

# 新G高分范文

新学期开始了

爽了一寒假并增重 10 斤的你还好吗

俗话说：

3 月不减肥，6 月徒伤悲

3 月不杀 G，申请要悲剧

考 G 的日子越来越近了

作文又一次要裸考了有木有 !!!

眼看着越来越多的学校要求 AW3.5

还不赶快和 AW3.0 分手！

快来看看三千菌为你精心编排的高分作文吧

3000菌



微臣教育 琦叔团队 专注 GRE

咨询电话: 010-82484015

<http://www.weichenedu.cn>

## You Get More than GRE

**在 GRE 备考的路上困难重重，常常有人抱怨：**

“在图书馆气氛太差，根本学不进去”

“找不到一个坑里的队友”

“每天被拖延症耽搁，总是完不成计划的任务”

**直到你来到了微臣线下 325 计划**



高质量的课程体验



钢铁般的同学友谊



摆脱拖延症的良方

### 课程特色：

世界上考 G 次数最多没有之一的大神、GRE 考场最熟悉的面孔---琦叔领衔授课；

小班授课，一站式解决 GRE 备考中的全部问题；

课程结束之后，按照我们的方法复习 1-2 个月，极大可能冲到 155+170 以上的成绩。

### 课程时间：

325 计划分为 28 天与 15 天，15 天是 28 天的浓缩版本，是为有过系统学习 GRE 的经历以

及 28 天时间不合适的同学所准备的，每天 8:30-21:30，让你体验到前所未有的高效。

**详情请咨询：010-82484015 / 18632737591**





微臣教育 琦叔团队 专注 GRE

咨询电话：010-82484015

<http://www.weichenedu.cn>

如果你来不了线下 325 计划，也不要担心~还有**线上课**给你帮忙！

#### **点词班：**

最近两次考试的主考词；最新题目和最核心的词汇融合串讲；用两套真题主考词极大提升实力。

#### **Verbal 考点精练班：**

用最短的时间打下夯实的基础；进一步提升解题速度和解题能力；琦叔团队带你横扫所有考点。

#### **GRE AW 作文班：**

详细分析 GRE 经典题目；当面分析错因，现场书写范文；用最短的时间理清写作的逻辑思路。

#### **GRE 阅读冲分班：**

阅读备考最强定心丸；剖析 GRE 经典阅读篇目；5 小时高强度突破，极大提升阅读耐力。

详情请关注微信公众号：qishuGRE

微臣教育官网：[www.weichenedu.cn](http://www.weichenedu.cn)

新浪微博：<http://t.cn/RwNbssj>

YY 再要你命 3K 频道：<http://t.cn/Rz45OeA>

顺带，想咨询更多备考信息，请联系 3000 菌微信：zynm3000



# Issue 1

Colleges and universities should require all faculty to spend time working outside the academic world in professions relevant to the courses they teach.

Write a response in which you discuss your views on the policy and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should consider the possible consequences of implementing the policy and explain how these consequences shape your position.

Should universities and college require **all** faculties to spend time working outside the academic world in professions relevant to the course they teach? To a large extent I agree this recommendation because faculties' exposures to different industries to society related to their field of study can both promote academic research and teaching, though this policy may not be applicable to instructors in all fields.

In the first place, a professor's research can benefit from his past working experience in a non-academic environment, thanks to his awareness of the need of the industry and thus that of the society originating from this very experience. For example if a faculty member in biology department can get the opportunity to work in a pharmaceutical company, he will have a more in-depth and comprehensive understanding of the current needs of the medicine industry. Such needs reflect the difficulties arising from battling diseases. Therefore when he returns to the university, he can focus his work on those pressing demands of the industry, thereby benefiting the society by testing more effective medicines and better combating diseases. Such lines of reasoning can also be extended to other branches of applied sciences, and therefore it would be helpful for professors in college to work outside academia in terms of scientific research.

Moreover benefits from understanding the needs of industry and society extend further to teaching. Once instructors are fully aware of such needs, their students will be better informed and better prepared in career. Imagine a faculty member specializing in computer science, who actively participates in non-academic, industrial activities. He will certainly know requirements of the industry and desired qualities for a programmer in this rapid-changing field better than his colleagues who never leaves the ivory tower of universities. Thus he will be able to enlighten his students with his insights and help them become a productive member of the community as well as find a lucrative career. Professors' working in industry becomes an effective channel to broadcast the demands of employers to potential labor providers, and thereby benefiting his students.

Before I reach my final conclusion, I feel the urge to point out that it's not always an advisable suggestion to require all faculty members to step aside from academia for a period of time and engage themselves in the real world. To understand this point, we must realize some certain fields of study, such as pure mathematics and theoretical cosmology, the connection between the academia and the industry is relatively weak. Under such circumstances, it is hard for faculties to find an appropriate job and even if they do, the society benefit from their participation is nominal, since there may be little industrial interest either in their research or teaching. Therefore it would be a waste of time and resources to require faculties from those specific to work outside academia.

To sum up, it would be very helpful with respect to research and teaching to require faculty members to work in the industrial world outside the academic one, though admittedly for some particular disciplines, especially those with little connections with the industry and society, this may not be a good recommendation.

People's behavior is largely determined by forces not of their own making.

Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should consider ways in which the statement might or might not hold true and explain how these considerations shape your position.

Human behaviors are interesting in that they can either be spontaneous or forced by external environment. Opinions vary greatly regarding the relative importance of the factors mentioned above. From my perspective, I agree with the statement that external forces, rather than people's own making, play a more important role in determining people's behaviors.

To start with, human beings are social animals and therefore must live by and obey social norms. Therefore to a large extent, social norms determine what can be or not can be done. The reason for mankind being a social species can be traced back to ancient times, when individuals are fragile against the adversities of nature. However when acting collectively, humans become much stronger and the possibility of survival substantially increases. Over time being a part of a group or tribe becomes an advantage to survival. Therefore one could be excluded from the group and face the risk of perishing alone if he defies the norms that governs the group. That's why humans are gregarious in nature.

Indeed although we have illustrated the importance of environmental factors in regulating our behaviors, one can still find some instances in which our behavior is solely determined by our own making. For example they may argue one can decide what his dinner is going to and there is no external forces at first glance. While this argument can be true when people don't interact with the society, we must realize that instances with complete isolation from the society are rare in modern days. Let's still take the dinner problem as an example of how profoundly we are connected with the society. As mentioned above, social norms determine our behavior in an effective way, and moreover we should notice that social norms are diverse. One particular type concerns itself with the food we eat. Different cultures for example may have different attitude towards the same food: in Western countries dogs are rarely regarded as food whereas in some Eastern countries people eat dog. Imagine you're born in the United States and even if you have the power to decide what to have for dinner, you wouldn't pick dog because societal culture prohibits such behaviors. Thus implicitly our social environment has already imprinted some norms and regulations in our behaviors, even though we may feel the decision comes purely from our own consideration.

To summarize, because human beings are social animals subject to established social norms, I must conclude that people's behavior is largely determined by external forces. The adverb "largely" must be highlighted here because as some may suggest, in some circumstances where no interaction with the outside world is involved our own making determines what we do.

Scientists and other researchers should focus their research on areas that are likely to benefit the greatest number of people.

Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should consider ways in which the statement might or might not hold true and explain how these considerations shape your position.

Those who keep an eye on the relationship between science and society have been debating whether scientists and researchers should focus their research on areas that are likely to benefit the majority of people. Although I largely support the view that scientists' focus should benefit majority of people in theory, in practice this view may not be beneficial, because our limited ability to predict whether a field will benefit society or not, and because ethically speaking the minority also deserves equal treatment.

To start with, I agree with the belief that science should be aimed to benefit the majority of people in society, because government funding provided to scientists come from taxpayers, or every societal member. Therefore scientists have the social responsibility to serve the public, and the way to achieve that is by addressing the questions to benefit everyone. However, the resources are limited, preventing scientists delving into all the fields in which they are interested. In this case, the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few. In other words, scientists should fulfill their social responsibility by focusing their research on the area that can benefit most people.

However, although in theory it is justifiable for scientists to study what can be beneficial to the greatest number of people, such a belief may encounter many difficulties in practice and produce many negative consequences. The most prominent problem is that it is hard for us to determine if an area is capable of benefiting the majority of people, as the world of science is changing so fast that no one can confidently predict its trajectory. For example, a field of study that might seem irrelevant to our society today may turn out to be of pivotal importance in the future. Molecular biology, when it was born, was not regarded as scientific discipline that can benefit many people; rather, it is our curiosity to understand the world that drove scientists to unflaggingly study that field. A few decades later, however, molecular biologists have been in the frontline of combating diseases such as cancer and AIDS, and their research has become critical in improving the life quality of most people. This is a vivid example of how an area which is of not social significance at first glance becomes what can benefit the greatest number of people. In this case, if scientists only focus their research on areas that are known to produce social benefits, they will lose research opportunities that can benefit society in the future.

Furthermore, the rights of the minority should not be completely ignored. From my point of view whether the minority receives adequate attention is the marker of a civilized society. Therefore if scientists' research focus is only limited to the benefits of the majority, the rights of the minority would not be adequately addressed. For example, people with rare diseases should also receive medical attention and scientific scrutiny. Thus for the sake of equality scientific research should also cover the benefits of the minority.

To summarize, although theoretically speaking scientists should work for the benefits of the greatest number of people, there are certain practical and moral issues involved. There isn't a simple answer to what scientists should focus their research on.



# Issue 4

Requiring university students to take a variety of courses outside their major fields of study is the best way to ensure that students become truly educated.

Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should consider ways in which the statement might or might not hold true and explain how these considerations shape your position.

Recently those who have been keeping an eye on college education propose that taking a variety of courses outside their major fields of study is the best way to ensure that students become truly educated. From my perspective, I largely agree with this statement, in that exposure to an interdisciplinary environment will help students not only gain deeper understanding but also expand the frontiers of their major fields of study, although under some particular circumstances this proposal may not be the best one.

Before any serious discussion on the statement above can be made, it is necessary to define what “become truly educated” is. In my view, college education should aim to promote the advancement and accumulation of human knowledge. In this sense, to become truly educated, a student must be able to have a profound understanding of existing knowledge of a specific realm, and at the same time to explore new domains of knowledge.

Within the scope of this definition, it is obvious that taking classes outside one’s major fields of study can be helpful in terms of “true education” in at least two ways. Firstly taking non-major classes can better our understanding of our own fields of study, because they provide tools by which we can more effectively scrutinize what we are interested in. For example, economics can be applied in various scientific disciplines related to social issues, such as the study of environmental pollutions. By studying basic principles in economics such as Value of Statistical Life and cost-benefit analysis, a student majoring in environment sciences will have a clearer picture of the social dynamics behind pollutions. In other words, he will have a more profound understanding of environmental issues thanks to a different perspective from economics. Secondly, our world today is different from its past, where different scientific disciplines operated own their own and there were little, if any, interactions among scholars in different fields. Hence nowadays the advancement of sciences relies on inputs from other disciplines. Sociologists for instance have benefited greatly from the progress in computer sciences, particularly those from networking theories, which allow sociologists expand their research fields into the domains they could have never explored using traditional methods. Judging from the two benefits of studying non-major courses mentioned above, asking students to take classes outside their major fields of study fulfills the purpose of true college education.

Admittedly, though, sometimes requiring every student to participate in non-major classes might produce unexpected negative consequences, which could actually prevent students from becoming truly educated. For instance, the workload of major classes might be already formidable for students in certain majors, and any additional requirement to take non-major ones could pose heavy burden on them. Instead of benefiting from the interdisciplinary environment, those students may actually be adversely affected in that their efforts in primary fields of study are distracted. In cases like this, it is necessary to evaluate the impact of requiring students to enroll in a variety of classes outside their major fields of study, even though in theory this could be a generally beneficial practice.

To sum up, it is admittedly true that not every student shall benefit from courses outside their major fields of study. That being said, given the definition of “becoming truly educated”, it is very beneficial to let students engage in classes outside their major in most cases.

# Argument 1

The following appeared in a newsletter offering advice to investors.

"Over 80 percent of the respondents to a recent survey indicated a desire to reduce their intake of foods containing fats and cholesterol, and today low-fat products abound in many food stores. Since many of the food products currently marketed by Old Dairy Industries are high in fat and cholesterol, the company's sales are likely to diminish greatly and company profits will no doubt decrease. We therefore advise Old Dairy stockholders to sell their shares, and other investors not to purchase stock in this company."

Write a response in which you discuss what questions would need to be answered in order to decide whether the advice and the argument on which it is based are reasonable. Be sure to explain how the answers to these questions would help to evaluate the advice.

In this newsletter, the author recommends stockholders of Old Dairy sell their shares and other investors refrain from investing in Old Dairy, because of a number of facts that presumably indicate an unpromising future for Old Dairy's financial performance. Although the advice itself might be useful, close scrutiny reveals that there are some unsubstantiated assumptions and logical flaws in the author's lines of reasoning, which prevent us from giving an effective evaluation on his advice unless several key questions can be adequately addressed.

To start with, we need to consider the fundamental question whether the survey the author provides is valid. Since we are not given any information about the scope of the survey or the constituent of respondents, it is possible that the survey is biased, or statistically invalid at all. For example, if the study only surveys a small group of consumers, it is questionable whether the survey can represent the will of the general public. On the contrary if the author can demonstrate the validity of the survey by offering more details about how it is done, we will find the survey as well as subsequent reasoning based upon it more credible.

Furthermore, granted that consumers are willing to purchase more food low in fat and cholesterol, as the survey suggests, it remains a question whether they will put such a will into real action. The rationale behind this concern is that consumers usually take into account various factors, including taste and price, when making a purchase decision. A possible scenario is that consumers may find food low in fat and cholesterol too expensive or less tasty, and in this case they will not likely decrease the consumption of high fat products even though concerns about health encourage them to switch from high fat foods to low fat ones. Thus the author's advice shall be weakened, unless there are observations that consumers indeed decrease the consumption of foods high in fat and cholesterol.

Finally, even if we assume that consumers will turn their wills into actions, it is still worthwhile to consider whether Old Dairy will be adversely affected to the extent that its stock shall depreciate significantly. After all as a company Old Dairy may change its product line and marketing strategy according to consumer preference. For instance, if Old Dairy decides to transform itself from a producer of high fat foods into that of healthy foods low in fat and cholesterol, it is not unreasonable to predict that Old Dairy will enjoy better sales and subsequent higher profits. That being said, it is also possible that Old Dairy is reluctant to change so as to cater to the taste of customers, which could possibly undermine its sales and profitability, and ultimately lower the value of its stock.

To summarize, although the author provides some facts in hopes of supporting his advice, we cannot safely reach a conclusion about whether his recommendation is advisable, due to some flaws in his argument. For a better evaluation of his conclusion, more information is needed to address certain critical questions.