

# 雅思 G 类大作文

## Scoring criteria

Task response  
Coherence and cohesion  
Vocabulary  
Grammar

## Structure

250 words, 40min, 4 paragraphs, 13 sentences

## Planning: 10mins

## Introduction: 2 sentences, 5mins, 30 words

Discussion

Topic (paraphrase the question) – Answer (simple answer)

Opinion: Do YOU agree or disagree.... “I”, “My”...

Topic – Answer (agree/disagree/balanced opinion)

Problem and solution

Topic—Answer (several reasons, and a variety of measures)

Two-part question

Topic—Answer (separately)

## Two main paragraphs: 2\*5sentences, 20mins, 90-100 words

Firstly, secondly, and thirdly: advantages, disadvantages, problems, solutions

Topic sentences

Firstly (explain more and add an example)

Secondly...

Finally...

Idea, explain, example: one idea, a reason, an opinion

Idea

Explain (3 sentences, the reason, the result progressively)

Example

## Conclusion: 1sentence, 5mins

Never write something new, repeat and summarize (paraphrase the introduction to show variety)

In conclusion...

## Four types of essay

### Opinion essay

#### Agree

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

To what extent do you agree or disagree?

#### Planning:

1. introduction
2. explain why 'space' spending should be stopped
3. explain why public service spending is better
4. Conclusion: spend on services that benefit us all

Governments in some countries spend large amounts of money on space exploration programmes. I completely agree with the idea that these are a waste of money, and that the funds should be allocated to public services.

There are several reasons **why space programs should be abandoned**. Firstly, it is extremely expensive to train scientists and other staff involved with **space missions, and facilities and equipment** also **come at a huge cost** to the government. Secondly, these programmes do not benefit normal people in our daily lives; they are simply **vanity projects for politicians**. Finally, many space missions fail completely, and the smallest technological error can **cost astronauts their lives**. The Challenger **space shuttle disaster** showed us that space travel is extremely dangerous, and in my opinion, it is not worth the risk.

I believe that the money from space programmes should go to vital public services instead. It is much cheaper to train doctors, teachers, police and other public service workers than it is to train astronauts or the scientists and engineers who work on space exploration projects. Furthermore, **public servants** do jobs that have **a positive impact on every member of society**. For example, we all use schools, hospitals and roads, and we all need the security that the police provide. **If governments reallocated** the money spent on space travel and research, many thousands of people could **be lifted out of poverty** or **given a better quality of life**.

In conclusion, my view is that governments should spend money on services that benefit all members of society, and it is wrong to waste resources on projects that do not improve our everyday lives.

## Disagree

Some people believe that hobbies need to be difficult to be enjoyable.  
To what extent do you agree or disagree?

### **Planning:**

Some hobbies are relatively easy, while others present more of a challenge. Personally, I believe that both types of hobby can be fun and I, therefore, disagree with the statement that hobbies need to be difficult in order to be enjoyable.

2. explain why easy hobbies can be enjoyable
3. explain why difficult hobbies can be fun
4. Conclusion: disagree that difficult hobbies are better

Some hobbies are relatively easy, while others present more of a challenge. Personally, I believe that both types of hobby can be fun, and I, therefore, disagree with the statement that hobbies need to be difficult in order to be enjoyable.

On the one hand, many people enjoy easy hobbies. One example of an activity that is easy for most people is swimming. This hobby requires very little equipment, it is simple to learn, and it is inexpensive. I remember learning to swim at my local swimming pool when I was a child, and it never felt like a demanding or challenging experience. Another hobby that I find easy and fun is photography. In my opinion, anyone can take interesting pictures without knowing too much about the technicalities of operating a camera. Despite being straightforward, taking photos is a satisfying activity.

On the other hand, difficult hobbies can sometimes be more exciting. If an activity is more challenging, we might feel a greater sense of satisfaction when we manage to do it successfully. For example, film editing is a hobby that requires a high level of knowledge and expertise. In my case, it took me around two years before I became competent at this activity, but now I enjoy it much more than I did when I started. I believe that many hobbies give us more pleasure when we reach a higher level of performance because the results are better and the feeling of achievement is greater.

In conclusion, simple hobbies can be fun and relaxing, but difficult hobbies can be equally pleasurable for different reasons.

Partly agree

Many people say that we now live in consumer societies where money and possessions are given too much importance.

To what extent do you agree or disagree?

**Planning:**

It is true that many people criticize modern society because it seems to be too materialistic. I agree with this to some extent, but I do not think it is the case that everyone is a victim of consumer culture.

2. I believe many people focus too much on money
3. However, many others are not money oriented
4. Conclusion: partly agree

In the last century, the first man to walk on the moon said it was "a giant leap for mankind". However, some people think it has made little difference to our daily lives.

To what extent do you agree or disagree?

**Planning:**

It is often argued that the act of sending a man to the moon has been of no benefit to normal people. While I agree that this is true in practical terms, I believe that the psychological impact of this great achievement should not be underestimated.

2. no benefit in practical terms (standard of living, health)
3. but it was an inspiring achievement
4. Conclusion: partly agree

## Discussion essay

Some people think that a sense of competition in children should be encouraged. Others believe that children who are taught to cooperate rather than compete become more useful adults. Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

People have different views about whether children should be taught to be competitive or cooperative. While a spirit of competition can sometimes be useful in life, I believe that the ability to cooperate is more important.

On the one hand, competition can be a great source of motivation for children. When teachers use games or prizes to introduce an element of competitiveness into lessons, it can encourage children to work harder to outdo the other pupils in the class. This kind of healthy rivalry may help to build children's self-confidence while pushing them to work independently and progress more quickly. When these children leave school, their confidence and determination will help them in competitive situations such as job interviews. It can therefore be argued that competition should be encouraged in order to prepare children for adult life.

On the other hand, it is perhaps even more important to prepare children for the many aspects of adult life that require cooperation. In the workplace, adults are expected to work in teams, follow instructions given by their superiors, or supervise and support the more junior members of staff. Team collaboration skills are much more useful than a competitive determination to win. This is the attitude that I believe schools should foster in young people. Instead of promoting the idea that people are either winners or losers, teachers could show children that they gain more from working together.

In conclusion, I can understand why people might want to encourage competitiveness in children, but it seems to me that a cooperative attitude is much more desirable in adult life.

## Problem and solution

In many countries schools have severe problems with student behaviour.

What do you think are the causes of this?

What solutions can you suggest?

It is true that the behaviour of school pupils in some parts of the world has been getting worse in recent years. There are a variety of possible reasons for this, but **steps can definitely be taken to tackle the problem.**

In my opinion, **three main factors are to blame for** the way young people behave at school nowadays. Firstly, modern parents tend to be **too lenient or permissive.** Many children **become accustomed to getting** whatever they want, and they find it difficult to **accept the demands of teachers or the limits imposed on** them by school rules. Secondly, if teachers cannot control their students, there must be an issue with the quality of classroom management training or support within schools. Finally, children are influenced by the behaviour of **celebrities,** many of whom set the example that success can be achieved without finishing school.

Student behaviour can certainly be improved. I believe that **the change must start with parents,** who need to be persuaded that it is important to **set firm rules for their children.** When children **misbehave or break the rules,** parents should **use reasonable punishments to demonstrate that actions have consequences.**

Also, schools could play an important role in training both teachers and parents to **use effective disciplinary techniques,** and in improving the communication between both groups. At the same time, famous people, such as musicians and football players, need to understand the responsibility that they have to act as role models to children.

In conclusion, schools will continue to **face discipline problems** unless parents, teachers and **public figures** set clear rules and **demonstrate the right behaviour themselves.**

## Two-part question

News editors decide what to broadcast on television and what to print in newspapers.

What factors do you think influence these decisions?

Do we become used to bad news, and would it be better if more good news was reported?

It is true that editors have to make difficult decisions about which news stories they broadcast or publish, and their choices are no doubt influenced by a variety of factors. In my opinion, we **are exposed to** too much bad news, and I would **welcome a greater emphasis on** good news.

Editors **face a range of considerations** when deciding what news stories to focus on. Firstly, I imagine that they have to consider whether viewers or readers will be interested enough to choose their television channel or their newspaper over competing providers. Secondly, news editors have a responsibility to inform the public about important events and issues, and they should therefore **prioritize stories that are in the public interest**. Finally, editors are probably under some pressure from the owners who employ them. For example, a newspaper owner might have particular political views that he or she wants to promote. It seems to me that people do **become accustomed to** negative news. We are exposed on **a daily basis to stories about war, crime, natural disasters and tragic human suffering** around the world. I believe that such repeated exposure gradually desensitizes people, and we **become more cynical about the world and more skeptical that we can do anything to change it**. I would prefer to see more positive news stories, such as reports of the work of medical staff after a natural disaster, or the kindness of volunteers who help in their communities. This kind of news might inspire us all to lead better lives.

In conclusion, it must be extremely difficult for editors to choose which news stories to present, but I would like to see a more positive **approach to this vital public service**.

## Topics

### Education

Some people think that all university students should study whatever they like. Others believe that they should only be allowed to study subjects that will be useful in the future, such as those related to science and technology.

Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

People have different views about how many choices students should have with regard to what they can study at university. While some argue that it would be better for students to be forced into certain key subject areas, I believe that everyone should be able to study the course of their choice.

There are various reasons why people believe that universities should only offer subjects that will be useful in the future. They may assert that university courses like medicine, engineering and information technology are more likely to be beneficial than certain art degrees. From a personal perspective, it can be argued that these courses provide more job opportunities, career progression, better salaries, and therefore an improved quality of life for students who take them. On the societal level, by forcing people to choose particular university subjects, governments can ensure that any knowledge and skill gaps in the economy are covered. Finally, a focus on technology in higher education could lead to new inventions, economic growth, and greater future prosperity.

In spite of these arguments, I believe that university students should be free to choose their preferred areas of study. In my opinion, society will benefit more if our students are passionate about what they are learning. Besides, nobody can really predict which areas of knowledge will be most useful to society in the future, and it may be that employers begin to value creative thinking skills above practical or technical skills. If this were the case, perhaps we would need more students of art, history and philosophy than of science or technology.

In conclusion, although it might seem sensible for universities to focus only on the most useful subjects, I personally prefer the current system in which people have the right to study whatever they like.



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.

完全不同意

只了解自己历史的坏处：文化不是孤立存在，都在相互影响-不利于学习文学知识；完全不了解其他地方的历史文化，认为自己的文化和文学才是最好的，狭隘的民族情绪；轻视其他文化，容易固步自封，不利于本国文化发展；

了解其他历史的好处：更有创造性-从其他文化里面吸取想法，很多优秀的画家文学家都有海外生活背景；broad mind-不管是哪里历史都是人类创造的 值得被欣赏-在全球化的今天，有助于消除歧视

Moreover, if we focus solely on our own culture and literature, it can lead to a narrow-minded, nationalistic mentality. Arrogance and a lack of respect for other cultures can ultimately hinder the development of one's own culture and literature.

Caring for children is probably the most important job in any society. Because of this, all mothers and fathers should be required to take a course that prepares them to be good parents. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this view?

It is true that parents **shoulder a huge responsibility** and that **raising children is by no means an easy task**. However, I completely disagree with the idea that we should therefore force all mothers and fathers to **attend parenting courses**.

In my opinion, the idea that all future parents should **take a parenthood preparation course** is completely impractical. Many prospective parents have jobs and busy schedules, and they may not be willing or able to attend regular parenting classes. This raises the question of whether those who missed the classes or perhaps refused to attend, would be punished. I believe that it would be wrong to do this, and it would therefore be impossible to **enforce the idea of compulsory training** for parents. Besides, even if parents could be forced to attend, I doubt that people would agree on what good parenting entails, and so it would be difficult to create a parenting course to suit everyone.

As well as being impractical, I would argue that training courses for parents are unnecessary. Mothers and fathers have been raising children without any formal help or official interference for thousands of years. Parenting skills are learnt from family members, friends, neighbours and the surrounding culture. Perhaps more importantly, adults learn to be good parents by instinct, by trial and error, and by getting to know their own children; for example, a good parent will try different strategies when faced with a badly-behaved child, and will gradually develop an understanding of what works to correct the behaviour. None of this **requires the intervention of a taught course**.

In conclusion, while compulsory parenting lessons might seem like a good idea, I believe that such a scheme would be unworkable and largely pointless.

观点：同意应该让家长上课

很多人认为开设这样的课难度很大：很多人太忙难以找到时间；每个家庭情况不一样要针对性；强制性的课程会给压力

但是我认为父母仍然需要上课：家长是孩子的第一任老师，对孩子发展至关重要-心理学上很多孩子的恶行都与 family of origin 有关；很多父母心理不成熟，对子女不负责，需要接受教育；可以选择线上授课的方式，灵活的多种课程

Some parents buy their children whatever they ask for, and allow their children to do whatever they want. Is this a good way to raise children? What consequences could this style of parenting have for children as they get older?

It is true that some parents are **overly permissive and tend to spoil their children**. In my opinion, this is not a **good parenting style**, and it can have a range of negative long-term consequences.

If parents want to raise respectful and well-behaved children, I believe that a **certain amount of discipline** is necessary. Having worked with children myself, I have learnt that **clear expectations and boundaries** are necessary, and it is important to be able to say 'no' to children when they **misbehave or try to push against these boundaries**. This is the only way to help young people to **regulate their desires and develop self-control**. In my view, parents who do the opposite and constantly give in to their children's demands, are actually doing more harm than good. They are failing their children rather than being kind to them.

Children of **indulgent or lenient parents** are likely to grow up with **several negative personality traits**. The first and most obvious danger is that these children will become **self-centred** adults who show little consideration for the feelings or needs of others. One consequence of such an attitude could be that these adults are unable to work successfully in teams with other colleagues. A second negative trait in such people could be impulsiveness. A person who has never lived with any boundaries is likely to lack the patience to carefully consider options before making decisions. This may lead, for example, to **compulsive shopping, unwise financial decisions, or even criminal activity**.

In conclusion, parents should help their children to develop self-control and respect for others, and I do not believe that the permissive parenting style supports this objective.

现象：越来越多的家长满足孩子任何要求 尤其是在大城市有一定经济条件的父母；原因：没有时间陪伴孩子感到亏欠，希望用这种形式让孩子感受到爱；虽然这可以提高孩子的安全感和幸福感，但是无节制的满足会助长虚荣心；由于得到东西太容易，也不利于形成正确的金钱观  
结果：自我为中心，不考虑其他人；消费观不成熟，买很多不需要的东西，无法存钱应对风险；一旦欲望不被满足，有可能违法犯罪

Some people believe that schoolchildren should not be given homework by their teachers, whereas others argue that homework plays an important role in the education of children. Discuss both of these views and give your own opinion.

People's opinions differ as to whether or not schoolchildren should be given homework. While there are some strong arguments against the setting of homework, I still believe that it is a necessary aspect of education.

There are several reasons why people might argue that homework is an unnecessary burden on children. Firstly, there is evidence to support the idea that homework does nothing to improve educational outcomes. Countries such as Finland, where school children are not given homework, regularly top international educational league tables and outperform nations where setting homework is the norm. Secondly, many parents would agree that the school day is already long enough and leaves their children too tired to do further study when they return home. Finally, it is recognized that playtime is just as beneficial as study time from the perspective of brain development.

In spite of the above arguments, I support the view that homework has an important role to play in the schooling of children. The main benefit of homework is that it encourages independent learning and problem-solving, as children are challenged to work through tasks alone and at their own pace. In doing so, students must apply the knowledge that they have learnt in the classroom. For example, by doing mathematics exercises at home, students consolidate their understanding of the concepts taught by their teacher at school. In my view, it is important for children to develop an independent study habits because this prepares them to work alone as adults.

In conclusion, homework certainly has its drawbacks, but I believe that the benefits outweigh them in the long term.

Some universities now offer their courses on the Internet so that people can study online. Is this a positive or negative development?

It is true that online courses are becoming a common feature of university education. Although there are some drawbacks to Internet-based learning, I would argue that there are **far more benefits**. The main drawback of the trend toward online university courses is that there is **less direct interaction**. Students may not have the opportunity to **engage face-to-face with their teachers**, and will instead have to rely on written forms of communication. Similarly, students who study online do not come into direct contact with each other, and this could have **a negative impact on peer support, discussion and exchange of ideas**. For example, whereas students on traditional courses can attend seminars and even discuss their subjects over coffee after lessons, online learners are restricted to chatting through website forum areas. These learners may also lack the motivation and element of competition that face-to-face group work brings.

**Despite the negatives mentioned above**, I believe that online university courses are a positive development for various reasons. Firstly, they allow learners to **study in a flexible way**, meaning that they can work whenever and wherever is convenient, and they can **cover the material at their own pace**. Secondly, the cost of a university education can be greatly reduced, while revenues for institutions may increase as more students can be taught. Finally, online learning offers **open access to anybody who is willing to study**, regardless of age, location, ability and background. For example, my uncle, who is 65 years old, has recently enrolled in an online MBA course in a different country, which would have been impossible in the days before Internet-based education.

In conclusion, while I recognize the possible disadvantages of online learning, I consider it to be a positive development overall.

## Life

Today, the high sales of popular consumer goods reflect the power of advertising and not the real needs of the society in which they are sold. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is true that we are increasingly surrounded by advertising by companies that want to sell us their products. To some extent, I agree that advertising has an impact on sales, but I would also argue that we do need most of the goods that we buy.

Advertisements can certainly tempt people to buy products that they might not otherwise want. A good example could be the mobile phone. Every year people can be seen queuing to buy the latest models, even when they already have a perfectly good phone that does not need replacing. Perhaps it is the influence of marketing that leads us to make these kinds of decisions; we want to stay up-to-date with the latest fashions or own the newest high-status device. The high sales of the iPhone seem to support this idea.

On the other hand, I believe that most people do not buy products because of advertising alone. There are other good reasons why we make these choices, and there must be some kind of need before a person makes a purchase. New versions of products almost always have improved features that buyers may want. A new car, for example, may have greatly improved safety features, or it may be more economical to run, or it may pollute less. A new phone may allow the user to communicate more quickly or effectively, thus enhancing their quality of life.

In conclusion, while advertising obviously influences our buying behaviour, I do not agree that people make decisions that go against their real needs.

The older generations tend to have very traditional ideas about how people should live, think and behave. However, some people believe that these ideas are not helpful in preparing younger generations for modern life.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this view?

It is true that many older people believe in traditional values that often seem incompatible with the needs of younger people. While I agree that some traditional ideas are outdated, I believe that others are still useful and should not be forgotten.

On the one hand, many of the ideas that elderly people have about life are becoming less relevant for younger people. In the past, for example, people were advised to learn a profession and find a secure job for life, but today's workers expect much more variety and diversity from their careers. At the same time, the 'rules' around relationships are being eroded as young adults make their own choices about who and when to marry. But perhaps the greatest disparity between the generations can be seen in their attitudes toward gender roles. The traditional roles of men and women, as breadwinners and housewives, are no longer accepted as necessary or appropriate by most younger people.

On the other hand, some traditional views and values are certainly applicable to the modern world. For example, older generations attach great importance to working hard, doing one's best, and taking pride in one's work, and these behaviours can surely benefit young people as they enter today's competitive job market. Other characteristics that are perhaps seen as traditional are politeness and good manners. In our globalized world, young adults can expect to come into contact with people from a huge variety of backgrounds, and it is more important than ever to treat others with respect. Finally, I believe that young people would lead happier lives if they had a more 'old-fashioned' sense of community and neighbourliness.

In conclusion, although the views of older people may sometimes seem unhelpful in today's world, we should not dismiss all traditional ideas as irrelevant.

传统观点有用，但是也需要与时俱进

社会不管怎么变，始终是需要人际交往-需要的基本素质是一样的，例如有责任心的人会更受欢迎；当遇到问题我们还是会从前人那里吸收经验，甚至是历史名人的故事；即使处境和时代背景完全不同，我们仍然可以找到相似点解决自己的问题

发展新的方式也很重要：社会观念发生了翻天覆地的变化 陈旧的思想不行-例如女性受教育工作；随着科技发展有不同的社交方式，充分利用这些

In some countries, many more people are choosing to live alone nowadays than in the past. Do you think this is a positive or negative development?

In recent years it has become far more normal for people to live alone, particularly in large cities in the developed world. In my opinion, this trend is **having both positive and negative consequences in equal measure.**

The rise in one-person households can be seen as positive for both personal and broader economic reasons. On an individual level, people who choose to live alone may become more **independent and self-reliant** than those who live with family members. A young adult who lives alone, for example, will need to learn to cook, clean, pay bills and manage his or her budget, all of which are valuable life skills. From an economic perspective, **the trend toward living alone will result in greater demand for housing.** This is likely to benefit the construction industry, estate agents and a whole host of other companies that rely on homeowners to buy their products or services.

However, the personal and economic arguments given above can **be considered from the opposite angle.** Firstly, rather than the positive feeling of increased independence, people who live alone may experience feelings of loneliness, isolation and worry. They miss out on the **emotional support and daily conversation** that family or flatmates can provide, and they must bear the weight of all household bills and responsibilities. Secondly, from a financial point of view, a rise in demand for housing is likely to **push up property prices and rents.** While this may benefit some businesses, the general population, including those who live alone, will be **faced with rising living costs.**

In conclusion, the increase in one-person households will have both beneficial and detrimental effects on individuals and on the economy.



Some people regard video games as harmless fun, or even as a useful educational tool. Others, however, believe that video games are having an adverse effect on the people who play them. In your opinion, do **the drawbacks of video games outweigh the benefits**?

Many people, and children in particular, enjoy playing computer games. While I accept that these games can sometimes have a positive effect on the user, I believe that they are more likely to have a harmful impact.

On the one hand, video games can be **both entertaining and educational**. Users, or gamers, are transported into virtual worlds which are often **more exciting and engaging than real-life** pastimes. From an educational perspective, these games encourage imagination and creativity, as well as concentration, logical thinking and problem-solving, all of which are useful skills outside the gaming context.

Furthermore, it has been shown that computer simulation games can improve users' motor skills and help to **prepare them for real-world tasks**, such as flying a plane.

However, I would argue that these benefits are outweighed by the drawbacks. Gaming can **be highly addictive** because users are constantly given scores, new targets and frequent rewards to keep them playing. Many children now spend hours each day trying to progress through the levels of a game or to get a higher score than their friends. This type of addiction can have effects ranging from lack of sleep to problems at school when **homework is sacrificed for a few more hours on the computer or console**. The **rise in obesity** in recent years has also been linked in part to the sedentary lifestyle and lack of exercise that often accompany gaming addiction.

In conclusion, it seems to me that **the potential dangers** of video games are more significant than the possible benefits.

## Work

Some people think that employers should not care about the way their employees dress, because what matters is the quality of their work. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

In the modern workplace, dress codes are changing as employers focus more on results than on the rules that employees must follow. While I agree that the way people dress should be seen as irrelevant in many work contexts, I believe that dress codes still exist for good reason in certain professions.

On the one hand, many employers have stopped telling their staff how to dress, and I see this as a positive trend. Some of the most successful companies in the world, including technology giants like Google and Facebook, are famous for the relaxed office environments that they try to create. Employees are encouraged to dress casually, and even the company executives and leaders are rarely seen wearing anything other than T-shirts and jeans. However, while managers and programmers are free to dress how they like, they are expected to produce work of outstanding quality. It is clear from the performance and global dominance of such companies that strict dress codes are completely unnecessary in the technology sector.

However, I would also argue that rules regarding employees' clothing are still relevant in other work situations. We expect certain professionals, such as nurses, police officers and airline pilots, to wear uniforms. These uniforms may have a practical or safety function, but perhaps more importantly they identify the person's position or role in society. Similarly, a lawyer, politician or school principal may choose to wear formal clothing in order to portray an image of authority, trustworthiness and diligence. I believe that most of us prefer to see these professionals in smart, formal attire, even if it is not strictly necessary.

In conclusion, I support the trend toward relaxed dress codes for workers, but I do not see it as applicable to all occupations or sectors of the economy.

不需要着装 现象举例：很多科技公司不要求着装-描述：只要干净整洁 有更多穿衣选择-好处：节省时间和精力，放到提升工作质量上-也形成了宽松自由的企业文化

要求着装 金融行业-要留给客户好印象，提升专业性；医生 航天员-经过特殊设计的服装更好帮助工作；

When choosing a job, the salary is the most important consideration. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Many people choose their jobs based on the size of the salary offered. Personally, I disagree with the idea that money is the key consideration when deciding on a career because I believe that **other factors are equally important.**

On the one hand, I agree that money is necessary in order for people to **meet their basic needs.** For example, we all need money to pay for housing, food, bills, health care, and education. Most people **consider it a priority to** at least earn a salary that allows them to cover these needs and have a reasonable quality of life. If people chose their jobs based on enjoyment or other non-financial factors, they might find it difficult to support themselves. Artists and musicians, for instance, are known for choosing a career path that they love, but that does not always provide them with enough money to live comfortably and raise a family.

Nevertheless, I believe that other considerations are just as important as what we earn in our jobs. Firstly, **personal relationships and the atmosphere in a workplace** are extremely important when choosing a job. Having a good manager or friendly colleagues, for example, can make a huge difference to workers' levels of happiness and general quality of life. Secondly, **many people's feelings of job satisfaction** come from their professional achievements, the skills they learn, and the position they reach, rather than the money they earn. Finally, some people choose a career because they want to help others and contribute something positive to society.

In conclusion, while salaries certainly affect people's choice of profession, I do not believe that **money outweighs all other motivators.**

## Environment

Some people claim that not enough of the waste from homes is recycled. They say that the only way to increase recycling is for governments to make it a legal requirement.

To what extent do you think laws are needed to make people recycle more of their waste?

It is true that we do not recycle enough of our household waste. Although I accept that **new legislation to force people to recycle** could help this situation, I do not agree that a recycling law is the only measure that governments should take.

In my view, a new recycling law would be just one possible way to **tackle the waste problem**.

Governments could make it **a legal obligation for householders** to separate all waste into different bins.

There could be **punishments for people who fail to adhere to this law**, ranging from a small fine to community service, or even perhaps **prison sentences for repeat offenders**. These measures would **act as a deterrent and encourage people to obey the recycling law**. As a result, the improved behaviour of homeowners could lead to a clean, waste-free environment for everyone.

However, I believe that governments should **do more than simply introduce a recycling law**. It might be more effective if politicians put education, rather than punishment, at the centre of a recycling campaign.

For example, children could be taught about recycling in schools, and homeowners could be informed about the environmental impact of household waste. **Another tactic** that governments could use would be to **create stricter regulations for the companies** that produce the packaging for household products.

Finally, money could also be spent to improve recycling facilities and systems, so that waste is processed more effectively, regardless of whether or not people separate it correctly in the home.

In conclusion, perhaps we do need to make recycling a legal requirement, but this would certainly not be the only way to encourage people to dispose of their waste more responsibly.

Explain some of the ways in which humans are damaging the environment. What can governments do to address these problems? What can individual people do?

Humans are responsible for a variety of environmental problems, but we can also take steps to reduce the damage that we are causing to the planet. This essay will discuss environmental problems and the measures that governments and individuals can take to address these problems.

Two of the biggest threats to the environment are air pollution and waste. Gas emissions from factories and exhaust fumes from vehicles lead to global warming, which may have a devastating effect on the planet in the future. As the human population increases, we are also producing ever greater quantities of waste, which contaminates the earth and pollutes rivers and oceans.

Governments could certainly make more effort to reduce air pollution. They could introduce laws to limit emissions from factories or to force companies to use renewable energy from solar, wind or water power.

They could also impose 'green taxes' on drivers and airline companies. In this way, people would be encouraged to use public transport and to take fewer flights abroad, therefore reducing emissions.

Individuals should also take responsibility for the impact they have on the environment. They can take public transport rather than driving, choose products with less packaging, and recycle as much as possible. Most supermarkets now provide reusable bags for shoppers as well as 'banks' for recycling glass, plastic and paper in their car parks. By reusing and recycling, we can help to reduce waste.

In conclusion, both national governments and individuals must play their part in looking after the environment.

## Technology

Nowadays the way many people interact with each other has changed because of technology. In what ways has technology affected the types of relationships that people make? Has this been a positive or negative development?

It is true that new technologies have had an influence on communication between people. Technology has affected relationships in various ways, and in my opinion, there are both positive and negative effects. Technology has had an impact on relationships in business, education and social life. Firstly, telephones and the Internet allow business people in different countries to interact without ever meeting each other. Secondly, services like Skype create new possibilities for relationships between students and teachers. For example, a student can now take video lessons with a teacher in a different city or country. Finally, many people use social networks, like Facebook, to make new friends and find people who share common interests, and they interact through their computers rather than face to face.

On the one hand, these developments can be extremely positive. Cooperation between people in different countries was much more difficult when communication was limited to written letters or telegrams. Nowadays, interactions by email, phone or video are almost as good as face-to-face meetings, and many of us benefit from these interactions, either in work or social contexts. On the other hand, the availability of new communication technologies can also result in isolating people and discouraging real interaction. For example, many young people choose to make friends online rather than mixing with their peers in the real world, and these 'virtual' relationships are a poor substitute for real friendships. In conclusion, technology has certainly revolutionized communication between people, but not all of the outcomes of this revolution have been positive.