

Arts in Schools?

Some people think that **art is an essential subject for children at school** while others think it is a waste of time. **Discuss both sides and give your opinion.**

There is no doubt that art education can play a vital role in the overall development of a child. Although some believe that including this including art in their curriculum is not worth their time, I would argue that it is a necessary subject that enhances their learning experience.

On the one hand, those who believe studying art is time consuming and worthless might argue that it does not lead to a successful career. This is because many artists struggle to make a living. For instance, a painter may have trouble selling a single piece of his art. By contrast, if the same time is utilized for learning other more important subjects such as science or business at school, it is likely that it will result in a fruitful profession like medicine, engineering, law or architecture.

On the other hand, my view is that it is very important to teach art at this stage because it imparts different life skills. The reason for this is that by practicing arts children can develop skills like patience, improved motor ability, better hand-eye co-ordination, creativity and many more. By completing a project and observing the rewards of hard work they build perseverance and unique way of thinking abilities, for example. Hence, if these skills are not taught at school, it may hinder the overall development of children.

In conclusion, while it is true that teaching art at school may seem to be a worthless and time consuming pursuit, it is my firm belief that the time spent on it will definitely foster life skills crucial for success in future.

History in Schools?

Schools are spending more time teaching traditional subjects such **as history**. Some people think they should rather spend more time in teaching skills that can help students find a job. **To what extent do you agree or disagree.**

Traditional school curriculum gives too much importance to subjects like history or arts. Some people oppose this. In their opinion, schools should teach subjects that will improve the employability of their students. I totally agree with this view.

History is important. After all, there is no point in developing a generation of professionals who know absolutely nothing about their culture or history. However, problems arise when traditional subjects get more importance than job-oriented subjects.

Learning subjects like history or literature might make a person more knowledgeable; however, these subjects do not improve the job worthiness of a student. Employers need professional degrees. It is not easy to find a job after obtaining a degree in history or arts. This is not exactly the case with science or maths graduates. Since they possess the skills required by the industry, they find jobs easily.

Everyone wants to be able to find a good job after finishing their studies. When the schools give more importance to professional or vocational subjects, students can start learning the skills required by the industry from a young age. This will improve their competence. Unemployment figures are increasing rapidly all over the world. If we examine the unemployment situation in any country, it is not hard to see that most of the unemployed are students who lack a professional degree. When schools give more importance to subjects like maths or science, more and more students will want to enrol in professional courses when they go to university and such courses will enable them to find jobs easily.

To conclude, subjects like history or literature are important, but maths and science are even more important. After all, the ultimate goal of education is helping students to find employment. Therefore, I totally agree with the argument that schools should focus on teaching the skills that will prepare their students for the workplace.

Some people believe that it is more important to teach **children the literature and history of their own country**, rather than the literature and history of other countries. **To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

People have different views about the teaching of national versus global literature and history in schools. Personally, I support the idea that children should study first and foremost the great books and historical events of their own countries.

There are several reasons why I believe that schools should focus on teaching national literature and history. Firstly, children enjoy learning about where they live, and by studying the ideas, culture and history of their own countries they begin to develop a sense of identity. At the same time, this approach is appealing to parents, who studied the same books and historical events and can therefore help their children with school work. English children, for example, read Shakespeare and learn about the Battle of Hastings just as their parents did, and there is educational continuity across the generations. Finally, an emphasis on national literature and history gives educators a narrower teaching scope, making curriculum design an easier task.

By contrast, the study of global events and foreign novels could cause unnecessary difficulty and confusion for school pupils. For example, I do not see the point in presenting Russian or Chinese history to a British child who has not yet studied the history of his or her own country in detail. Surely the child would be more able to comprehend historical events that took place in London than those that happened in Moscow or Beijing. Similarly, any exposure to international literature is likely to require the teaching of a foreign language or the use of translations. Young people at primary or secondary school age are simply not ready for such complications.

In conclusion, I would argue that it is undesirable for schools to cover aspects of foreign history and literature; they should ground their pupils in the local culture instead.

Some people believe that **studying history** is very important and we must study the past to understand the present. Others say that it is useless and should not be studied at all. **Discuss both views and give your own opinion.**

While some people think that learning history is crucial for understanding the present, others argue that it is a waste of time. This essay supports the idea that people can improve their future by studying past, and it disagrees with people who believe that historical situations are unlikely to be repeated in future.

People who are in support of studying history opine that it provides opportunities to learn from the mistakes. Every nation faced challenges in the past and sometimes wrong decisions taken in those situations resulted in undesirable outcomes. People can learn from these mistakes and take better decisions in case they face similar circumstances again. This essay agrees with this notion, because it can be easily observed that almost every developed country gives significant importance to history, which shows that a willingness to learn from the past mistakes helps in achieving economic and social milestones.

However, many people argue that the historical situations are not comparable / can never be compared to the current scenarios. These people think that world has changed in so many different ways that learning about the history is useless. This essay does not agree with this thinking because history has repeated itself many times. For instance, Pakistan and India suffered huge losses when they fought their first war against each other; however, both countries did not learn from their mistakes, and consequently they were forced to fight several subsequent battles.

In conclusion, nations can control their present and shape their future by learning from the mistakes committed in the history. Although dynamics of the world have changed significantly over the period of time, history tends to repeat itself; therefore, it is always useful to study the past and to anticipate similar situations.

Music in Schools?

Music should not be taught in **schools**. Instead other subjects such as computer and science should be taught. **Do you agree or disagree with the statement?**

It is considered by many that subjects such as computer and science should be preferred to subjects such as music. Although computer and science are crucial subjects, in my opinion, they cannot replace music as it has its own importance.

Firstly, music comes under the category of art and therefore, it cannot be compared with science. In other words, often music represents the culture and custom of a community which cannot be represented by other means. If music is replaced in schools with other subjects, newer generation will never be able to fully understand and connect with their community's culture. For example, often a lot of traditional stories are told in the form of folk songs because the music in the folk songs helps the children to understand the situation and emotions of the story.

Another point to consider before preferring subjects like computers to music is that every child has different interests. While some students may be interested in science, there will be many who are interested in music. Moreover, students will get to know about the music at a young age which will increase career options available to them. For instance, a lot of famous musicians discovered music as a subject in their school. Ultimately, they found value in music and chose it as their career path.

In conclusion, music is as important as subjects like computer and science because it has cultural significance and helps people to understand emotions. While other subjects have good career opportunities, music also offers a career with money and fame. Hence, I think it will be unwise to replace music with other subjects.

Music should not be taught in **schools**. Instead other subjects such as computer and science should be taught. **Do you agree or disagree with the statement?**

Some people believe that music should not be part of the school curriculum, and only other subjects such as information technology, science and math should be taught. In my opinion, music might not be a subject that can directly help individuals in their professional life, yet there are indirect benefits that make music indispensable.

Admittedly, people who claim that music should not be taught at school believe it is no longer a subject that provides individuals with skills required to generate a sustainable income. Moreover, they think that the current job market favours professions related to artificial intelligence, mobile applications, finance and economy. These occupations require knowledge in subjects such as information technology, math and science.

On the other hand, although music might not open the doors to a successful career, it has an important influence on individuals and supports them in their personal and professional life. First, music helps the mental and spiritual growth of people. It is proven that listening to or playing certain kind of music helps individuals to relax, reduce stress and focus on their work. Secondly, music makes considerable contribution to enhancing the health of human beings. Many Medical studies have proven that playing certain music instruments reduces heart rates and blood pressure. For these reasons music will always be an essential subject that humans should not ignore. It helps them to find their inner peace and supports them in doing other activities and facing challenges.

In conclusion, I believe music might not be the subject that directly helps students in their future professional career; however, music can give important contribution to human's spiritual and mental health which makes it indispensable.

Music should not be taught in **schools**. Instead other subjects such as computer and science should be taught. **Do you agree or disagree with the statement?**

Some people believe that music should not be part of the school curriculum, and only other subjects such as information technology, science and math should be taught. In my opinion, music might not be a subject that can directly help individuals in their professional life, yet there are indirect benefits that make music indispensable.

Admittedly, people who claim that music should not be taught at school believe it is no longer a subject that provides individuals with skills required to generate a sustainable income. Moreover, they think that the current job market favours professions related to artificial intelligence, mobile applications, finance and economy. These occupations require knowledge in subjects such as information technology, math and science.

On the other hand, although music might not open the doors to a successful career, it has an important influence on individuals and supports them in their personal and professional life. First, music helps the mental and spiritual growth of people. It is proven that listening to or playing certain kind of music helps individuals to relax, reduce stress and focus on their work. Secondly, music makes considerable contribution to enhancing the health of human beings. Many Medical studies have proven that playing certain music instruments reduces heart rates and blood pressure. For these reasons music will always be an essential subject that humans should not ignore. It helps them to find their inner peace and supports them in doing other activities and facing challenges.

In conclusion, I believe music might not be the subject that directly helps students in their future professional career; however, music can give important contribution to human's spiritual and mental health which makes it indispensable.

Unpaid Community Work / Volunteering
in Schools?

Some people believe that **unpaid community service** should be a compulsory part of high school programmes (for example working for a charity, improving the neighborhood or teaching sports to younger children). **To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

It is argued that volunteering should be made part of the school curriculum. This essay agrees with that suggestion completely because of the benefits it brings to pupils. The essay will first look at how voluntary work can help students develop soft skills and then discuss how these extracurricular activities are valued by universities and employers.

Education should not be limited to strictly academic pursuits and those in education should also develop life skills, such as teamwork, empathy and self-discipline, and one of the best ways to hone these aptitudes is through community service. Serving those less fortunate than ourselves teaches us many lessons including how to work with people from other backgrounds and the value of hard work. For example, I personally volunteered to spend 6 weeks in Africa teaching disadvantaged children and this led to a much higher work ethic when I returned to my studies.

Many colleges and companies are also increasingly looking for this type of experience. Most school leavers have the same grades and charitable works can help set you apart from the herd. For example, Cambridge and Oxford receive thousands of applications from straight-A students every year and can only accept a small percentage of applicants. What you have done outside the classroom is often the thing that differentiates you from everyone else and gets you that coveted spot.

In conclusion, teenagers should be made to partake in unpaid work as part of their schooling because it will help them learn things they wouldn't ordinarily learn from their teachers and it will also boost their chances of getting into third level education.

Some people believe that **unpaid community service** should be a compulsory part of high school programmes (for example working for a charity, improving the neighborhood or teaching sports to younger children). **To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

Education plays a very important role in the lives of people. Some people are of the opinion that unpaid community services should be made compulsory for school students. In my opinion, the advantages of adding unpaid community service to the school curriculum outweigh the drawbacks, if any.

Children have very impressionable minds and school programs should be designed in such a way that they will ensure the overall development of the child. Dignity of labor is an essential topic that is covered in the school curriculum but it is better understood when children actually engage in various forms of labour. For example, when students are made to do community service like cleaning up a park every Friday, it instills in them respect for the person doing that job and also a greater awareness that littering is a bad habit.

Some people will argue that a child should not be put through these kinds of experiences as they should be made to aspire for greater things in life by working really hard in school. Moreover, they should spend more time studying. I believe if the importance of serving the society is instilled in the children from a very early age, they will grow up to become a much more socially aware and socially responsible person. For example, in Japanese education system, special emphasis is given to community service, though many people do not understand why it is necessary. However, the purpose of this became clear during the recently concluded football World Cup in Russia. Although the Japanese team lost the semi final match they won the hearts of many people by the service they provided by cleaning up the stands of a foreign country.

In conclusion, the advantages of mandatory community service in school outweigh any disadvantages associated with it. After studying the pros and cons, I am convinced that community service helps the overall development of the child and subsequently the nation.

Some people believe that **unpaid community service** should be a compulsory part of high school programmes (for example working for a charity, improving the neighborhood or teaching sports to younger children). **To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

Every nation needs citizens who show social commitment. Since children are the future of a nation, some people believe that they should be required to engage in unpaid community work while they are at school. I strongly agree with this argument. In my opinion, every student should be required to do something for the society. Since many of them are unlikely to have the inclination to do so on their own, making it compulsory is the only way out.

When school students engage in community service, they get to learn a lot of life skills. They learn to be empathetic. When they help poor or disabled people, they learn to appreciate their own life. They realize that they have got many things that other people don't have. Working with or working for less fortunate people is a great way to understand the meaning of one's own life.

There is yet another reason for making social work compulsory. Nowadays children are becoming too full of themselves. They have little time for others. They are constantly glued to their smart phones or gaming consoles. In most cases, making community service an integral part of the school curriculum is the only way to get them engaged in social work. The best part is that once they become involved in social causes they will begin to enjoy helping others. When they realize that their work makes a difference to another person's life, they will begin to like it.

Another important benefit of engaging in community service is that it provides children an opportunity to improve their communication skills. When they interact with people from all walks of life, they learn a lot of coping skills as well.

To conclude, students who engage in unpaid community service reap a lot of benefits. Since few students have the natural drive for social work, making it compulsory is the only way to get them engaged in social work. Therefore, I agree with the argument that community service should be a compulsory part of school curriculum.

Some people believe that **unpaid community service** should be a compulsory part of high school programmes (for example working for a charity, improving the neighborhood or teaching sports to younger children). **To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

Many young people work on a volunteer basis, and this can only be beneficial for both the individual and society as a whole. However, I do not agree that we should therefore force all teenagers to do unpaid work.

Most young people are already under enough pressure with their studies, without being given the added responsibility of working in their spare time. School is just as demanding as a full-time job, and teachers expect their students to do homework and exam revision on top of attending lessons every day. When young people do have some free time, we should encourage them to enjoy it with their friends or to spend it doing sports and other leisure activities. They have many years of work ahead of them when they finish their studies.

At the same time, I do not believe that society has anything to gain from obliging young people to do unpaid work. In fact, I would argue that it goes against the values of a free and fair society to force a group of people to do something against their will. Doing this can only lead to resentment amongst young people, who would feel that they were being used, and parents, who would not want to be told how to raise their children. Currently, nobody is forced to volunteer, and this is surely the best system.

In conclusion, teenagers may choose to work for free and help others, but in my opinion we should not make this compulsory.

Some people believe that **unpaid community service** should be a compulsory part of high school programmes (for example working for a charity, improving the neighborhood or teaching sports to younger children). **To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

It is often argued that school curricula should include community work, and pupils ought to do it free of charge. This essay will show that such experience at school can be beneficial for children as they learn to be better people and more responsible citizens of their country.

Undoubtedly, volunteering teaches people to empathise with others, not to be indifferent to others' needs and lend a hand to strangers when it is needed. It is crucial that children acquire these qualities since a very early age, and schools can provide a great opportunity to do that. Looking from my vantage point, I can say that the school where I used to study made me a kinder, more considerate person when my fellow pupils and I participated in a special programme that was aimed at helping older people do housework.

Many educators around the world claim that it is important to make even young children aware of the fact that they are citizens of their country, and that they have their rights and responsibilities. Community service can certainly raise this awareness by showing that even very young people can improve the world around them. For example, in my hometown in Russia, schoolchildren are encouraged to collect recyclable materials such as plastic, paper and glass, and everything that is collected by them accounts for three-quarters of all recyclables in the region.

In conclusion, unpaid labour for the sake of a better neighbourhood has many advantages such as learning to be caring to others and to be in charge of what happens in one's community. While some countries such as Russia has partly adopted community service for their curricula, more countries can incorporate this element in theirs in the future.

Foreign Language in Schools?

Some experts believe that it is better for children to begin learning a foreign language at primary schools rather than secondary school. Do **the advantages of this outweigh the disadvantages?**

Some authorities think that it is more favorable for pupils to begin studying languages at primary school instead of secondary school. In my opinion, merits of learning a foreign language at an early age are far higher than its demerits. The essay will first demonstrate that the earlier someone learns an additional language the more likely they are to master it and that it brings added cognitive benefits, followed by an analysis of how the primary disadvantage, namely confusion with their native tongue, is not valid.

The main reason to start kids off with foreign languages early is that this increases the likelihood they will achieve fluency in adulthood. They will have far more years to perfect their skills and it will seem perfectly normal to speak bilingually. For example, in countries such as Holland and Norway where English is taught from a very young age, more than 95% of adults speak it at an advanced level. Learning a second language also helps to improve overall cognitive abilities. In other words it benefits the overall development of a child's brain. A recent survey by Cambridge University found that children who studied a new language before the age of 5 were significantly more likely to score higher in Mathematics and Science.

On the other hand, some people believe that children may confuse the foreign language with their mother tongue when they learn it at a younger age. However, research has proven that young children are better than older children at learning pronunciation, vocabulary and rhythm of the language. They will also achieve higher levels of proficiency at the end of the secondary school education, if they start to learn it early. For this reason I think learning a new language is more effective in primary schools than secondary schools.

In conclusion, although some people are against teaching foreign languages to young people, I believe that it is beneficial for young children to learn foreign language at a younger age as it will their cognitive abilities and language skills.

School work in Free time?

Some people believe that **children are given too much free time**. They feel that this time should be used to do more school work.

How do you think children should spend their free time?

Some people feel that children get too much free time. In their opinion, kids should use their spare time to do their school assignments. I do not agree with me. In my opinion, free time is essential for the overall growth and development of children and it should not be used for academic work.

To start with, I do not agree with the view that children get a lot of free time. Most children spend a great deal of time at school and once they get home they have to do their homework. Therefore, it is unfair to ask them to do their school work in the few spare hours they get. Parents and teachers who insist that children should only study and not play are actually doing them a major disservice.

Contrary to what some people believe, leisure is actually important for the wellbeing of both children and adults. Free time allows children to relax and engage in activities they enjoy. Studies have shown that children who play well are actually healthier and more intelligent. Obesity has become a major health problem among children who lead a sedentary lifestyle. By encouraging them to play a physical sport in their free time, parents can actually protect them from a variety of ailments.

Since physically active children fall ill less often they do not miss many school days. Actually both factors improve their grades in school. They are also happier than their counterparts who are always busy with their studies. Better still, free time allows children to discover and hone their latent talents.

To conclude, the argument that children should do their school work in their free time is meaningless. In order to succeed in life they should not only study but also play.

Some people believe that **children are given too much free time**. They feel that this time should be used to do more school work. How do you think children should spend their free time?

Many people think that youngsters are having so much leisure time and this time could be spent with more school work. I think that school work is crucial for children but spending free time on other activities may be more beneficial for them.

Some people suggest that children should spend their free time on school work. Although this suggestion is beneficial for their grades, this can lead to some problems. For instance, children who are forced to do more homework in their free time are becoming less sociable. Also more work increases their stress level so allowing them to be free in their leisure time may lead to an increase in their happiness.

I think that children should spend their free time with their friends in the parks or they can spend their time on activities that they enjoy doing the most. Playing in the park with their friends contributes to their social skills in a positive way. Also, they can do a variety of things that they enjoy such as, playing with their toys or drawing pictures. These activities may increase their creativity. Another benefit of having free time without extra school work could be that children may find hobbies that are enjoyable to do. So there are many fun and enjoyable activities that kids can do in their free time to keep them fruitfully occupied.

In conclusion, even though studying for school work in children's free time could be useful, there are also negative sides to that choice and spending time on other activities like playing with friends or spending time on art could have more positive impacts on them.

Some people believe that children are given too much free time. They feel that this time should be used to do more school work. How do you think children should spend their free time?

Nowadays both parents and teachers give undue importance to academic grades. Some people feel that since children get too much free time, they should use it to do their school work. I do not agree with this view.

To start with, the argument that children get too much free time does not hold water. Most of them already spend 7 or 8 hours at school and afterwards they have coaching classes to attend and homework to do. Most kids receive barely one or two hours of free time in a day and asking them to use that time for school work is outrageous to say the least.

Over emphasis on academics stems from the belief that school grades are an indicator of a child's future success. However, this is not always the case. If we look around we can see that many of the super successful people in our world are college dropouts. While it is true that we are now living in an age of cut throat competition there is nothing to prove that only A graders can succeed in life. Success, in fact, depends on a variety of factors and academic grades are just one of them. A person's communication skills, overall personality and character traits also play a crucial role in determining their chances of finding success and happiness in life. Therefore, in my opinion, parents should encourage children to pursue their non-academic interests during their free time. For example, they should be allowed to play a sport or learn a musical instrument. Engaging in such activities is a great opportunity for them to beat stress and gain physical strength and stamina.

To conclude, leisure is important for the overall development of children and hence instead of asking them to complete their school work during their free time, parents should allow them to play and be themselves.

Academic vs Non-Academic Subjects

Some people believe that academic subjects such as chemistry, physics and history should be taught in schools, while others believe that students will derive more benefit from studying practical subjects, such as motor mechanics and cooking. **Discuss both views and give your own opinion**

Some people insist / opine that the school curriculum should give more importance to academic subjects like history or physics, while others argue that the emphasis should be on imparting practical skills. In my opinion, subjects such as science, mathematics and history prepare children for a brighter future and hence they should be given more importance.

On the one hand, there is ample evidence to prove that children are interested in practical skills. To begin with, these skills may help them make a little amount of money to fulfil their small needs and wishes. Furthermore, learning practical skills such as cooking, or carpentry is fun because the output can be seen and appreciated almost instantly. For example, in a recent survey done by the sophomores of Florida University, 65% of parents of school going children admitted that their young kids enjoy learning practical skills more than academic subjects. However, learning academic subjects leads to better career prospects in future.

On the other hand, during the past decade, job market surveys emphasized the importance of having professional skills. Firstly, scientists and technologists are paid far better than the people doing lower level jobs. In other words, this means that well educated people live more comfortable lives than those who lack it. Secondly, there is a huge demand for professionals in all fields in comparison to the saturated market of blue collar jobs and workers. It goes without saying that if children are encouraged to pursue academic subjects with more interest then they will witness a brighter future.

To conclude, practical skills may interest children in their initial stage of life but to have better opportunities and happiness in life they will need to master academic subjects.

With pressure on today's young people to succeed academically, some people believe that **non-academic subjects** should be removed from the syllabus so that the children can concentrate wholly on academic subjects. **To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

There is no denying the fact that school children are under tremendous pressure to perform well in academics. It is no secret that the students who score high grades in academics are more likely to have a successful career in the future compared to their counterparts, who score average or below-average. Many schools offer these days both academic and non-academic subjects in their curriculum to ensure the holistic growth of their students' minds. There are many arguments about whether schools should adopt an all-inclusive approach or drop out vocational subjects that add no value to the intellect of a child's mind. In my opinion, non-academic subjects are immensely beneficial to the pupils because they enable them to master a versatile set of skills.

To begin with, there are many reasons to include vocational subjects in the curriculum. Firstly, by learning art and craft students can overcome the performance pressure imposed on them by parents and teachers. These activities like dance, drama, singing, cookery or physical education cause no unnecessary strain on learning minds. In fact, they provide relaxation and help these brainers to concentrate better on academic subjects. Also, learning these subjects is indispensable for the overall development of children.

Additionally, pupils with innate artistic or other talents can hone them when they get to practice those talents at school and become eminent performers of tomorrow. For example, a renowned cricketer was discovered by his sports teacher while he was playing in the school playground. Thanks to his teacher's encouragement, he later pursued cricket and became unbeatable at the cricket ground. Thus it is evident that learning non-academic subjects at school will help not only the students but also the society. To conclude, it is utterly ridiculous to eliminate non-academic subjects from the syllabus. In my opinion, schools should encourage to pursue a career in a field of their choice. This would not be feasible without including a wide range of topics in the curriculum.

Music, Arts, Drama vs Other Subjects

Some people say that art subjects **such as music, drama and creative writing are an essential part of education**, and every school should include them in its syllabus. **Do you agree or disagree with this statement?** Give your opinion and examples from your own experience.

For the holistic development of children, schools should have a perfect mix of academic as well as non-academic subjects. According to some people, it should be made compulsory for students to learn music, acting and creative writing. I agree with this viewpoint as learning these subjects will enhance their creative skills, and they will also get a much needed break from regular subjects.

To begin with, having extracurricular subjects such as arts, drama and creative writing in the syllabus helps students enormously. This is because when students learn these courses, it enables them to develop their creative, thinking and imaginative skills, which are beneficial for learning academic subjects. For instance, it is easier for a student with higher imagination capabilities to solve a complex mathematics problem. Additionally, some children are blessed with artistic skills so these classes will give them a platform where they can develop these abilities further and perfect them.

Another benefit of having non-academic subject in the syllabus is that it alleviates the academic pressure on children. These subjects give students a much needed break from their regular academic curriculum. Undoubtedly, competition among students has increased which can sometimes lead to stress. Therefore, it has become imperative for both schools and parents to let children spend some time doing activities which can give them a chance to relax their mind and body. For this reason, many schools have already included such subjects as part of their syllabus. If, however, students are not given this break, it will become difficult for them to stay focused, motivated and enthusiastic in other subjects because of stress.

To conclude, including arts, drama and creative writing in school curriculum will help students to reap rich benefits by strengthening their thinking power and relaxing their mind; therefore, they should be made a mandatory part of school syllabus.

Some people say that art subjects **such as music, drama and creative writing are an essential part of education**, and every school should include them in its syllabus. **Do you agree or disagree with this statement?** Give your opinion and examples from your own experience.

It is argued that the arts are just as valid as the other subjects, especially for primary school children. This essay agrees with that statement and will first discuss how some students flourish when studying music, art or drama and then talk about how maths and science are not crucial at primary level.

Not everyone has a talent for mathematics, physics or languages and many students only do their best work when they can be creative. In fact, many pupils simply cannot focus on traditional subjects unless they are expressing themselves creatively through painting, song or dance. Take Gillian Lynne for example, who at a young age was told she had a learning difficulty, but in fact could not learn without moving. Gillian went on to become a world-class choreographer but would have never have been a success without the encouragement of her dance teacher.

Other would disagree with this view and say that art stops young children from spending enough time on the more 'serious' subjects and passing important exams. However, until children get to high school, it is more important for them to have a good relationship and attitude towards education than passing tests. For instance, in Finland, primary school children do no tests at all and this has been shown to be one of the leading factors in them having the best education system in the world.

In conclusion, painting, dance and acting should be given equal status in the primary classroom because they allow artistic children to learn more effectively and it is unwise to put pressure on children to pass maths and science exams at such a young age.

Single Sex vs Co-Ed

Some people feel that children should be educated in single sex schools; others argue that mixed schools are better. **Discuss both views and give your opinion**

Education plays an important role in everyone's life. Some countries have single-sex schools while others have both single-sex and co-educational schools. In my opinion, it is up to the parents to decide which model is ideal for their children.

It is believed that there is less room for distraction in single-sex schools. As a result, students focus on their studies with all their attention. Gender based prejudices do not exist in single sex schools and students can pursue whatever subject they like without any inhibitions. For example, girls in single sex schools tend to pursue science at a higher level. Similarly, boys at single-sex schools are more likely to take cookery classes or learn a language, despite the fact that these are often thought of as traditional subjects for girls.

On the other hand, mixed schools prepare their students for future life where both genders need to co-exist, be it at home, university or office. Boys and girls learn to live and work together from a younger age and are emotionally mature in their relations with their opposite sex. They also happen to learn from each other and may pick up some new skills or traits. Developing mutual respect for one another is another positive. They are also sensitive in their dealings with members of the opposite sex.

I think that both models of schooling have their merits and demerits. It depends on the institute and how well a child adapts to his or her surroundings. Parents play the most crucial role here because ultimately it is their decision.

Some people think that it is better to educate boys and girls in separate schools. Others, however, believe that boys and girls benefit more from attending mixed schools. **Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.**

It is often argued that school children should go to single sex schools, while other would say that males and females get the most out of integrated schools. This essay will argue that despite there being some social benefits to females and males going to the same school, the academic advantages of educating them separately make it more worthwhile.

Many feel that mixing both sexes at school helps to develop social skills and makes people less awkward around the opposite sex later in life. This is especially true for males, who often find it difficult to approach and talk to women socially if they don't get used to it first in the classroom. For example, the Sunday Times recently reported that men who did not have regular social contact with girls when they were growing up are 68% more likely to suffer from anxiety when in the company of females.

Despite the argument above, it is difficult to argue with the fact that single-sex schools consistently top examination league tables. In nearly every area of the United Kingdom, the top schools only allow boys or girls to attend and this may lead to higher grades because students can focus exclusively on their studies. Personally, I went to a school for both boys and girls and found that I had to deal with many more distractions compared to friends who attended the local boys-only college.

In conclusion, integrating the sexes can prevent social awkwardness later in life and make pupils more sociable in the company of other genders, but a school's primary purpose is to educate and those with just one sex or the other outperform those that allow both.

School Curriculum – Who should Design?

The subjects that children are taught in schools are decided by central authorities. Some people say that teachers, not politicians should be responsible for this. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the opinion.**

There are some debates about who should design the school curriculum. While some people argue that the teachers should be responsible for this, others are of the opinion that the government should design the curriculum. I extend my support to the latter view because I believe that the government is the most appropriate authority for taking such vital decisions.

Firstly, the central authorities have a better idea about what is needed in the society as they are more aware of the social and economic needs of the people. Furthermore, they conduct studies and hold discussions with subject experts before choosing topics. They make sure that the subjects taught equip students with the skills they need to succeed in the world. For example, nowadays central authorities of many countries have decided to include vocational subjects in the curriculum in order to improve the employability of people.

On the other hand, a teacher's role is to impart knowledge – to deliver the developed curriculum in the most effective way so that each student is able to learn well. Their main aim should be assessing the learning capacity and capability of each student and developing methods and tools to aid them understand and learn so that they can progress well in today's world. If teachers decide what curriculum is to be taught there will be too much variation and hence no standardization. This will not be fair to children as their knowledge level cannot be tested and compared if different curriculum exists. In addition, it will hinder government's goal of providing equal and quality education to all children.

Hence, I firmly believe that central authorities should be responsible for designing the curriculum to ensure equal and fair education is given to all and comparable standards exist to meet the education goal of the country.

Sports vs Academic Subject

Most schools are planning to replace sport and exercise classes with more academic sessions. How will this change affect children's lives in your view?

The debate between where to allocate valuable teaching resources probably started with the first educational institutions. In present-day society the conflict continues and rightly so. In my opinion converting sports classes to more traditional subjects has two significant advantages. Firstly, it is a more effective use of a student's time. Secondly, in the future, academic skills are more useful.

Switching time spent on sport in a school to time spent on more academic activities is a wise and cost-effective solution. Firstly, academic studies are inherently less expensive to perform when compared to physical education. For example, to play almost any sport one has to invest in the appropriate equipment, ranging from shorts, t-shirts to rackets and balls. Furthermore, excess time is spent in the changing rooms or washing afterwards. In more traditional subjects, students merely enter the classroom and are learning within minutes.

Secondly, sport can be argued as an activity practised naturally by children, especially boys. In every school at break time many children engage in energetic activities, whereas hardly any are studying algebra, biology or physics. Because these subjects are less popular more resources should be allocated to teaching them. In addition, academic skills could be argued as more important due to the small number of people in society currently using sport skills in a work environment. Thus, focussing on skills demanded by the labour market would benefit students' lives dramatically in the future.

To conclude, young learners going through school would finish much better prepared for life avoiding sport tuition. Furthermore, they would have taken full advantage of their school years through more time spent learning.