been a matter of intense debate for quite some time now as to what should be done with old buildings. Some opine that it is futile to spend money on their restoration and upkeep and that it would be better to build modern ones instead. I partially agree with their view. I believe that those old buildings which are neither beautiful nor useful, should be demolished where as those buildings which add character to a place, give it a unique identity or have a historic significance should be repaired and restored at all costs.

There are many arguments in favour of demolishing old buildings. It is not very uncommon to hear news on TV that a building in a particular city crumbled killing a few people. Such buildings should be demolished even if they have an emotional value for the owners. The maintenance costs of such buildings which are in a very bad shape are much more than the cost of demolishing and building new ones instead.

What is more, the newer buildings could be made in such a way that they can accommodate more people in that much space. These buildings could also be made to be energy efficient by using newer technologies which could save a lot of energy later on. For example, double glass panels could be used for insulation and the terraces could be made as to accommodate solar panels. All these measures are the need of the hour considering the rapidly occurring climate changes and the burgeoning population.

On the other hand, there are some old buildings which give a unique identity to a place and with a little maintenance can be used effectively even today. For example, the Sainik School of Kapurthala was the home the maharaja of Kapurthala, Jagatjit Singh. It is a magnificent piece of architecture and is now serving a very good purpose. There are many other such buildings which house important government offices or have been converted to hotels for tourists. The Umedh Bhawan Palace in Jodhpur, Rajasthan has been converted into a hotel and is a good source of revenue for the government. We would be losing a lot of our historical and cultural background if we demolish such buildings.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, the decision to preserve or demolish old buildings should be made after considering many factors. If the old building can be used effectively or be made into a tourist attraction or is giving a unique identity to a place, it should definitely be preserved. If a building is occupying a lot of space and is unfit to live in, then it should be demolished.

Research indicates that the characteristics we are born with have much more influence on our personality and development than any experiences we may have in our life. Which do you consider to be the major influence?

Nature versus nurture debate has been around for ages and has been supported well by both sides. *Nature*, referring to heredity, and the *nurture*, referring to the environment, are two very reasonable explanations to why we are the people we are today. It would be worthwhile to look at both sides of the issue before forming an opinion.

*Nature* is believed to be what determines our personalities, looks, and other things because it's all genetically passed down. It has been concluded that a newborn doesn't have a blank slate of personality, but does have a set of inherited traits.

Identical twins reared apart are far more similar in personality than randomly selected pairs of people. Likewise, identical twins are more similar than fraternal twins. Also, biological siblings are more similar in personality than adopted siblings. Each observation suggests that personality is heritable to a certain extent.

The other side of the debate says that *nurture* is the cause to our behavior as well as characteristics. Even though genes are what give us that certain spunk to our personality, the environment has the power to alter it and make us into the exact opposite. Even the way that certain children are brought up can change how they turn out. If environment didn't play a part in determining an individual's traits and behaviors, then identical twins should, theoretically, be exactly the same in all respects, even if reared apart. But a number of studies show that they are never exactly alike, even though they are remarkably similar in most respects.

The more we delve into the topic, the more the evidence reveals that the answer is —BOTH<sup>I</sup>. Genes are the foundation of who we are, but the nurture we receive in our lives is what we finally turn out to be. Even the best of inborn talents can go unrecognized if not given proper training and education. But it would seem that —Nurture complements Nature and that Nature's gift of rich human potential is realized through socialization and education.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that although both nature and nurture play a role in human personality and development, the influence of our upbringing and life experiences gets an edge over the genetic influences.

Most high level jobs are done by men. Should the government encourage a certain percentage of these jobs to be reserved for women?

Since the beginning of twentieth century, women have fought for equal rights and opportunities in society. As a result, in many countries these days, women make up 50% of the workforce. However, it is still a fact that high positions such as CEO jobs are still dominated by men. Although this is not desirable, I do not personally believe that imposing quotas is the solution.

Firstly, I believe that companies have a right to choose the best person for the job, whatever their gender, in order to contribute to the success of their business. Forcing companies to hire, promote and appoint women could negatively affect businesses in the short term and even in the long term. Reserving a few seats for women may also result in negative discrimination against deserving men.

Furthermore, I believe that this problem should be solved outside the workplace. Girls need to be encouraged to take more male-dominated subjects at school and later at university, and to aspire to do well in their careers. Girls and boys also need to be taught equality from an early age. This education can take place in schools, career programmes and in homes.

Finally, it has been seen that artificially imposing rules has not always had the desired effect. In places where governments required males and females to receive the same pay for the same job, employers simply changed job titles to ensure that women were still paid less than men. It is my belief that employers will simply find loopholes to get around any such law.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, forcing companies to allocate jobs to women is not the best way to address this imbalance. Rather it is a question of education and of changing mindsets so that those who deserve to be at the top, will earn it and be appropriately appointed.

In the past people wore their traditional clothes and followed their culture. These days most people wear similar clothes and therefore look very similar to one another. Do you think this is a positive or a negative development?

Today, we do not belong to a big planet Earth; we belong to a small global village. In this shrunken world, the cultures have also come closer and as a result people all over the world are dressing up in similar clothes and looking similar. This is largely a positive development.

On the positive side, people have become more tolerant of each other and are accepting each other in a much better way. They have a feeling that they are all connected even though there are different religions and ways of life. For example, when the tsunami disaster occurred, the whole world felt the devastation. People from all over the world offered their support and sent money to help victims. Instead of saying that different parts of the world should deal with their own problems, everyone made other countries problems their own. This shared belief of safety and happiness brought people together for comfort and relief. Every culture can agree on such beliefs. What is more, the idea that the world is shrinking its' differences and uniting, makes us stronger and more capable to accomplish anything.

Another positive aspect of this culture exchange is that all over the world people are accepting the good points of each other's culture and this also makes them more aware of the good points of their own culture. For example, the western clothing, jeans and T-shirts, is very comfortable and easy to manage. Therefore, people all over the world have adopted it. In the same way, we can see the inclination of many foreigners towards our cultural values and living style. Our holy books, Geeta' and

\_Ramayana' have gone global. Yoga and meditation have gained worldwide popularity. Our Indian classical dances are being taught in western countries and such classes are not monopolized by the Indian students; they have a diversity of students from all over the world.

On the negative side, some people feel that it is leading to a loss of global diversity and people are forgetting their own cultural and traditional values. This seems true on the face value, but I still feel that there are some deep rooted cultural differences which can never be forgotten. Wearing similar clothes and accepting other people's cultures can never make anyone completely aloof from one's own culture.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that the worldwide similarity among people is largely a positive trend.

<u>People find it very difficult to speak in public or to give a presentation before an audience. Do you think public speaking skill is really important? Give reasons. Some people say public speaking should be taught at school. Do you agree or disagree?</u>

Public speaking and oration are the most valued skills that an individual can possess. These skills can be used for almost anything. The most influential prophets and leaders were those who could sway their audiences verbally. The Powerful oratory skills of many leaders have won wars, averted mass panic and saved companies from financial disaster. Unfortunately, speaking in public is one of the most feared activities today. In the following paragraphs, I shall delve into the importance of the skill of public speaking. I believe that it should definitely be a part of the school curricula.

To begin with, public speaking is interrelated with communication skills and can be described as a form of communication. Public speaking does not always mean that you have to give a speech to a large audience. When you go for an interview, and speak to a group of interviewers or when you are giving a class presentation; all these are also a form of public speaking. In such situations, if you have the ability to communicate properly, it can help you shape up your future. Secondly, it helps to overcome fear. Surveys have revealed that most people are afraid of public speaking more than their fear of death. The major reason is that one has to gather a thorough knowledge of the subject matter on which one has to speak. Once a person goes into the depth of any topic, he realizes that his anxieties and fears associated with it go down quite remarkably.

Furthermore, this skill helps in personality development. When a person successfully delivers a good speech, it gives a sense of self-worthiness. A positive response from the audience can help a person feel more confident. Thus, it can bring about a lot of improvement in one's overall personality. Last but not least, the art of public speaking improves relationships. Once a person develops good public speaking skills, a marked improvement can be seen in his interpersonal skills, which in turn, will help him maintain a healthy relationship with his friends and family. Even in one's professional life, an effective interaction with one's boss, clients or subordinates can help a person enhance the possibility of advancement in his chosen profession.

In our present teaching system, writing and reading seems to be the main focus of literacy, and oratory skills are not stressed. The system needs to change, so that it can focus more of its resources on teaching how to interact in the world. Almost all jobs require an interview, and if one doesn't know the workings of a job interview, he will probably do poorly. But if the schools teach the skills of public speaking, appearing for an interview would be a piece of cake.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that the art of public speaking is very important in today's scenario. If today's children overcome glossophobia or the fear of speaking in public, they would stand a much better chance in the highly competitive global village of today.

Many old cities around the world are going through a major process of modernization. What are the advantages and disadvantages of modernization?

Modernization is the process by which cities are being transformed under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution. Modernization is usually associated with urban and industrial development. Cities are growing as economic and cultural centers, and new technologies have transformed almost every aspect of life. As everything has its pros and cons, similarly modernization also has its good and bad points which I shall discuss in this essay.

On the one hand modernization of cities is very beneficial to meet the needs of the growing population. Sky-scrapers are part of modern cities and they are needed today as land is becoming scarce. Modern architecture uses pre-fabricated material instead of wood for the doors and windows, which is also the need of the day. Modern buildings are also being made to be energy-efficient. For example, walls are being insulated so that lesser air-conditioning is needed. This is also a big plus point as we are all facing energy crises today.

Furthermore, road systems are being expanded to meet the needs of the growing number of vehicles. The benefits of these changes are becoming obvious as traffic jams are becoming things of the past in these places. Finally, as globalization is opening doors for the developing countries to expand their trade, modernization is becoming mandatory to attract foreign investments in these cities. It goes without doubt that these changes are bringing tangible benefits to these cities. For instance, the various multinational companies have opened in these cities and these are providing employment to many.

On the other hand, in the process of modernizing, most of the city administrators just copied the architecture of other cities from the developed world and this resulted in cloning of cities. Very naturally, to rebuild any city with modernization while maintaining its historical and cultural uniqueness is a difficult task that demands know-how in many areas. Copying is relatively simple and fast. Most of the cities now look similar and this has led to a loss of architectural diversity.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, modernizing cities is the need of the time and it has obviously much more advantages than disadvantages. However, care should be taken, as far as possible, to preserve some of the historic and cultural uniqueness of these cities.

<u>Nowadays doctors can become very rich. Maybe they should not focus on profitable activities</u> <u>such as plastic surgery or looking after rich patients and concentrate more on patient's health,</u> <u>no matter how rich they are.</u>

It is irrefutable that the medical profession is a very lucrative field but I disagree that they should not delve into money-making plastic surgeries and treatment of rich patients and focus on patients' health instead of looking at his pocket. In the following paragraphs, I shall put forth my arguments to support my views.

To begin with, I would like to say that, it takes years to become a doctor and medical education is also very expensive nowadays. No doubt, doctors must serve the society, but to serve the poor or needy first they have to generate their own sources of income. For a doctor the status of the patient is not important and he has to treat anyone who comes to him. By rendering his services to the rich, he can provide help to weaker sections and thus help society.

Secondly, I would like to add here that cosmetic surgeries are also part of people's health. They are part of mental health, which is also very important. It is not just the celebrities who go in for such surgeries. People having accidents in which facial features are affected, also need to go in for such surgeries. Can you imagine the mental status of a woman who has lost her external ear in an accident?

Finally, there are children born with cleft lip or palate, who also need plastic surgery. Therefore, it would be wrong to say that doctors should not focus on such surgeries. There are doctors who are doing plastic surgeries absolutely free for children suffering from cleft lip and palate. They charge their rich patients but they never say no to a poor and needy one. Also, it is a well known fact that as in any other profession, it is not all who earn very high.

To put it in a nutshell, I would like pen down saying that a doctor's duty is to treat patients and there is nothing wrong if he charges money from those who can afford to pay as long as he is looking after the poor ones too. It would also be wrong to label all cosmetic surgeries as un-needed and profitable activities as they are also part of the mental health of the patients.

<u>Universities should accept equal numbers of male and female students in every subject.</u> To what extent do you agree or disagree?

In my opinion, men and women should have the same educational opportunities. However, I do not agree with the idea that universities should fix equal number of seats for both genders in all subjects.

To begin with, it would not be practical to have the same number of men and women in all courses. Many courses are more popular with one gender than the other, and it would not be practical to aim for equal proportions. For example, nursing course is more popular among female applicants, and mechanical engineering is more common among the male applicants. This would lead to many seats remaining vacant and many deserving candidates would not get the course of their choice.

Secondly, universities should select the best candidates for each course according to their qualifications. In this way, both men and women have the same opportunities, and applicants know that they will be successful if they work hard to achieve good grades at school. The main reason why some people say that universities should have equal numbers of both genders in all subjects is that they want to remove discrimination against women who have lesser chances of higher education in many societies. However, taking such a step could lead to negative discrimination against the men.

Finally, it could be argued that such a step could lead to unwilling students in a few courses. What sort of graduates would the society have of students who have studied half-heartedly just because of the fact that they could not get into the subject of their choice. What is more, the numbers of drop-outs would also increase and many would not complete their higher education.

In conclusion, the selection of university students should be based on merit, and it would be both impractical and unfair to change to a selection procedure based on gender.

Providing children with pocket money on a weekly basis can benefit them in the future. Do you agree or disagree?

I definitely agree that providing children with a little amount of pocket money on a weekly basis is helpful to their development. In the following paragraphs, I shall put forth my arguments to support my views.

Firstly, giving children a small amount of money every week helps their early understanding of financial matters. For example, my parents gave me 25 rupees as pocket money per week when I was at school. Initially I used to spend it frivolously on items of little value such as candies and ice cream. However, as time went on, I came to understand that if I saved this money I could buy things like a dress or a pair of fashionable shoes. So, I started saving money. This habit has been permanently inculcated in my character and today I manage my money well and buy the things I want. postponed the spending of his dollar his overall wealth accumulated and this allowed him to buy items of greater value. As this example shows, providing children with pocket money every week leads them to have constructive experiences regarding financial issues.

Secondly, parents who issue their children a minute weekly allowance encourage the development of their child's sense of responsibility. For instance, in my own childhood I was given very small amounts of money every week and allowed to spend it freely. I feel having control over the use of these funds was one of the first major steps I took in my life towards learning how to become a responsible person.

As my personal story shows, providing children with pocket money is a positive thing.

After analyzing how giving children a little cash on a weekly basis develops their financial comprehension and level of responsibility, it has been proven that this practice is more positive than negative. Thus, parents are encouraged to consider adopting this regime.

People who fail at school will often succeed in adult life. Why it is happening? Give reasons and also give some examples.

It is often seen that some students who are not very brilliant in school time become very successful in their adult life. There could be many reasons for this phenomenon, a few of which I shall put forth in this essay.

To begin with it could be said that some students may not be good at studies, but may have some talent in them which could make them reach the pinnacle of their careers and they could become rich and successful. For example, one of my class fellows always used to fail at school, but he was a born singer. He took part in a reality show of singing and reached the third last elimination round. Although he did not win the show, but ever since then he has his evenings booked for shows and he is earning handsomely well.

Another reason could be attributed to the education system which relies on rote learning and in which too much emphasis is given to theory and very little to practical. Because of this some intelligent students may be left behind in studies and those with good rote learning capability could pass with flying colours. Later on in life, when they enter the world of work, they may succeed in life because of their practical skills. Furthermore, some students may be very good at some sports or other extracurricular activities. They may succeed in life because they work hard in those sports and excel in them. Who has not heard of the famous cricketer Sachin Tendulkar. He was a school drop-out and failed his board exams.

Some children are born with a silver spoon in their mouth. They may take school very nonseriously but may be very successful in life because they may get business tactics from their parents which may make life smooth sailing for them. The son of the biggest cloth merchant of my home town is a school dropout but he has got very good business acumen and today he is earning much more than the highly educated elite of my home town.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, there are many reasons why many, who fail at school succeed in adult life but such examples are not very common and a lot many school failures have to struggle throughout their lives.

Some businesses find that their new employees lack in basic interpersonal skills such as lack of ability to work with colleagues as a team. What are the causes and suggest possible solutions. Also provide relevant examples from your experience. 28<sup>th</sup> July 2011 essay (Sakshi and Neha) ( written by Sakshi)

-A new broom sweeps well, but an old broom knows the corners.

In today's scenario, every student wants to do job after completing studies. Consequently, it is generally observed in the field of work that they lack basic interpersonal skills such as ability to work with colleagues due to less team spirit. This essay shall delve into the causes of this problem and I shall put forth some relevant solutions.

To begin with, only new employees are not to blame for their lack of basic skills. In fact, the new employees suffer a complete change in environment. When they are subjected to work field from the learning environment, then sometimes they fail to adjust to the new one. Moreover, the education system is also responsible to some extent. In our system, it is more important to get good marks rather than to have any other skill. Also practical education does not have much importance. In short, the system insists to learn theoretical portion rather than the practical one which is the basic requirement to do any job. What is more, nowadays competition among students is also at its peak. Consequently, there is lack of team spirit among students and so, later they find it difficult to work as a team.

Like other problems, it also has some possible solutions. Firstly, the old employees and employers should provide friendly surroundings to their new colleagues. Secondly, the education system should be improved. Students should be made excellent in practical. Thirdly, there must be proper training session after every course completion, even for the students who want to become teachers. Finally, there must be additional classes of communication skills and debate competitions from time to time. Also, students should be given team projects as it would teach them the skills of co-operation and co-ordination.

From my experience of life, we had a mathematics teacher, who was a scholar in her school time, but she lacked the ability to present her views. Also she did not have good rapport with other teachers. So, she had to resign from her job. Inspite of her higher degrees she was unable to get a job.

To put it a nutshell, it is undeniable fact that the new employees may lack the basic interpersonal skills but improvement in educational system and co-operative behaviour of colleagues can help to overcome the problem.

# What are the benefits of requiring young people to serve the army? Does participation in community work qualify as an alternative?

Military service is voluntary in most of the world. However, it is compulsory in some countries like Mexico and Iran. Although it has many benefits, some people argue its mandatory nature. Therefore, some alternatives, such as community service, can be taken into account.

There are many advantages of military conscription. First of all, young people can raise their physical fitness and enjoy better health. They also develop a sense of team spirit and improve abilities to get along well with others. They learn to cope with problems independently and gain self confidence. What is more, they expand their social circle as people from different corners of the country are together in the army camps. This can prove an invaluable asset when they return to civilian life.

It is irrefutable that army officers are very efficient, disciplined and excellent time managers. They are highly respected by the civilians. Some of them may join the army permanently if they like that life. It is also considered a positive point when they look for other jobs. It also instills a sense of patriotism among the youth. However, despite all these benefits, its mandatory nature is arguable. Many young, people cannot cope with the high level of stress in the army. That's why community service is suggested as an alternative in most countries.

Community service requires young people to contribute part of their time, energy and skills only. Moreover, community service tends to offer a direct assistance to participants in preparing for the workforce. By volunteering, young adults develop skills, gain work experience and explore career options. They can also acquire practical knowledge through community service.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, military service is helpful only when it is voluntary. Mandatory military service does not fit all young people, whereas community service benefits every young person. Therefore, community service is better than military conscription.

"The qualities a person needs to become successful in today's world cannot be learned at a university or similar academic institution. To what extent do you agree or disagree? - (Sept  $3^{rd}$  2011 essay question Australia)

Success is a very subjective term. It is very difficult to define a successful life. All too often we equate a successful life with material possessions. Yet, there are millions of people out there who lead successful, fulfilled lives and are not financially sound. They may not be rich in the financial sense, but they are rich in life and values. Therefore, I partially agree with the statement.

Undoubtedly, a university education is essential if you want to have a career in a profession such as law, engineering, teaching, or medicine. What is more, it opens more doors than you would have if you didn't get one. A university education is a great platform in learning more and gaining valuable knowledge in the field we are passionate about. Also, the university is a great place to network for friends and business associates or partners. So, definitely, in this respect, university education can help you get success.

However, there are other types of people who make it big without going to college. For instance, those who start their own business. These people took risks pursued a dream. And, for them, it was a very profitable decision. Take for example, Michael Dell, the founder and CEO of Dell who dropped out of college at 19. He first started his computer company in his college dorm room, later using company's earnings and family loans to expand. Henry Ford never graduated high school, but went on to start one of the largest automobile manufacturing companies in the world, Ford Motor Company.

Furthermore, in today's scenario, people with some talent, for example, in the entertainment or sports field can achieve name and fame very soon. The reality shows have made it possible for the girl or boy next door with some talent achieve success overnight. Finally, a university education does not generally enable you to achieve successful relationships with family and friends.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that the attributes needed to become successful in today's world do not necessarily depend on a university degree. However, in some situations such as professional courses, it is needed to get success.

# Essay number 287 ( 22<sup>nd</sup> Oct 2011 Australia)

In recent years, there has been growing interest in the relationship between inequality and personal achievement. Some people believe that individuals can achieve more egalitarian societies. Others believe that high levels of personal achievement are possible only if individuals are free to succeed or fail according to their individual merits. What is your view of the relationship between equality and personal success?

If we look at history, it is clear that since time immemorial, people have always wanted to create an egalitarian society but have been unsuccessful. This is largely due to the fact that the impetus to work hard and excel would be lost if all were to remain equal. I firmly believe that a perfect society needs some kind of social inequality, or as it can be called, a distinction in ability. A number of arguments surround my opinion.

A perfect society needs some inequality based on the ability of the person. What keeps the world going is the motive to work hard, excel and take the lead. Those in the higher strata of society should be there because of their superior abilities and they should have greater responsibilities and, therefore, a higher social standing. An ideal society should have some struggle. If you had no struggle in life would you be happy? No, because that takes all the fun and enjoyment out of the difficulty - the losing, the failures, and the overcoming - the victory, the success.

The concern arises when some form of inequality does not allow equal opportunities for the people. A well-known example can be cited from the caste system is India. People are born into a caste. Caste membership determines your occupation, social interaction, power, and education. No amount of achievement can change your caste position. In such cases the opportunities are denied to the people of the lower caste. Now, the democratic set up has reserved quotas in an effort to bring equal opportunities for all. Even in these situations, the freedom to fail or succeed according to merit should be there otherwise there would be negative discrimination against those who actually deserve.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, there are different types of inequality. The inequality can be social or economic or based on gender. Different people have different notions on the relation between equality and personal achievement. As far as opportunities are concerned, people should have equality. However, everyone should be free to work hard and reach the upper strata of society, otherwise no one would progress and there would be stagnation in society.

Plan followed
Intro: Strong view. A perfect society needs some social inequality Para
1: Why a society needs some inequality
Para 2: Inequality in opportunity is not good
Conclusion: Different types of inequality should be considered differently. Equality in opportunities and equality in personal merit

Some say that economic development is the solution to poverty; others say it is the cause of poverty. Do you agree or disagree with the statement? Give your own opinion. (Academic IELTS essay question November 2011 Canada)

The persistent problem of poverty in the developing world has put a question mark on the relation between economic growth and poverty. Some individuals are of the opinion that when economy develops, poverty comes down. Others believe that economic growth leads to poverty. I agree with the former view. A number of arguments surround my opinion.

To begin with, economic growth benefits nearly all citizens of a country, even if not equally, and therefore reduces poverty. For example, in rural areas, most of the poor are engaged in agriculture. When such a country grows through agricultural exports, it benefits both poor farmers and the even poorer labourers they employ. Similarly, rapid growth in manufacturing sector because of increase in demand creates a lot of new jobs, and eventually causes a rise in wages that further reduces poverty.

My second argument comes from historical records. Western countries began discovering the positive relation between economic growth and poverty reduction around 1820 and as a result the living standards in Europe and the United States improved many fold in the next years. Economic growth thus eliminated mass poverty in what is today considered the developed world. Even a short-term view confirms that the recent acceleration of growth in many developing countries has reduced poverty, measured the same way.

The opponents of this view claim that economic progress leads to inequality between the rich and the poor. They opine that a handful of rich are getting richer while the poor are being driven to the wall. However, results have proved that such inequality is only short lived and everyone has benefited in the long run. It is because of the high initial inequality that it appears as if economic growth is leading to poverty.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, economic progress definitely reduces poverty. Sometimes, there is unequal distribution of wealth in the initial stages of economic development. Nonetheless, everyone benefits eventually.

The best way to prepare for the future is to invest in young people. How true do you think is this? What are the ways to spend resources on these young people?

Youth are the wealth and future of their nation, hope for their family and pride and glory of their college or institute. Some of them become ideal citizens, politicians and businessmen. The nation can reach the zenith of glory if our youth become ideal and participate in the task of national reconstruction. Young people are the backbone of their country. So, government should invest in young people in order to gain success in future.

To begin with, every young man or woman must be given work to his/her capacity. If a state fails to provide jobs to its youth so as to ensure the satisfaction of their basic needs, it is sure to be doomed one day. No country can make any progress when its youth remain idle and unemployed. It is rightly said, "an idle brain is the devil's workshop". Self-employment schemes started by the government have not yet yielded much response. More and more young men and women should be encouraged to take up technical work. Job-oriented or vocational education is the only remedy.

Secondly, the system of education and the system of examination must be changed. It should also aim at reducing rush at the university stage so that our colleges are not crowded with unmotivated students. Proper colleges should be provided to the students according to their need. Furthermore, Games and sports are necessary and useful for all. They are especially useful for the youth who must have a balanced development of the body as well as the mind. There is always a sound mind in a sound body. Games and sports also produce a sense of equality, cooperation and fraternity. Sportsmen and players have started choosing sports and games as their career. Government should give special grants to their sportsmen and players. For example, when India won world cup in 2011, it brought publicity of that country at international level. So, if the governments invest in sports it can bring name and fame and also be beneficial for that country's economical growth.

Youth represent action, dynamism, and adventure. It was only the spirit of youth which stirred the revolutionaries like Bhagat Singh, Azad and many others who stood against the mighty British empire.

In the nutshell, I can say young people have started realizing their responsibilities . They are now active in every field be it sports, research or administration. They are the hope of the country. If they get stirred into dynamic activity, they can certainly lift the nation to the pinnacles of glory. So, investment on youth is better to secure the future .

Parents often buy their children many toys. What are the advantages and disadvantages of children having a large number of toys? Use examples from your personal knowledge and experience.

Toys are not just playthings. They are the building blocks of our child's future. They teach our children about the world and about themselves. That is precisely why parents always want to provide their children with toys. The issue of concern here is regarding the number of toys children are given. While some parents fill their children's rooms to the ceiling with toys, others limit the number of toys that children have to play with.

On the one hand there are a few advantages of children having a plethora of toys. They have more variety to play with and they can pick out their personal favourites from those toys according to their taste. Moreover, parents can be satisfied that their children have enough to play with when they are themselves busy.

On the other hand, too many toys prevent kids from fully developing their gift of imagination. Kids learn to be more creative with fewer toys. To cite an example, an experiment was conducted in Germany in which all toys of a kindergarten classroom were removed for three months. It was observed that children soon began to use their basic surroundings to invent games and use imagination in their playing.

Furthermore, children with fewer toys establish better social skills. They learn how to share with other children. Also, they develop a greater love for reading, writing, and art. Fewer toys also make children to become resourceful by solving problems with only the materials at hand. And resourcefulness is a gift with unlimited potential.

Children with fewer toys become less selfish. Those who get everything they want believe they can have everything they want. This attitude is definitely detrimental to a child's psychology. They do not even value the toys they have. Another advantage of not having a basement full of toys is that children are more likely to play outside and have the much needed physical exercise which results in healthier and happier bodies. Finally, fewer toys result in a less-cluttered, cleaner and healthier home.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, toys are very much needed for the development of children, but there should be a limit on the number of toys a child should have. Excess of everything is bad.

#### Plan followed in the essay

Intro: a balanced approach as it

is a discuss essay. Para 1:

Advantages of having too many

toys

- More choices Parents are free Para 2: Advantages of fewer toys
- Children become more creative
  - Imagination power develops
- Para 3: Other advantages of fewer toys Better social skills learn to share Time for other activities like reading, writing and art Learn to manage with less resourcefulness in a virtue

- Para 4: more advantages of fewer toys Children with more toys develop the attitude that they will always get what they want this is detrimental to their psyche Lesser toys means more outdoor games which is good for health Conclusion: fewer toys are better

#### Australia GT – September 2011

# Although there are more and more women police officers in reality, are they really suitable for this job?

Increasing numbers of women are choosing to work in the police force nowadays and have showed their mettle in this field. The issue raised is whether women are actually suited for such jobs. I believe that not only are women suited for such jobs, they are in fact better than men in many areas of police jobs.

In many of the areas of police activity, women are especially adaptable and can even perform better than men. For example, policewomen are especially suitable for working for special police prostitution groups, dealing with trafficking in women within the larger cities. They are also better in dealing with domestic violence and juvenile affairs. Policewomen are generally more acceptable to women and children who have been the victims of the misdeeds of men. Girls and young children have more confidence in women.

What is more, the field of crime prevention is becoming more important to police agencies and here policewomen play their greatest role. They are also gifted in gaining the confidence of small children and in determining whether behaviour is normal or antisocial. The employment of policewomen offers the best method of finding out the real problem, and then determining the best course of action to pursue.

Research conducted internationally clearly demonstrates that women officers use less physical force and are therefore better at dealing with violent confrontations with citizens. Additionally, women officers often possess better communication skills than their male counterparts and are better in obtaining the cooperation and trust required in their job. They are considered at least equal to male officers in most areas of police work. They have shown no differences in the quality of their performance in street patrolling. Those skeptical about their role of police officers base their argument on women's lack of physical strength. However, with proper training even this factor can be overcome.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, female officers are equally capable as their male counterparts. In some situations they have even proved themselves better than men. No wonder, we are seeing more and more women in police force.

Plan followed in the essay

Intro: Give your opinion and write a thesis statement. I have said women are suitable for these jobs and are even better at places.

Para 1: Give examples where women are better than men – Prostitution, juvenile crime Para 2: More examples of where they are better – crime prevention

Para 3: Better communication skills – as good in street patrolling. Opponents view – less physical strength – negate it

Conclusion: Reiterate your views.

According to a survey, people involved in certain occupations and professions are seen to be honest. What is the situation in your country? Why?

—Honesty is the cornerstone of all success, without which confidence and ability to perform shall cease to exist. I -- Mary Kay Ash

It is well-known that some professions require people to demonstrate extra levels of honesty than other professions. For instance, those working in the medical and the teaching profession are seen to be more honest than advertisers and insurance agents. The situation is the same all over the world and my country is no exception. In the following paragraphs, I shall put forth some reasons for this phenomenon.

In some professions being honest is the best way to maximize profits in the long run. Let us take the example of a businessman. The most effective way for a businessperson to maximize profits over a long period of time is to follow the highest standards of ethics. Ethical conduct will gain a company the kind of good reputation that earns repeat business. Treating suppliers, customers and others fairly is likely to result in their reciprocating.

Moreover, in some professions there is no room for dishonesty. For instance, in the medical profession you have to tell the correct diagnosis to the patients. A lawyer has to stick to facts and cannot afford to distort them based on his judgements. Similarly, journalists must provide news based on facts and cannot afford to present ill-founded news.

On the other hand, there are some professions such as the insurance agents and advertisers, who are seen to be less honest than others. This dishonesty may not apparent as they may not be lying about their products or services; they may just be hiding facts. Thus, undue concern with honesty in these cases might result in lower profits and perhaps ultimate business failure.

However, it is difficult to generalize professions based on honesty. For instance, in the medical profession, some doctors may be prescribing an un-necessary battery of tests just for their benefit and some insurance agents may be telling all the positive and negative points of their insurance plans to their clients.

To put it in a nutshell, I pen down saying that, some occupations seem to be more honest than the others. The situation is the same all over the world. However, to survive in the long run, honesty always pays.

#### Plan followed in the essay

Intro: Start with a quotation. Acknowledge the statement and tell about the situation in your country.

Para 1: One reason for honesty – beneficial in the long run Para 2: Another reason – some professions have no room for dishonesty Para 3: Reason for dishonesty in some professions with example Para 4: Difficult to generalize honesty – individual variation Conclusion:

S.No.	Essay	
1.	Some sports are extremely dangerous but many	
	people still like them very much. Why do people	
	take part in <u>dangerous sports</u> ? Give some suggestions	
	on how to deal with these dangers.	
2.	People try new dangerous sports such as sky-diving	
	or rock climbing. Should such sports be	
	banned?	
3.	When families have a <u>meal together</u> it is	2010 India AC
	considered social activity. Do you think eating	
	together is important to people in your country?	
4.	Some people say that <u>parents have the most</u>	2010 India AC
	important role in a child's development.	
	However, others argue that other things like	
	television or friends have the most significant	
	influence. Discuss both views and give your own	
~	opinion.	2002
5.	Wild animals have no place in the 21st century, and	2003
	the protection is a waste of resources. To	
	what extent do you agree or disagree?	
6.	Some people claim that there are more	
	disadvantages of <u>the car</u> than its advantages.	
	Do you agree or disagree?	
7.	<u>Tobacco</u> is a kind of drug. People have been free to	
	use it. Some people think that it should be illegal to	
	use it comparing with other drugs.	
	To what extent do you agree or disagree? What is	
0	your opinion?	
8.	<u>Tobacco</u> is a kind of drug. People have been free to	
	use it. Some people think that it should be illegal to	
	use it comparing with other drugs. To what extent do	
	you agree or disagree? What is your opinion?	
9.	Some people say that the government should not	
).	put money on <u>building theatres and sports</u>	
	stadiums. They should spend more money on	
	medical care and education. Do you agree or	
	disagree?	
10.	Some people think that <u>children should learn</u> how	
	to compete, but others think that children should be	
	taught to cooperate to become more useful adults.	
	Express some reasons for both	
	views and give your own opinions.	
11.	The world would be a much poorer place without	
	<u>colour</u> . To what extent would you agree or disagree.	
12.	The <u>computers</u> are widely used in education and	
	some people think that teachers do not play	
	an important role in the classroom. To what	

	extent do you agree?	
13.	Some people think that <u>charity organizations</u> should only offer help to people of their own country. But others believe that these organizations should give aid to people in great need wherever they live. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	
14.	History tells that people have often thought about creating an <u>ideal society</u> , but most of the times fail in making this happen. What is your opinion about an ideal society? How can we create an ideal society?	
15.	Some people believe that <u>tourists should accept</u> <u>social and environmental responsibility</u> while others believe that tourists should not accept any responsibility at all. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2010 India
16.	Some <u>languages are increasingly spoken</u> in different countries, while the usage of others is <u>rapidly</u> <u>declining</u> . Is this a positive or a negative development?	2010 India
17.	These days many people <u>leave their country to work</u> <u>abroad and take their family with them.</u> Do you think benefits of this outweigh disadvantages in terms of family development?	
18.	Everyone should stay <u>in school until the age of</u> <u>eighteen</u> . To what extent do you agree or disagree?	
19.	Mothers generally stay home to take care of their children after pregnancy. Do you support the opinion that these mothers should be compensated by the government?	
20.	Some people think that <u>paying taxes</u> is enough to contribute to the society. Others argue that being a citizen involves more responsibilities. Discuss, what is your opinion?	
21.	Some companies and organizations require their <u>employees to wear uniform.</u> What are the advantages and disadvantages of wearing uniform?	
22.	For some <u>people shopping is not just about buying</u> <u>what is necessary, but a form of entertainment</u> . Do you think it is a positive or a negative development? Give your opinion and examples from your experience.	
23	Young people these days tend to be less polite and respectful than in the past. Causes and solutions.	GT
24	Nowadays for many people the Internet is	GT

	replacing regular books. What do you think will	
25	happen in the future and what is your opinion?	0.5
25	Nowadays for many people the <u>Internet is</u>	GT
	replacing regular books. What do you think will	
0.6	happen in the future and what is your opinion.	
26	Today, majority of children are raised by their	GT
	grandparents due to the fact that their parents are	
	busy working. To what extent do you think it	
~=	affects the whole family?	
27	In many countries, <u>children are getting fatter and</u>	GT
	less fit day by day. Why is it so and suggest	
•	solutions.	
28	Scientists believe that <u>computers will become</u> more	
	intelligent than human beings. Some people find it a	
	positive development while others think it is negative	
	development. Discuss both points and give your own	
20	opinion.	CT
29	Small shops in towns and villages are closing and	GT
	<u>replaced by big stores</u> . Explain your opinion. Do you think it is good or bad?	
30		GT
30	Some people say that subjects <u>like arts, music, drama</u> and creative writing are more beneficial to children	61
	and therefore they need more of these subjects to be	
	included in the timetable.	
	Do you agree or disagree?	
31	Discuss your opinion on how modernism can	GT
51	<u>affect our health</u> . What can the government do to	01
	overcome such situations?	
32	Advertising influences people to buy things such as	GT
52	<u>clothes and shoes</u> . What are the problems caused by	
	that? What solutions can be given.	
33	In companies, promotions to high positions	GT
	should be given to employees inside the	
	company and not to somebody outside the	
	company or new hiring. Do you agree or	
	disagree?	
34	Do you agree or disagree that animals should be	GT
	kept in men made cells.	
35	Should old people live with family or separately	GT
	with the same aged people?	
36	Do you think children should be given freedom to	GT
	do whatever they want or parents should	
	impose <u>restrictions</u> on them?	
37	Some people say that parents should control	GT
	their children's behavior from a very young age.	
	What do you think?	
38	Some people think if students are afraid of the	GT
	teacher it is better. Others say that having a	
	friendly relation is better. What do you think?	

39	<u>Road transport is taking over rail services</u> . Discuss the positive and negative effects of this development. Is this situation true for your country?	
40	Some people think that <u>competitive sports have a</u> <u>positive effect</u> on the child's education while others argue it is not so. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages and opine.	GT
41	<u>Competitive sports like football</u> are considered to add a lot of value by bringing people of different states and nationalities together. Yet some people argue that these sports divide people on the basis of nationalities and age groups. What is your opinion? Write about each view and then describe your answer supporting it with relevant examples from your own experience.	GT
42	Films can have effect on the children's education and teach them many things. Do you think it is always a positive influence? Discuss.	GT
43	Some people believe the range of technology available to individuals today is increasing <u>the gap</u> <u>between poor people and rich people.</u> Others think it is having an opposite effect. Discuss these points of view. What is your opinion?	2009
44	Students at schools and universities learn far more from <u>lessons with teachers than from others sources</u> (such as the internet, television). To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2009
45	Today, <u>people can work and live in anywhere</u> they want, because of the improvement of communication technology and transport. Do advantages of this development outweigh the disadvantages?	2009
46	<u>Fossil fuels (coal, oil, natural gas)</u> are the main sources in many countries, but in some countries the use of <u>alternative sources of energy</u> (wind energy and solar energy) are encouraged. To what extent do you think it is a positive or negative development?	2009
47	Do you agree or that improvements in technology reduce the role of Olympic Games.	GT
48	Many students have to study subjects which they do not like. Some people think this is a complete waste of time. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?	GT
49	Nowadays, people get information through news and papers, but meanwhile are uncertain about	2005

	the truth of these news. Should we believe the	
	journalists? What qualities should a good journalist or correspondent have?	
50	Some teachers say students should be organized into groups to study. Others argue students should be made to study alone. Tell the benefits of each study method. Which one do you think is more effective?	2005
51	Recent years, the number of crimes committed by young people in major cities throughout the world is increasing. Discuss this issue. Give reasons and suggest some solutions.	2005
52	Food can be produced much more cheaply today because of improved fertilizers and better machinery. However, some of the methods used to do this may be dangerous to human health and may have negative effects on local communities. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2005
53	Leisure is a growing industry, but people no longer entertain themselves as much as they used to because the use of modern technology has made them less creative. Do you agree or disagree?	2005
54	People can perform <u>everyday tasks</u> , <u>such as shopping</u> <u>and banking as well as business transactions</u> , without meeting other people face- to-face. What are the effects of this on individual and society as a whole?	2005
55	Some people think <u>visitors to others countries</u> should imitate local customers and behaviours. Some people disagree; they think the host country should welcome cultural differences. Discuss the two views and give your opinion.	2005
56	It is generally believed that <u>education is of vital</u> <u>importance</u> to the development of individuals and the well-being of societies. What should education consist of to fulfil both these functions?	2005
57	Some people think that <u>cultural traditions may be</u> <u>destroyed when they are used as money- making</u> <u>attractions</u> aimed at tourists. Others believe it is the only way to save these traditions. Discuss on both sides and give your opinion.	2005
58	Pressure on the school and university students is increasing and <u>students are pushed to hard work</u> <u>when they are young</u> . Do you think it is a positive or negative development?	2005

59	Nowadays education quality is very low. Some people think we should encourage our <u>students to</u> <u>evaluate and criticize their teachers</u> . Others believe that it will result in a loss of respect and discipline in the classroom. Discuss on both sides.	2005
60	The advantages brought by the spread of <u>English as a –global languagel</u> will outweigh the disadvantages. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this view?	2005
61	Some <u>school leavers travel or work for a period of</u> <u>time</u> instead of going directly to university. What are the advantages and disadvantages?	2005
62	many people are optimistic of the 21st century and see it as an opportunity to make positive changes to the world. To what extent do you share their optimism? What changes would you like to see in the new century?	2005
63	Nowadays, some universities offer graduate students skills that assist to find employment, but some people believe the main function of a university should be to access knowledge for its sake. What's your opinion?	2005
64	The government is responsible for protecting a nation's cultural identity. Thus, some people believe new buildings should be built in traditional styles. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?	2005
65	Sending criminals to prison is not the best method of dealing with them. Education and job training are better ways to help them. Do you agree or disagree?	2005
66	Some people think that the news media nowadays have influenced people's lives in negative ways. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2005
67	Some people think the government should pay for health care and education, but other people claim that it is the individual's responsibility. Do you agree or disagree?	2005
68	Many employees work at home with the modern technology. Some people claim that it can benefit only the workers, not the employers. Do you agree or disagree?	2005
69	The detailed description about crime will affect the people and cause many social problems. Some people say that the media should be strictly controlled. Do you agree or disagree?	2005
70	Many people say that we have developed into a	2005

I		l I
	-throw-away culture, because we are filling up our environment with so many plastic bags and rubbish that we cannot fully dispose of. To what extent do you agree with this opinion and what measures can you recommend reducing this problem?	
71	Some scientists believe that studying the behaviour of 3-year-old children can tell which children would grow up to be criminals. To what extent in your opinion is crime a product of human nature or is it possible to stop children from growing up to be criminals?	2005
72	Some people think that people moving to a new country should accept new culture in the foreign country rather than living as a separate minority group with different lifestyle. Do you agree or disagree?	2005
73	Children who grow up in families which are short of money are better prepared with the problems of adult life than children who are brought up by wealthy parents. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2005
74	The only way to improve the safety on our own road is to have stricter punishment for driving offenders. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2005
75	Some people think that using <u>animals for</u> <u>experimentation</u> purpose is cruel, but other people think that is necessary for the development of science. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	2005
76	In many countries, good schools and medical facilities are available only in cities. Some people think new teachers and doctors should work in rural areas for a few years, but others think everyone should be free to choose where they work. Discuss and give your own opinion.	2005
77	The <u>speeding up of life</u> in many areas such as travel and communication has <u>negative effects</u> on <u>society</u> at all levels—individual, national and global. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2005
78	Some people think the <u>increasing business and</u> <u>cultural contact</u> between countries brings many positive effects. Others say it causes the loss of national identities. Discuss on both sides and give your opinion.	2005
79	As global trade increases between different countries, many daily necessities are produced	2005

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	in other countries. Such goods are usually	
	transported a long distance. Do the benefits of this	
	trend outweigh its drawbacks?	
80	Advertising encourages consumers to buy in quantity	2005
	rather than promoting quality. To what extent do you	
	agree or disagree?	
81	The main purpose of public libraries is to provide	2005
	books and they shouldn't waste their limited	
	resources and space on providing expensive hi-tech	
	media such as computer software, videos and	
	DVDs. To what extent do	
	you agree or disagree with this statement?	
82	Far too little has been done to prevent animals and	2005
	plants from dying out, although people have been	
	aware of this problem for a long time. Why do	
	people do so little about it? Give your suggestions on	
	how to solve this problem.	
83	Many people believe that <u>scientific research</u> <u>should</u>	2005
05	be carried out and controlled by the governments	2005
	rather than private companies. To what extent do you	
	agree or disagree with this	
	opinion?	
84	It is more important for a <u>building to serve a purpose</u>	2005
04	than to look beautiful. Architects	2005
	shouldn't worry about producing building as a work	
	of art. Do you agree or disagree?	
85		2006
85	Some people believe they should keep all the money	2006
	they have earned and <u>should not pay tax</u>	
0.6	to the state. Do you agree or disagree?	2007
86	There are social, medical and technical problems	2006
	associated with the use <u>of mobile phones</u> . What	
	forms do they take? Do you agree that the problems	
	outweigh the benefits of	
07	mobile phones?	2007
87	Today, the advanced science and technology have	2006
	made great changes to people's life, but artists such	
	as musicians, painters and writers are still highly	
	valued. What can arts tell us	
	about life that science and technology cannot?	
88	In many countries, the proportion of older people is	2006
	steadily increasing. Does this trend have more	
	positive or negative effects on the	
	society?	
89	Some people believe that air travel should be	2006
	restricted because it causes serious pollution and uses	
	up the world's fuel resources. To what	
	extent do you agree or disagree?	
90	More and more measures to improve the	2006
	security in large urban areas have been	

	introduced in many countries because of the	
	increased crime. Do the benefits of these measures	
	outweigh the drawbacks?	
91	In many countries more and more young people are	2006
	leaving school but unable to find jobs. What	
	problems do you think youth unemployment causes	
	for individuals and the society? What measures	
	should be taken to reduce the level of unemployment	
	among youngsters?	
92		2006, 2011 Ch
92	1 1	2000, 2011 Cli
	responsible for teaching students to judge what is	
	right and wrong so that they can behave well. Others	
	say that teachers should only teach students	
	academic subjects. Discuss both views	
	and give your opinion.	
93	One <u>long-distance flight</u> consumes fuel which a <u>cars</u>	2006
	uses in several years' time, but they cause the same	
	amount of pollution. So some people think that we	
	should discourage non-essential flights, such as	
	tourist travel, rather than to limit the use of cars. To	
	what extent do you agree or	
	disagree?	
94	In the last century when a human astronaut first	2006
<i>_</i>	<u>arrived on the Moon he said: "It is a big step for</u>	2000
	mankind". But some people think it makes little	
	difference to our daily life. To what extent do	
	you agree or disagree?	
95		2006
95	Some people think <u>history</u> has nothing or little to tell	2000
	us, but others think that studying the past history can	
	help us better understand the present. Please discuss	
	the two views and give your own opinion.	
0.6		2007
96	Some people think that <u>national sports teams</u> and	2006
	individual men and women who represent their	
	country should be financially supported by the	
	government. However, others argue that they should	
	be funded by non-government sources (e.g. Business,	
	scholarships, etc.).	
	Discuss both views and give your opinion.	
97	Housing shortage in big cities can cause severe social	2006
	consequences. Some people think only government	
	action can solve this problem. To	
	what extent do you agree or disagree ?	
98	<u>International tourism</u> has become a huge	2006
70	industry in the world. Do the problems of	2000
00	international travel outweigh its advantages?	2007
99	Some people prefer to provide help and support	2006
	directly to those in the local community who	
	<u>need</u> it. Others, however, prefer to give money	

	to national and international charitable organisations.	
	Discuss both views and give your opinion.	
	Discuss both views and give your opinion.	
100	The best way to solve the world's environmental	2006
	problem is to increase the price of fuel. To what	
	extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?	
101	Some people think that students benefit from going	2006
	to private secondary schools. Others, however, feel	
	that private secondary schools can have a negative	
	effect on society as a whole. Discuss both these	
	views and give your	
	own opinion.	
102	In many countries today there is insufficient respect to	2006
	old people. What are the reasons?	
	What problems might it bring to the society?	
103	It is better for students at university to live far away	2006
	from home than to live at home with their parents.	
	To what extent do you agree or	
	disagree with this statement?	
104	Earlier technological developments brought more	2006, 2011 25 <sup>th</sup> June India
	benefits and changed the lives of ordinary people	
	more than recent technological developments. To	
	what extent do you agree or	
107	disagree?	2006 2000 Cl
105	Some people think <u>museums</u> should be enjoyable	2006, 2009 Ch
	places to attract and entertain young people, while	
	others think the purpose of museums should be to educate, not entertain.	
	Discuss both sides and give your own opinion.	
106		2006
100	In order to <u>learn a language well</u> , we should also	2000
	learn about the country as well as the cultures and lifestyles of the people who speak	
	this language. To what extent do you agree or	
	disagree with this opinion?	
107	Multi-cultural societies, in which there is a mixture	2006
107	of different ethnic peoples, bring more	2000
	benefits than drawbacks to a country. To what extent	
	do you agree or disagree?	
108	There is an increasing amount of <u>advertising directed</u>	2006
	at children which encourages them to buy goods such	
	as toys and snacks. Many parents are worried that	
	these advertisements put too much pressure on	
	children, while some advertisers claim that they	
	provide useful information to children. Discuss both	
	views and	
	give your opinion.	
109	Some people think that the government should	2006
	decide which subjects students should study at	

	the university, while others think that students should be allowed to apply for the subject they prefer. Discuss the two views and give your opinion.	
110	It is suggested that all the <u>young adults should</u> <u>undertake a period of unpaid work</u> helping people in the community. Does it bring more benefits or drawbacks to the community and the young people?	2006
111	Some people think the <u>main purpose of schools</u> is to turn the children into good citizens and workers, rather than to benefit them as individuals. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?	2006
112	A country becomes more interesting and develops more quickly when its <u>population includes a mixture</u> <u>of nationalities and cultures</u> . To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?	2006
113	As most people spend a major part of their adult life at work, job satisfaction is an important element of individual well-being. What are the factors that contribute to job satisfaction? How realistic is the expectation of job satisfaction for all workers?	2006
114	Some people think that good health is a basic human need, so the <u>medical service should not</u> <u>be run by</u> <u>profit-making companies</u> . Do you think the disadvantages of the private health care outweigh the advantages?	2006
115	Some people think <u>secondary school students should</u> <u>study international news</u> as one of their subjects. Other people say this is a waste of valuable school time. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	2006
116	Exposure to international media such as films, TV and magazines has a significant impact on local <u>cultures</u> . What do you think has been the impact? Do you think its advantages outweigh the disadvantages?	2006
117	Throughout the history, <u>male leaders</u> always lead us to violence and conflict. If a society is governed by <u>female leaders</u> it will be more peaceful. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?	2006
118	<u>Modern buildings</u> change the character and appearance of towns and cities. The government should insist that new buildings be built in <u>traditional styles</u> to protect cultural	2006

	identity. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	
119	Some people think that <u>personal happiness is directly</u> <u>related to economic success</u> . Others argue that happiness depends on different factors. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.	2006
120	The world of work is changing rapidly. Working <u>conditions</u> today are not the same as before and people no longer rely on taking one job for life. Discuss the possible causes for these changes and give your suggestions on how people should prepare for work in the future.	2007
121	Individuals can do nothing to improve the <u>environment</u> . Only governments and large companies can make a difference. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?	2007
122	Maintaining public <u>libraries</u> is a waste of money since computer technology can replace their functions. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2007
123	Some people think that schools should <u>select pupils</u> <u>according to their academic abilities</u> , while others believe that it is better to have pupils with different abilities study together. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.	2007
124	With the increase in the use of mobile phones and computers, fewer people are <u>writing letters</u> . Some people think that the traditional skill of writing letters will disappear completely. To what extent do you agree or disagree? How important do you think is letter-writing?	2007
125	Some people think that the government should provide <u>assistance to all kinds of artists including</u> <u>painters, musicians</u> and poets, etc. However, other people think that is a waste of money. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	2007
126	The society would benefit from a <u>ban on all forms of</u> <u>advertising b</u> ecause it serves no useful purpose, and can even be damaging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?	2007
127	Consumers are faced with increasing numbers of <u>advertisements from competing companies</u> . To what extent do you think are consumers influenced by advertisements? What measures can be taken to protect them?	2007

128	Air transport is increasingly used to export types of fruits and vegetables to countries where they cannot be grown or are out of season. Some people say it is a good thing, but other people think it can't be justified. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.	2007
129	Some people believe that some <u>unpaid community</u> service should be a compulsory part of high school <u>programmes</u> (e.g. working in a charity, improving the relationship of neighbourhood or teaching sports to children) To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2007
130	<u>Computers are increasingly used in education</u> . In which areas do you think are computers more important and in which areas are <u>teachers</u> more important?	2007
131	Many developing countries are currently <u>expanding their tourist industries</u> . Why is this the case? Is it a positive development?	2007
132	Some people claim that <u>public museums and art</u> <u>galleries will not be needed because people can see</u> <u>historical objects and works of art by using a</u> <u>computer</u> . Do you agree or disagree with this opinion?	2007 Similar 268
133	In many countries <u>traditional foods are being</u> <u>replaced by international fast foods</u> . This is having a negative effect on both families and societies. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2007
134	The natural <u>resources such as oil, forests and fresh</u> <u>water</u> are being consumed at an alarming rate. What problems does it cause? How can we solve these problems?	2007
135	In some countries, secondary schools aim to provide a general education across a <u>range of subjects</u> . In others, children focus on a <u>narrow range of subjects</u> related to a particular career. For today's world, which system is appropriate?	2007
136	In the past, lectures were used as a way of teaching large numbers of students, but now with the development of technology for education, many people think there is <u>no</u> justification for attending <u>lectures.</u> To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?	2007
137	As we are facing more and more problems which affect the whole planet, <u>good relationships between</u> <u>different countries</u> are becoming more important than ever before. To	2007

	what extent do you agree or disagree?	
138	<u>Team activities can teach</u> more skills for life than	2007
150	those activities which are played alone. To what	2007
	extent do you agree or disagree?	
139		2007
139	It is known to all that the <u>technological and scientific</u>	2007
	advances have made great changes to the range and	
	quality of our food. Some people regard it as an	
	improvement while others believe that the change is	
	harmful. Discuss both	
1.40	views and give your own opinion	2007
140	Some people think that we should <u>invent a new</u>	2007
	language for international communication. Do	
	the benefits of this outweigh the problems?	
141	Some people say that it is the responsibility of	2007
	individual to save money for their own care after	
	they retire. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	
	~	
142	Some people think that studying in a college or	2007
	<u>university</u> is the best way for students to prepare for	
	their future career. But others think they should leave	
	school as soon as possible to develop their career	
	through <u>work experience</u> . Discuss both these views	
	and give your own	
	opinion.	
143	The unlimited use of <u>cars</u> may cause many problems.	2007
	What are those problems? In order to reduce the	
	problems, should we discourage people to use cars?	
144	Many countries spend a lot of money in art. Some	2007
	people think investment in art is necessary, but	
	others say money is better spent on improving <u>health</u>	
	and education. Discuss	
	both these views and give your own opinion.	
145	Higher education can be funded in several ways	2007
	including the following three: 1. all costs are paid by	
	the government. 2. all costs are paid by the students.	
	3. all costs are paid by the student using loans form	
	the government that must be	
	repaid after graduation. Discuss the benefits of each	
	option. Which is the best one?	
146	Today's children are living under more pressure	2007
	from the society than children in the past. To what	
	extent do you agree or disagree with this	
	opinion?	
147	Some people think it is better for <u>children to begin to</u>	2007
	learn a foreign language at primary school than at	
	secondary school. What's your opinion? Do you	
	think the advantages outweigh	
	the disadvantages?	

148	The government should pay for the course fees for everyone who wants to study at the university. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2007
149	Nowadays, a lot of <u>advertisements are aimed at</u> <u>children</u> . Some people think there are lots of negative effects for children and should ban the advertisements. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2007
150	Some people believe that <u>giving aid to poorer</u> <u>countries has more negative effects than the positive</u> <u>effects.</u> To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2007
151	Nowadays, we are living in a <u>throw-away</u> <u>society</u> . What are its causes and what are its problems?	2007
152	Today, it is common that <u>TV news programmes</u> show the images of disasters and violence to the public. Discuss the reasons and the effects on the individual and the society.	2007
153	Some people think <u>children's spending time on TV</u> , <u>video and PC games is good</u> , while others think it is bad. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.	2008
154	Some people think that <u>criminals should be given</u> <u>longer terms in prison</u> , so as to reduce the crime rate. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2008
155	Old generations often hold some traditional ideas on the correct way of life, thinking and behavior. However, some people think that it is not helpful for the young generations to prepare for modern life in the future. What's your opinion?	2008
156	<u>Unemployment</u> is getting increasingly serious in many countries. Some people think students only need to get <u>primary education</u> , while others <u>think</u> <u>secondary education</u> is necessary. What's your opinion	2008
157	Some people think people can <u>exploit animals</u> for <u>any purpose</u> they need, while others do not think so. What is your opinion?	2008
158	An increasing number of people choose to <u>live in big</u> <u>cities.</u> What problems will this bring about? Should the government encourage people to live in small towns?	2008
159	An American film actor once said, <u>-Tomorrow is</u> <u>important and precious.</u> Some people think individuals and society should pay more	2008

	attention to the future than to the present. Do you	
	agree or disagree?	
160	Some people think <u>imported food exerts positive</u> <u>impacts</u> on our lives. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2008
161	Schools offer a wide range of <u>courses</u> such as physical education, music, economics, philosophy, math, English, geography, physics and history. Among all these subjects, which one do you think is <u>the most important</u> and which one is the least important?	2008
162	The number of cars keeps increasing, so road systems should be expanded. Some people think the government should pay for it, while others think the car owners should pay for it. What's your opinion?	2008
163	People should <u>look after their health as a duty to the</u> <u>society they live in rather than personal benefits</u> . To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2008
164	Some people think <u>government should ensure the</u> <u>healthy lifestyle. of people, but others argue that it</u> <u>should be decided by individuals.</u> Discuss both views and give your opinion.	2008
165	<u>Aircraft uses more fuel than cars</u> and produces more pollution. Some people suggest the non- essential use of aircraft like international travel should be discouraged. Do you agree or disagree?	2008
166	Figures show that some countries have an <u>ever-increasing proportion of the population who are aged 15 or younger</u> . What do you think are the current and future effects of this trend for those countries?	2008
167	Teachers used to convey information, but now with wide resources of information, there is <u>no role for</u> <u>teachers to play in modern education</u> . Do you agree or disagree.	2008
168	Some children can learn efficiently by watching TV. Therefore, they should be encouraged to <u>watch TV</u> <u>both at home and at school.</u> To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2008
169	Some people think that schools should concentrate on <u>academic classes</u> , because they are helpful for future career. But they think <u>music and sports classes</u> are not useful. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2008
170	Some people think that university students should specialize in <u>one subject</u> , while others	2008

	think universities should encourage students to learn a <u>range of subjects</u> . Discuss both views and give your opinion.	
171	Some people think the <u>cheap air flight</u> gives ordinary people more freedom. However, others think the cheap air flight should be banned because it pollutes the air and brings many other problems. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	2008
172	Some people think that <u>children should obey rules</u> or do what their parents and teachers want them to do, but others think that children controlled too much cannot deal with problems well by themselves. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.	2008
173	With technology speeding up, more and more young people begin to use <u>mobile phones and the Internet</u> , but old people have little chance to be exposed to them. What ways could mobile phone and the Internet be useful to old people? How can old people be encouraged to use this new technology?	2008
174	Some people think students should learn more practical courses like computer, but others think they should learn more about theoretical courses like geography and mathematics. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	2008
175	Some people support development of agriculture, like factory farming and scientific creation of fruits and vegetables, while others oppose. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	2008 2 <sup>nd</sup> April 2011 India
176	Some people think that in the modern society individuals are becoming more dependent on each others while others say that individuals are becoming more independent of each other. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.	2008
177	Some people think the main benefit of international cooperation is in protection of the environment, while others think that the main benefit is in the world business. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	2008
178	The government should encourage industries and business to move out of big cities and into regional areas. To what extent do you think the advantages outweigh disadvantages?	2008
179	Some people think that media should not report detail of crimes to the public. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2008

180	International travel makes people prejudiced rather than broad-minded. What are its causes and what measures can be taken to solve this problem?	2008
181	Once children start school, teachers have more influence on their intellectual and social development than parents. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2008
182	Many people think it is important to protect the environment, but they make no effort on it themselves. Why is it and what your opinion?	2008
183	Some people think that criminals should not be imprisoned. Instead, education and job training should replace the former to deal with criminals. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2008
184	Poor students or students who come from rural areas often find it is difficult to get access to the university education, so some people think universities should make it easier for them to study at . To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2008
185	Society is based on rules and laws. If individuals were free to do whatever they want to do, it could not function. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2008
186	Many people use distance-learning programs to study at home, but some people think that it cannot bring the benefit as much as attending college or university. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2008
187	Some people think that economic progress is the only way to measure a country's success, while others think that there are other factors which can be used to measure a country's success. What are these factors? And among them, which one is more important than others?	2008
188	More and more people work at home and study at home with the development of computer technology. Do you think it is positive or negative development?	2008
189	International travel is becoming cheaper than before, so more and more countries open their doors to tourists. Do the advantages of the increased tourism outweigh the disadvantages?	2008
190	Because of the global economy, many goods including what we use as daily basic produced by other counties have to be transported for a long distance. To what extent do the advantages outweigh the disadvantages?	2008

191	Memorization of information by frequent repetition, namely rote learning, plays a role in many education systems. To what extent do the advantages outweigh the disadvantages?	2008
192	Now, a lot of charities and organisations have to publicize their activities by setting up a number of days to name the special day like National Children's day and National non smoking day. Why do they do so? What are the effects?	2008
193	Rich countries often give financial aid to poor countries, but it does not solve the poverty, so rich countries should give other types of help to the poor countries rather than the financial aid. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2009, 28-5-2011 India lovepreet
194	Some people think music plays an important role in society. Others think it is it is simply a form of entertainment. Discuss both sides of this argument and give your own opinion.	2009
195	Development in technology causes environmental problems. Some people believe the solution in these problems is everyone accepts a simpler way of life, while others say that technology can solve these problems. Discuss both view and give your own opinion.	2009
196	Rich countries should not employ skilled labour from poor countries, as poor countries need the workers more. Do you agree or disagree?	2011
197	Some think that these environmental problems are too big for individuals to be solved, while others think that individuals cannot solve these environmental problems unless governments make some action. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	2009
198	Some people believe that improve public health should increase the number of sports facilities; others believe that it has little effects and need other measures to improve it. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	2009 2011 May 19 <sup>th</sup> India AC IELTS Lovepreet
199	Newspapers have an enormous influence in people's opinions and ideas. Why and do you think it is positive or negative situation?	2009
200	More and more students choose to go to another country for their higher education. Do you think the benefits outweigh the problems associated with it?	2009
201	Some people think it is more important to spend public money on promoting healthy lifestyle in order to prevent illness than to spend it on the	2009

	treatment for people who are already ill. To what	
	extent do you agree or disagree?	
202	Nowadays people live in the society where	2009
	consumer goods are cheaper to buy. Do you think	
	its advantages outweigh disadvantages?	
203	Caring for children is an important thing of the	2009
	society. It is suggested that all mothers and fathers	
	should be required to take childcare training courses.	
	To what extent do you agree or disagree?	
204	Crime is a problem all over the world and there is	2009
	nothing that can be done to prevent it. To	
	what extent do you agree or disagree?	
205	The cost of air flights has reduced sharply	GT
	nowadays. Do you think it is a positive or a	
	negative development, give your reasons.	
206	Individuals should not be allowed to carry guns.	By Patrick Bourne
	Do you agree or disagree.	
207	Advances in technology and automation have reduced	By Patrick Bourne
	the need for manual labour. Therefore working hours	
	should be reduced. To what	
	extent do you agree?	
208	Some people believe that teenagers should	2009
	concentrate on all school subjects. But, others believe	
	that teenagers should focus on the subject that they	
	are best at or that they find the most interest. Discuss	
	both these views and	
200	give your own opinion.	2000
209	If a product is good or it meets people needs, people	2009
	will buy it. So advertising is unnecessary and no	
	more than an entertainment. To what extent do you	
210	agree or disagree?	2009
210	Some people argue that companies and private individuals, rather than governments, should pay the	2009
	bill of pollution. To what extent do you	
	agree or disagree?	
211	The subjects and lesson contents are decided by	2009
211	the authorities such as the government.	2009
	Some people argue that teachers should make the	
	choice. Do you agree or disagree?	
212	Some people think that computers and the Internet	2009
_1_	are more important for a child's education than going	2007
	to school. But others believe that schools and	
	teachers are essential for children to learn effectively.	
	Discuss both views and give your own opinion.	
213	The food travels thousands of miles from farm to	2009
	consumer. Some people think it would be	
	better to our environment and economy if	

	people only ate local produced food. What	
	extend does the advantage outweigh	
	disadvantage?	
214	Report research suggests that majority of criminals who were sent to prison would commit crimes when set free. What do you think of this case? What to be done to solve this problem?	2009
215	Money for postgraduate research is limited. Some people think that financial support from governments should be only provided for scientific research rather than research for less useful subjects. Do you agree or disagree?	2009
216	Some people think that students should go to college for further education. However, some others claim that students should go to learn the skills such as fixing cars or construction. What is your opinion?	2009
217	Television has changed the quality of life for the ordinary person. Do you agree or disagree?	May 2011 GT India
218	Some believe that those who are not talented in language learning should not be required to learn a foreign language. Do you think school should require students to learn a foreign language?	2009
219	A hundred years ago, people think that human race is steadily improving in every area of life. Now it seems this is not certain in that situation. In which areas do you think we have made important progress nowadays? In which areas do you think we still need to make progress?	2009
220	Nowadays sending children to boarding school (either in other countries or in their own countries) is becoming increasingly popular. Why is it? Is it a positive development?	2009
221	The development of technology changes the way people connect with each other. In which way the development of technology change the types of relationships that people make? It has positive or negative effect on the relationships?	2009
222	Some people tend to take temporary jobs (they only work for few month of year), for they have time to do other things. Do the advantages outweigh the disadvantages?	2009
223	Many people go abroad to travel to see what other countries look like. However, the places all around the world are looking more and more similar. What do you think is the cause of this similarity? Do you think the advantages of this effect outweigh the shortages of it?	2009

224 225	Some people think that family life and parents have great influence on children's development, while others consider that external influence plays a more important role in children's life, discuss both views and give your own opinion. Individuals and countries cannot help everyone who needs help in the world, so they should only be concerned about their own communities and countries. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2009 2009
226	The environment problems facing today's world are so great that there is little ordinary people can do to improve the situation. Government and large companies should be responsible for reducing the amount of damage being done to the environment. To what extend do you agree or disagree?	2009
227	Some people say that professional workers such as doctors, nurses and teachers who make greater contribution to the society should be paid more than those people in the field of sports and entertainment. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2009
228	Some people think that introducing new technology can improve people's quality of life in the developing countries. However, others believe that free education should be offered. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.	2009
229	Nowadays, people always throw the old things away when they buy new things, some people claim that the broken things should be repaired and used again. What factors cause this phenomenon? What effects the phenomenon leads to?	2009
230	An increase in production of consumer goods results in damage of the natural environment. What are the causes and possible solutions?	2009
231	Young people are often influenced in their behaviours and situations by others in the same age. This is called -peer pressure". Do the disadvantages outweigh the advantages	2010 Ch
232	Some people think parents should read or tell stories to children, while others think parents need not do that, as children can read books, watch TV or movies by themselves. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	2010 Ch
233	Some people think typical teaching of a teacher and students in the class will not exist by the year 2050. Do you agree or disagree?	2010 Ch

234	Individual greed and selfishness has been the	2011 Ch
	basis of the modern society. Some people think that	
	we must return to the older and more	

	traditional values of respect for the family and the local community in order to create a better world to live in. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	
235	Some people think foreign visitors should be charged more than local people when they visit the cultural and historical attractions in a country. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2011 Ch
236	Some think that children should start school as early as possible, while others believe that they should start school at the age of seven. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.	2011 Ch
237	Environmental problems are too big for individual countries and individual persons to address. In other words, we have reached the stage where the only way to protect the environment is at an international level. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?	2011 Ch
238	In most of the societies, the role of mother and father differs. What are the causes of this difference? What will be the parental roles in future?	4 <sup>th</sup> April 2009, India Aastha got 7.5 in this essay
239	Some people believe that women should play an equal role as men in a country's police force or military force, such as the army, while others think women are not suitable for these kinds of jobs. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	2011
240	Some people think that men and women have different qualities. Therefore, some certain jobs are suitable for men and some jobs are suitable for women. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2010 Ch
241	Air travel can only benefit the richest people in the world. Ordinary people can get no advantage with the development of air travel. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2010 Ch
242	Some people think that politicians have the greatest influence on the world. Other people, however, believe that scientists have the greatest influence. Discuss both of views and give your opinion.	2010 Ch
243	The gap between the rich and the poor is becoming wider, the rich more richer, the poor even more poorer. What problems can the situation cause and give the solutions?	2010 Ch
244	Many people believe that today there is a general increase in anti-social behaviour and	2010 Ch

	lack of respect for others. What might have	
	caused this situation? How to improve it?	
245	Most countries want to improve standard of living through economic development, however, others think social value is lost as a result. Do you think the advantages of economic development outweigh the disadvantages?	2010 Ch
246	A report indicated that many children between 7 and 11 spend too much time watching television and/or play video games. How does the problem affect the children, their families and society? What measures can be taken to control it?	2010 Ch
247	Studies suggest that children spend more time watching TV than they did in the past and spend less on doing active or creative things. Why do you think it is the case? What measures and methods can be used to tackle with it?	2010 Ch
248	It has been suggested that everyone in the world want to own a car, a TV and a fridge. Do you think disadvantage of such a development outweigh advantages?	2010 Ch
249	Technological progress in the past century has its negative effect, despite its remarkable contribution. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2010 Ch
250	In today's society, more and more work is done by machines. Do you think the positive effects of the development overweigh the negative effects on individuals and society?	2010 Ch
251	Many people who leave school hold a negative attitude towards learning. Why does this happen? How to solve the problem?	2010 Ch
252	An increasing number of people change their career and place of residence several times during their life time. Is this a positive or negative development?	2010 Ch
253	Nowadays more and more young people hold the important positions in the government. Some people think that it is a good thing, while others argue that it is not suitable. Discuss both these views and give your opinion.	2010 Ch
254	Some people think it is not necessary for adults to receive education in class. Self-study is a good way for them to study more effectively. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2010 Ch
255	The movement of people from agricultural areas to cities to work can cause serious problems in both places. What are the serious problems and	2010 Ch

	what measures can be taken to solve this	
	problem?	
256	The major cities in the world are growing fast, as well as their problems. What are the problems that young people living in cities are facing with? Give solutions to these problems.	2010 Ch
257	In some countries, small town-centre shops are going out of business because people tend to drive to large out-of-town stores. As a result, people without cars have limited access to out- of town stores, and it may result in an increase in the use of cars. Do you think the disadvantages of this change outweigh its advantages?	2010 Ch
258	In many cities, planners tend to arrange shops, schools, offices, and homes in specific areas and separate them from each other. Do you think the advantages of this policy outweigh the disadvantages?	2010 Ch
259	Mobile phones have made life easier: anyone can use a mobile phone to answer/make work calls or home calls at any place 7 days a week. Do you think this development has more positive effects or negative effects on the individual and society?	2010 Ch
260	Some countries have introduced a law to limit working hours for employees. Why is this law introduced? Do you think it is a positive or a negative development?	2010 Ch 13/9/2011
261	In some countries, it is illegal for companies to reject job applicant for their age. Is this a positive or negative development?	2010 Ch
262	Pollution and other environmental problems are resulting from a country's developing and becoming richer. Some think this cannot be avoided. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2010 Ch
263	Scientists say that junk food is harmful to people's health. Some say the way to ask people to eat less fast food is to educate them, while others say education does not work. Discuss both sides and give your own opinion.	2010 Ch
264	Some people have benefited from modern communications technology, but some people have not benefited from it at all. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2010 Ch
265	Some people think that robots are very important to human's future development, while others think they are dangerous and have	2011 Ch

	negative effects on society. Discuss both views and	
266	give your opinion. Nowadays, some workplaces tend to employ equal numbers of men and women workers. Do you think	2011 Ch
	it is a positive or negative development?	
267	Nowadays some individuals behave in an anti- society way, such as committing a crime. In general, it is the society to blame. What causes the anti-social behaviours of individuals? Who	2011 Ch
2 (0	should be responsible for dealing with it?	2011.01
268	Some people think that it is necessary to travel abroad to learn about other countries, while other people think that it is not necessary to travel abroad	2011 Ch Similar 132
	because all the information can be seen on TV and the Internet. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	
269	Tourism is an excellent way to develop a country, but it can also cause harm. How can countries ensure that tourism benefits the development.	2011 Ch
270	Some people think governments should spend money on measures to save languages with few speakers from dying out completely. Others think this is a waste of financial resources. Discuss both views and give your opinion.	2011 Ch
271	In several years many languages die out. Some say it is not important because if we speak fewer languages life would be easier. Do you agree or disagree?	11 <sup>th</sup> June 2011 India AC
272	Competitiveness is a positive quality for people in most societies. How does competitiveness affect individuals? Is it a positive or negative trend?	2011 Ch
273	The government should control the amount of violence in films and on television in order to decrease the violent crimes in society. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2011 Ch
274	Some people think that too much money has been spent looking after and repairing old buildings, so we should knock down old buildings and build modern ones instead. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	2011 Ch
275	Research indicates that the characteristics we are born with have much more influence on our personality and development than any experiences we may have in our life	GT old essay
276	Most high level jobs are done by men. Should the government encourage a certain percentage	Past AC essay

	of these jobs to be reserved for women?	
277	In the past people wore their traditional clothes and followed their culture. These days most people wear similar clothes and therefore look very similar to one another. Do you think this is a positive or a negative development?	GT Australia June 2011
278	People find it very difficult to speak in public or to give a presentation before an audience. Do you think public speaking skill is really important? Give reasons. Some people say public speaking should be taught at school. Do you agree or disagree?	GT April 2010
279	Many old cities around the world are going through a major process of modernization. What are the advantages and disadvantages of modernization?	GT
280	Nowadays doctors can become very rich. Maybe they should not focus on profitable activities such as plastic surgery or looking after rich patients and concentrate more on patient's health, no matter how rich they are.	GT
281	Universities should accept equal numbers of male and female students in every subject. To what extent do you agree or disagree?	Past AC
282	Providing children with pocket money on a weekly basis can benefit them in the future. Do you agree or disagree?	GT
283	People who fail at school will often succeed in adult life. Why it is happening? Give reasons and also give some examples.	GT
284	Some businesses find that their new employees lack in basic interpersonal skills such as lack of ability to work with colleagues as a team. What are the causes and suggest possible solutions. Also provide relevant examples from your experience.	28 <sup>th</sup> July AC essay ( Sakshi and Neha Pathak)
285	What are the benefits of requiring young people to serve the army? Does participation in community work qualify as an alternative?	Past essay
286	"The qualities a person needs to become successful in today's world cannot be learned at a university or similar academic institution. To what extent do you agree or disagree? -	Sept 3 <sup>rd</sup> essay question Australia 3/9/2011
287	In recent years, there has been growing interest in the relationship between inequality and personal achievement. Some people believe that individuals can achieve more egalitarian societies. Others believe that high levels of personal achievement are possible only if	

	individuals are free to succeed or fail according to their individual merits. What is your view of the relationship between equality and personal success?	
288	Some say that economic development is the solution to poverty; others say it is the cause of poverty. Do you agree or disagree with the statement? Give your own opinion.	Nov 2011 essay question Canada
289	The best way to prepare for the future is to invest in young people. How true do you think is this? What are the ways to spend resources on these young people?	
290	Parents often buy their children many toys. What are the advantages and disadvantages of children having a large number of toys? Use examples from your personal knowledge and experience.	GT
291	Although there are more and more women police officers in reality, are they really suitable for this job?	Australia GT – September 2011
292	According to a survey, people involved in certain occupations and professions are seen to be honest. What is the situation in your country? Why?	GT
293		

# GIỚI THIỆU VỀ TRUNG TÂM YES IELTS (NHƯ Ý IELTS 8.5)

- Trưởng thành từ trung tâm luyện thi cô Yến IELTS và thầy Hòa IELTS, trung tâm luyện thi YES IELTS tiền thân là Như Ý IELTS 8.5.
- Cô Như Ý tốt nghiệp Thạc sỹ Sư phạm tại Đại học Monash danh tiếng tại Úc đồng thời tốt nghiệp MBA tại Đại học Paris Pháp (merit scholarship). Với điểm thi IELTS 8.5 duy trì liên tục trong 3 năm gần nhất, cô Như Ý đã giảng dạy và cải thiện điểm số IELTS cũng như khả năng tiếng Anh tổng quát cho nhiều học viên mất căn bản trong thời gian cấp tốc.
- Đội ngũ giảng viên YES IELTS là những giảng viên trẻ, với điểm thi IELTS từ 8.0 đến 8.5 và nhiều kinh nghiệm thi cùng với tài liệu học tập mới nhất.
- Chúng tôi luôn cố gắng mỗi ngày để trở thành địa chỉ tin cậy để bạn đặt hết niềm tin học tập chính phục điểm IELTS thật cao trong mỗi kỳ thi.
- YES IELTS sẽ luôn nỗ lực hết mình giúp đỡ các bạn trong học tập để sự lựa chọn học tại trung tâm YES IELTS là quyết định chính xác nhất của bạn.

## YES IELTS - SAY YES TO EVERY TARGET!

- Như chúng ta đều biết IELTS là chứng chỉ chứng nhận khả năng sử dụng tiếng Anh trong môi trường học tập, nghiên cứu và định cư ở nước ngoài. Nhiều bạn sẽ cảm giác mục tiêu đạt được IELTS band 6.0 như một đỉnh núi khó có thể vượt qua. Đôi lúc, chính vì tâm lý NGẠI KHÓ này mà bạn đánh mất niềm tin vào bản thân, không dám phấn đấu đạt mục tiêu IELTS cao hơn, như 8.5 chẳng hạn.
- Mục đích của trung tâm luyện thi YES IELTS là: "Giúp bạn chinh phục tất cả mọi Band IELTS, đem mục tiêu ngoài tầm với vào trong tầm tay của bạn."
- Slogan của trung tâm: "Say YES to every Target!" Nói CÓ với mọi mục tiêu!

# TÂM THƯ GỬI VỀ CỦA CÁC BẠN HỌC VIÊN TẠI NHƯ Ý IELTS

#### Tâm Nguyễn (Học sinh ở Úc)

Before studying IELTS with Nhu Y, I had been struggling with improving my IELTS Speaking score. My ultimate goal for speaking was an eight but I only achieved 7 or 6.5 depending on the topic I would receive in the exam. So I decided to seek professional help. At that time I knew for sure that I wanted to study with a Vietnamese teacher who had already achieved the speaking score of 8. That was when I saw Y's ad on VDS Facebook Page and I was so so glad for that coincidence. I deliberately chose a Vietnamese teacher because he/she would understand the struggles a Vietnamese student had in terms of speaking English and therefore would be able to work out a strategy in order to achieve their desired score. Studying with Nhu Y was my perfect choice as she had everything to offer and a clear strategy for me how to achieve that score. Plus, I only studied online which gave me the convenience of studying at home. After 2 months of studying with Y, I was able to achieve my desired score of 8 and even 8.5. I highly recommend her online speaking course which will definitely help Vietnamese students who are struggling to get their desired scores.



#### Tochi Lam (Học sinh ở Úc)

Những bài dạy của chị thật sự rất hữu ích và dễ tiếp thu. Mặc dù chỉ học đúng 1 buổi speaking thôi nhưng nhờ áp dụng những tips và lời dạy của chị nên điểm speaking của em từ 6.5 lên 7.5. Đặc biệt luôn có tutor giúp tụi em chấm bài và đưa ra những nhận xét giúp tụi em có thể nâng cao kĩ năng ielts của mình 1 cách hiệu quả và nhanh chóng. Chị sửa bài rất kĩ trong từng kĩ năng. Nhờ vậy mà trong vòng 2 tuần học với chị em đã đạt được kết quả em mong muốn. Em rất thích cách chị khuấy động không khí trong lớp học để tụi em không cảm thấy nhàm chán và buồn ngủ khi học với chị. Em cám ơn chị rất nhiều và chúc chị thật nhiều sức khoẻ để giúp những học sinh khác đạt được thành tích ielts cao.

## Thanh Ngọc Trần (Học sinh ở Thụy Sỹ)

Nhờ những lần sửa bài tận tâm của chị mà nỗi sợ listening của em đã biến mất. Listening skills của em cải thiện một cách đáng kinh ngạc tới mức đạt được kết quả mong muốn và nghe giảng hoàn toàn trôi chảy khi em đi du học. Mà không chỉ có Listening, những bài giảng Writing của chị tới tận bây giờ đều có ích cho em trong tất cả các môn cần viết reports và essays ở Thuỵ Sĩ. Em rất biết ơn vì những gì chị dạy cho em còn giúp em vượt xa hơn cả IELTS. Em mong mọi người sẽ biết tới nhiều hơn một cô giáo trẻ có thể hiểu được những vướng mắc và biết cách giúp học sinh vượt qua một cách dễ dàng.





#### Dang Huyen Trang (Học sinh ở Úc)

Hôm nay e đã có kết quả Ielts đã đat được kết quả như mong muốn sau 12 buổi học tại trung Tâm chị Ý. Nhờ nhừng bài " chửi" banh xác của thầy mà kĩ năng viết cải thiện rõ dù dính cái đề không đầu vào đâu hihi. Học online vừa tiết kiệm được thời gian đi lại, vừa học được nhiều, cần gì thì nhắn 1 tin 1 cái là có thầy giải đáp ngay chứ không như học tại lớp, phải tốn thời gian và phải gặp thầy mới giải đáp được thắc mắc. Cảm ơn chị Ý đã xuất hiện trong cuộc đời e, học ở trung tâm chị Ý là nơi học tốt nhất từ trước đến nay e học. High recommend cho bạn nào muốn học ielts mà không muốn mất công đi lại như e. E có dự tính sẽ thi cao hơn nữa nên trong tương lai chị Ý và thầy lại đồng hành cùng e nha. Cảm ơn chị và Thầy nhiều lắm.



#### Vo Phan Hieu Thao (Học sinh ở quốc gia khác)

Trước khi đến học, em rất lo lắng về phần viết vì em đã thi 2 lần đều 5.5. Chỉ sau 10 ngày học với tổng cộng 20h, em đã đạt được mục tiêu đề ra cho môn Writing. Cách giảng bài và sự chỉ dẫn tận tâm đã giúp em có thể đạt được mục tiêu trong thời gian ngắn. Từ vựng và những tài liệu trong quá trình học thật sự hữu ích, không những trong kì thi mà ngay cả ngoài thực tế. Thật sự gửi lời cảm ơn đến chị Ý và đặc biệt là bạn Thiện Tutor đã giúp đỡ em rất nhiều ạ.



# TEAM GIẢNG VIÊN THÀNH TÍCH CỰC KHỦNG VỚI ĐIỂM IELTS TỪ 8.0 ĐẾN 8.5

1. Cô Ý Nguyễn	<ul> <li>Tốt nghiệp Cử nhân RMIT Thạc sỹ đại học Paris, Pháp (merit scholarship) Tốt nghiệp Thạc sỹ Sư Phạm tại đại học danh tiếng MONASH, Úc</li> <li>Đã giảng dạy và cải thiện điểm số IELTS cũng như khả năng tiếng anh tổng quát cho nhiều học viên mất căn bản trong thời gian cấp tốc</li> <li>Cô Như Ý theo chủ trương "Học ít - Trọng Tâm - nhưng Hiệu Quả" sẽ giúp các bạn giảm</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>tải khối lượng học và tập trung vào những điều cần thiết nhất để đi thi thần tốc</li> <li>Là một người sinh sống và từng du lịch ở nhiều quốc gia, ngoài kiến thức đi thi, cô còn chia sẻ những bí mật và cách thức học tiếng anh giao tiếp, phù hợp và hỗ trợ cho cuộc sống du học - định cư của học sinh sau này.</li> </ul>	
2. Thầy Kian Tuấn Anh	<ul> <li>Tốt nghiệp Cử nhân ngành Tài chính tại Đại học Kinh tế TPHCM,</li> <li>Nhiều năm kinh nghiệm đối thoại trong môi trường kinh doanh với các đối tác quốc tế tại Anh Quốc, Australia, Singapore, Hong Kong</li> <li>Kinh nghiệm phiên dịch, bao gồm thông dịch cho đoàn chuyên gia từ CLB Bóng đá Manchester United (Anh Quốc) năm 2017.</li> <li>Đạt điểm IELTS 8.0 từ lần thi đầu tiên năm 18 tuổi.</li> <li>Qua nhiều năm tiếp xúc môi trường thương mại chuyên nghiệp, thầy Kian Tuấn Anh quan tâm phát triển cho học viên vận dụng khả năng ngôn ngữ theo cách tự nhiên, vượt qua nỗi sợ và thiếu tự tin, rèn luyện thói quen diễn đạt</li> </ul>	
3. Cô Thanh UTS	<ul> <li>mạch lạc và súc tích theo phong thái năng động của ngành nghề kinh doanh.</li> <li>Tốt nghiệp cử nhân Đại học RMIT, thạc sĩ Quản trị Kinh doanh Đại học UTS - trường đại học đứng đầu danh sách các trường đại học trẻ tốt nhất nước Úc (thành lập dưới 50 năm), đạt chất lượng đào tạo 5 sao theo tiêu chuẩn QS.</li> <li>Đã từng có kinh nghiệm trong lĩnh vực giáo dục và communication, hỗ trợ nhiều học sinh - sinh viên cải thiện khả năng tiếng Anh từ xây dựng nền tảng, lấy lại căn bản và nâng cao các kỹ năng.</li> </ul>	CO THANH UTS

	-	
4. Cô Hà Speaking	<ul> <li>Tốt nghiệp Cử nhân Ngôn Ngữ Học Thạc sĩ Quan hệ quốc tế trường đại học Monash, Úc.</li> <li>Từng là top 3 Asia English Olympics bảng Newscasting năm 2015 diễn ra tại Indonesia. Một trong các đại diện Vn nhận được học bổng trao đổi văn hoá GMSTEC intercultural leadership tại đại học Victoria of Wellington - New Zealand</li> <li>Đã từng có kinh nghiệm giảng dạy và giúp đỡ nhiều bạn cải thiện tiếng anh thiên về kỹ năng nghe nói, giao tiếp, thuyết trình trước công chúng.</li> <li>Học với cô Hà, ngoài kỹ năng phát âm và nói lưu loát, cô Hà có thể giúp bạn phát triển phản xạ giao tiếp trong các cuộc hội thoại thường ngày, tăng tự tin cho các bạn có mong muốn đi học và làm việc trong môi trường nước ngoài."</li> </ul>	
5. Cô Cherry Speaking	<ul> <li>Tốt nghiệp cử nhân kinh doanh và tài chính tại New Zealand, Thạc sĩ kinh doanh quốc tế tại trường đại học Monash, Úc</li> <li>Với một thời gian dài sinh sống và học tập tại nước ngoài cùng với kinh nghiệm dạy kèm và tham gia các hoạt động tại trường đại học, cô Phương có thể giúp các bạn nâng cao cũng như cải thiện kĩ năng nghe hiểu, giúp phản xạ tốt hơn trong giao tiếp. Ngoài ra, dựa và những trải nghiệm của bản thân, cô Phương sẽ chia sẻ thêm những kinh nghiệm góp phần hỗ trợ cho việc giao tiếp cũng như cuộc sống du học sau này của các bạn sau này.</li> </ul>	
6. Cô Mỹ Linh – Lớp IELTS Tutor 1-1	<ul> <li>Tốt nghiệp Cử nhân Quản trị kinh doanh tại Học viện Kinh Tế London (LSE), là 1 trong 3 trường đại học tốt nhất ở UK.</li> <li>Đạt điểm IELTS 8.5 khi 17 tuổi, được nhận phần thưởng và bằng khen của Bristish Council.</li> <li>Có kinh nghiệm giảng dạy tiếng Anh và IELTS cho nhiều học viên.</li> <li>Với kinh nghiệm học tập và làm việc 7 năm ở Anh, cô Mỹ Linh tin rằng có thể giúp các bạnxây dựng cho mình một chiến lược học thi khoa học, cách luyện tập và áp dụng thuần thục kỷ thuật, chiến thuật trong việc làm các đề thi IELTS nhằm đạt được một kết quả tốt nhất.</li> </ul>	

7. Cô Sông Mây – Lớp IELTS Tutor 1-1	<ul> <li>Theo học Cử nhân ngành Kinh Doanh Quốc Tế tại Đại học Fordham, Hoa Kỳ.</li> <li>Đạt 1470 SAT và IELTS 7.5 với điểm Reading và Listening đều trên 8.0.</li> <li>Với kinh nghiệm luyện thi và tự ôn thi IELTS, nắm khá rõ về cấu trúc bài thi, các dạng câu hỏi và đặc biệt là những khó khăn các bạn hay gặp phải lúc làm bài.</li> <li>Cô có thể hiểu được điểm mạnh và điểm yếu của các bạn học viên trong 4 kỹ năng, giúp các bạn tránh những lỗi hay mắc phải và dần cải thiện điểm số của mình.</li> </ul>
8. Thầy Thiện Hữu – Lớp IELTS Tutor 1-1	<ul> <li>Overall IELTS 7.5 với điểm Listening 8.5 và Writing 7.0.</li> <li>Hiện đang học cử nhân Kinh tế Đối ngoại tại ĐH Ngoại Thương TPHCM và cử nhân Quản lý Sự kiện tại ĐH NHL Stenden Hà Lan.</li> </ul>
9. Thầy Thiện Bùi – Lớp IELTS Tutor 1-1	<ul> <li>Đạt IELTS 8.0 chỉ trong nữa tháng chuyên tâm tự học, với điểm Reading tuyệt đối, Listening 8.5 và Speaking 7.5 khi còn đang học lớp 12.</li> <li>Theo học Bachelor of Commerce tại University of British Colombia.</li> <li>Với những kinh nghiệm chinh chiến với IELTS, thầy đã giúp nhiều học sinh đặt ra một lộ trình tối ưu, vượt qua những vấn đề ngăn cản các bạn đạt được điểm IELTS như ý.</li> </ul>
10. Cô Nguyên Khanh – Lớp IELTS Tutor 1-1	<ul> <li>Tốt nghiệp Thạc sĩ Y học cộng đồng (Public Health) tại đại học Western Sydney.</li> <li>Tốt nghiệp Cử nhân Khoa học Phóng xạ cho Y Tế (Medical Radiation Science) từ đại học Newcastle, Úc.</li> <li>Đạt điểm IELTS 8.0 với Reading 8.5 và Listening 9.0. Đã từng có khoảng thời gian luyện thi với điểm thi tăng lên nên hiểu được tâm lý và cách giảng dạy để học viên có thể tiếp thu dễ dàng và nhớ lâu hơn.</li> <li>Có kinh nghiệm 1 năm dạy IELTS từ căn bản đến nâng cao. Thiết kế bài giảng theo từng khả năng và tiến độ của mỗi người để có thể đạt kết quả tốt nhất.</li> <li>Có kinh nghiệm hướng dẫn các sinh viên với</li> </ul>

	trình độ khác nhau về viết luận, đặc biệt là viết tiếng Anh học thuật (Academic English) tỉ mỉ và cẩn thận để học viên có thể tiếp thu dễ dàng, hiệu quả và có thể áp dụng cả cho IELTS lẫn luận ở trường học.	
11. Cô Sang Sang	<ul> <li>Theo học chương trình MA British/American Literature, Culture, Media (Christian Albrechts University Kiel, Germany)</li> <li>Đam mê nghiên cứu về American culture,Philosophy, Psychology, và Behaviour.</li> <li>Kinh nghiệm 4 năm làm việc cho công ty (Expeditors và CH Robinson) ngành Logistics,top 500 Fortune.</li> <li>Từng trợ giảng cho sinh viên bậc đại học môn Theoretical Literature và Introduction to British/American Culture.</li> <li>Kinh nghiệm giảng dạy tiếng Anh, đặc biệt dành cho người học tiếng Anh từ căn bản tới trình độ có thể sự dụng tiếng Anh linh hoạt trong môi trường giao tiếp hằng ngày, học thuật, làm việc, và các kì thi như Ielts.</li> </ul>	
12. Cô Nhi Phạm Lớp IELTS Tutor 1-1	<ul> <li>Cựu học sinh lớp chuyên Anh trường THPT chuyên Quốc Học Huế.</li> <li>Từng là sinh viên chuyên ngành Life Sciences tại đại học khoa học ứng dụng HAN, Hà Lan với ngôn ngữ chính trong giảng dạy và đời sống là tiếng Anh.</li> <li>Sinh viên chuyên ngành Doctor of Medicine tại VinUniversity (full scholarship).</li> <li>IELTS 8.0 với Reading và Listening đạt 9.0, Speaking đạt 7.5 vào năm lớp 12.</li> <li>Trong suốt các năm phổ thông đã giành được 2 giải Ba Học sinh giỏi Quốc gia môn tiếng Anh, 1 Huy chương Vàng kì thi IOE cấp Quốc gia và 1 Huy chương Bạc kì thi Tài năng tiếng Anh cấp Quốc gia.</li> <li>Có kinh nghiệm giảng dạy tiếng Anh cơ bản và IELTS cho người mới bắt đầu.</li> </ul>	

# TẠI SAO NÊN CHỌN YES IELTS?

- Cô Như Ý founder và các trainers với điểm IELTS 8.0-8.5, nhiều kinh nghiệm luyện thi IELTS và bề dày thành tích học bổng ở các trường top đầu ở Úc, Canada, Anh, Mỹ.
- Lớp học đảm bảo cho mỗi học viên đều được tương tác trên lớp trực tiếp.
- Bài tập về nhà đa dạng, nhiều topic ngắn, hiệu quả.
- Bài writing sửa riêng từng bạn.
- Thi thử speaking mỗi buổi học nói.
- Tập trung hướng dẫn *cách đạt điểm cao*, 2 kĩ năng nghe-đọc hướng dẫn *tips tăng từ 0.5-1.0* sau 2 tháng.
- Cuối mỗi buổi học *có video ghi lại* nội dung đã học, *tiện lợi* cho các bạn bận rộn.

### Hình thức học Online là như thế nào?

- Các em sẽ được *add vào 1 lóp* trên Skype.
- Vào giờ học, cô và các bạn sẽ cùng online. Cô sẽ hướng dẫn và giảng bài nhiệt tình trên Zoom.
- Mỗi lớp học đều có trợ giảng theo dõi bài học, bài làm và hỗ trợ học viên 24/7.
- Sau mỗi buổi học các bạn sẽ *nhận video ghi lại bài học* ngày hôm đó.
- Đảm bảo *không mất bài học*, mỗi nội dung có thể *học kỹ nhiều lần*.
- Tài liệu học, đề thi cập nhật được gửi qua email cá nhân liên tục.
- Bài Speaking và Writing nộp qua email và sửa trực tiếp riêng từng bạn.

## Học gì trong từng kỹ năng tại YES IELTS?

- *Reading*: chia sẻ các tips đọc nhanh tìm ý, gạch chân từ khoá, mẹo trả lời câu hỏi true-falsenot given, tăng khả năng đoán câu trả lời điền từ vào chỗ trống và cách làm bài nhanh gọn chính xác cao của dạng nối tiêu đề bài đọc
- *Listening*: hướng dẫn cách tận dụng thời gian đọc câu hỏi trước khi nghe hiệu quả, chỉ cách tìm từ paraphrase trong bài nghe và các mẹo tránh bị lừa trong câu hỏi
- *Writing*: cung cấp dàn ý cho 4 dạng đề chính, hướng dẫn và sửa các lỗi văn phạm học sinh hay gặp và cung cấp từ vựng các chủ đề khác nhau
- *Speaking*: chỉnh phát âm, cung cấp mẫu câu và từ vựng cũng như bài nói mẫu cho các topics hay gặp.

Tổng hợp từ nguồn: kiransielts.blogspot.com

- THÔNG TIN LIÊN HỆ:
- INBOX ngay để được tư vấn về lớp học và học phí!
- FB: https://www.facebook.com/nhuyielts8.5/
- Điện thoại: 070 676 2826
- Sách thuộc sở hữu của Như Ý IELTS (YES IELTS)
- Nghiêm cấm sao chép dưới mọi hình thức.

