
In some countries, secondary schools aim to provide a general education across a range of subjects. In others, children focus on a narrow range of subjects related to a particular career. Which do you think is appropriate in today's world?

立场：比起全才，培养专业人才应该是大趋势

学科数量多

1. 有助于学生发现自己的潜力、潜在兴趣

学科数量少

1. 提高专注度，避免浪费时间在无关学科上

In some countries, secondary schools provide a general education across a wide range of subjects. Other countries offer a much narrower range of subjects which are related to a particular career. I think the trends is most students would spend more time on fewer areas to increase the chances of having a successful career.

With the more liberal approach in which students are exposed to a wide range of subjects, students often acquire other areas of interest than those they might have had originally. For example, a student who may have originally been interested to study to become a doctor might find that he is more interested in becoming a writer when he is exposed to those subjects in a secondary school that provides a general education. So, those who argue for schools to offer a wider range of subjects will maintain that young students should be exposed to a larger range of subjects before making life decisions regarding the pursuit of a career.

On the other hand, the schools offering a narrower and more specific range of subjects will maintain that all of those non-related classes are non-essential, maybe even a waste of time. For example, if a person wants to study to be an accountant, there are fewer benefits of requiring him to take a biology course.

Today's world is a specialized world and it is understandable why many secondary schools are now focusing on a narrower path of subjects in training students for future careers and professions. Although some students will benefit from a wider selection of subjects in determining a career path, most students will opt for the fastest and most direct path available.

Some people say that art subjects such as painting or drawing should not be made compulsory for high school students. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

立场：不同意

正方：艺术课程可能纯粹是浪费时间

反方：

1. 总是会有学生对艺术感兴趣
2. 上艺术课程也会让学生接触到新领域的学习

Some people say that compulsory subjects should not include the ones related to art such as painting or drawing for high school students. My opinion is that learning from art subjects will certainly benefit students, so there is a need to make these subjects compulsory.

Those people who say that art courses should not be compulsory contend that students should not be required to study a subject unless they have an interest in that subject. Those people often classify study of art as a waste of valuable time. They tend to question the benefit of studying a subject that a student never intends to use.

The people who speak on behalf of requiring students to study art maintain that a student can benefit from being exposed to new subjects and new areas of study. All people have a practical side and a creative side. Even though a student intends to be an accountant, he might also find that he enjoys more creative activities such as painting, drawing, acting, singing, or dancing. So an effective way is that schools can introduce students to art activities that those students may enjoy, even if those activities are not related to their major course of study.

Although some students may object to having to take art courses in which they are not interested, those courses will expose them to different areas of study. Even if the student continues to be less interested in the arts, perhaps they will acquire an appreciation for those who pursue those areas of study. It is important for young students to be well-rounded and well-versed, even if through a compulsory course.

The best way to teach children to cooperate is through team sports at school. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

立场：团队运动只是一种教授合作的重要性途径，还有其他活动可以起到同样的作用

团队运动：

1. 让小孩认识到，团队的目标重于个人目标

其他方式

1. 应允许小孩根据自己的兴趣参与相关的活动
2. 只要是涉及和别人合作的活动都能起到同等作用。

Some people think that the best way to teach children cooperation is through team sports at school, but I would say that there are other approaches that can work in the same way.

There is no doubt that team sports have benefits in teaching children some valuable lessons. In being part of a team, the child will be encouraged to place the goals of the team over his or her individual goals. Team sports can teach people that if they work as a team, they can accomplish more than if they work as individuals. When people are part of a sports team, they will learn that the good of a sports team, they will learn that the good of the team is more important than the good of each of the team's members or players.

But team sports are not the only way to teach cooperation to children. Other groups and

organizations can teach cooperation just as effectively as team sports. It is important to point out that some children are not athletically inclined or they are not interested in participating in sports. For those children, other clubs and organizations offer a means for them to learn about the importance of cooperation. Organization such as student government, musical groups such as concert bands or choirs, and theater groups, can all provide the same team-building skills that are provided by team sports. Therefore, any activity or organization in which the participants or members work together can teach cooperation.

Although team sports can provide an excellent means to teach children about the benefits of cooperation, team sports are not for everyone and they are certainly not the only school activity or community activity which teaches those skills.

Some people say that playing computer games is bad for children in every aspect. Others say that playing computer games can have positive effects on the way children develop. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

立场：适度玩电脑游戏，总是好的

正方：玩多了影响学习和社交能力，同时身体状况也有负面影响

反方：玩游戏有助于小孩学会如何使用高科技产很多游戏也有教育意义

Some people say that playing computer games is usually harmful for children. Other people maintain that computer games help children develop. There are points to be made on each side of the argument.

Playing computer games can certainly have negative effects on a child. Studies have shown that computer games can be addictive and a child who is spending too much time playing computer games may not develop in other areas, including reading and comprehension and social interaction. Also, a child who spends a lot of time playing computer games is probably not physically active. It is harmful for children when lacking time to exercise both mind and body. So, a person who spends too much time playing computer games will most certainly be deprived in other areas of development.

On the other hand, since we are now living in a time when computers are used in almost all aspects of our lives, it is important for a child to learn how to use a computer and to be comfortable with computers. Some people, including children, will be afraid of computers until they learn how to use them. Computer games offer a good means for a child to become comfortable with a computer. And, in fairness, some computer games are educational.

With this in mind, it is probably not fair to say that playing computer games has no benefits for children. Nevertheless, parents may want to restrict the amount of time they allow their children to play computer games because this will encourage children to develop in other areas.

其他观点

When it comes to the value of computer games, I think the game can be harmful to the young if there is no discipline for self-control. However, it is also unfair to deny the benefits of playing these games.

The main concern comes from the fact that computer games are highly exciting to young players so it is easy to develop an addiction. Once the youngsters become obsessed with the games, they would be careless about school work and life but pay almost full attention to the game world. In a worse situation, the addiction may confuse children and let them believe that what they can do in the virtual world is acceptable in reality. So some children might apply violence to solve problems in real life as that is how they survive in some games.

However, we should also consider the positive sides of game-playing. Some games help young players unconsciously learn the importance of teamwork while other games may set up difficult tasks which require plenty of logic thinking. By being involved in these games, children would make efforts to figure out different problems, which from a cognitive point of view, is beneficial for it motivates them to use their brains more.

In my opinion, there is nothing wrong to allow children to play computer games as there is an effective way to teach some skills that they may not be able to learn from school. On the other hand, parental guidance is essential otherwise the addiction may destroy a child quickly. With proper discipline, digital games would play an important role in the child's development.

Some working parents believe childcare centers can provide best care for children, while others think family members like grandparents can do it better. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

立场：根据实际情况决定

正方：托儿所设施齐全有社交环境和看护人员，但不一定能照顾到每个小孩

反方：家人可以给予特殊关照，但不一定有正确的引导，同时家里也没有社交的氛围

Some working parents believe that childcare centers can provide better care for children than family members such as grandparents or older siblings. I would say it is difficult to judge which is the best way.

Childcare centers are generally well-equipped to care for children. They have workers who are accustomed to caring for children. They often organize games and activities, including some learning activities, for the children to participate in. Also, the child may benefit from the social interaction with other children at the childcare center. The biggest disadvantage of childcare centers might be the fact that there are multiple children at the centers and this can sometimes mean that a child will not receive the appropriate care or attention.

As for care from family members, some parents feel more comfortable with having someone

they know well look after their child. Also, if the parents want the child to receive special attention, the child is more likely to receive that under the care of a family member. There are also disadvantages in having a family member care for a child. The family member may not be qualified to teach a child. There may be distractions in the home environment and the family member might not be able to provide the expected care or attention that the child requires. Depending on who else is in the home the child may not receive the benefits of social interaction that he or she might get from a childcare center.

Whether a child will be better off in a childcare center or with a family member is a complicated decision. This decision will depend on the child, the quality of the available childcare center, the availability of family members and their interest and qualifications in caring for children.

其他观点

One of the concerns for working parents is who can provide the most needed care to their children when they are at work. Some say that going to childcare centers is a good option compared with leaving children to other family members, I believe combining childcare service and the home education is the best choice.

Most childcare centers not only provide a place for kids to study during the day but also have well-trained teachers to help the youngsters to improve their literacy and understanding of arts. Additionally, kids are guided to develop good habits like eating independently, following rules and so on. This is certainly beneficial to their future development.

Of course, there are advantages of having other family members look after the children while their parents are away. The one-on-one care is something the childcare center cannot guarantee. At home, the children can learn at their own pace without feeling too much pressure. And the love from their grandparents and other relatives will support them to grow strong and live happily.

I personally think that a child needs to be guided properly so that he will gain more valuable experience in his early life. At home, family members may either spoil the child or teach the child insufficiently. So going to a childcare center is a way to avoid wrong family education. Meanwhile, family always matters in a child's life. If working parents cannot devote much time for their children, other family members should step up and give the child the amount of attention that a daycare organization fails to provide. With the help from both sides, the nurturing in early childhood will be satisfying.

It has been suggested that all young adults should be required to undertake a period of unpaid work helping people in the community. Would the drawbacks greater than benefits to the community and the young adults themselves?

Some people suggest that every young adult ought to spend some time in helping people from their communities for free. In my opinion, it is difficult to judge whether this suggestion benefits the community and the young parents more.

In terms of the benefits to the community, the greatest benefit is that the residents may save some money from hiring paid workers to do various things. The young volunteer can take care of the young and the old or they can offer gardening and cleaning services, which certainly is financially helpful for everyone in the community.

Whereas considering the drawbacks, I would be concerned that free services does not guarantee quality all the time. As some young adults view money as a strong motivation for work, being required to work for free may lead to a negative attitude. Consequently, the residents may be disappointed and have some complaints.

I believe this type of work can improve the young workers' communication skills and expand their social networks as they get a chance to work for people from different backgrounds in their communities while offering free services. However, if they cannot choose what they want to do and being assigned with boring tasks, they might think of the work as a waste of time and refuse to work hard as required.

To conclude, if all the young adults can work for free in their communities, the help-receiving residents can save more money and the young volunteers can gain useful skills. But asides from these benefits, we need to also consider if the free service is quality-guaranteed and is something the volunteers are willing to provide.

Some people think reading stories in books is better than watching TV or playing computer games for children. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Some people think that story books are more beneficial than television and computer games for the young. I would say that this opinion is partly reasonable because story books have their limits too.

The first advantage that story books have is that children will read what is suitable to their ages and find it easy to absorb knowledge from the books whereas many TV programs and video games are adult-oriented, so young viewers may not learn much. Secondly, there is less inappropriate information in a child's book, which frees parents from worrying about their children being exposed to violence and other immoral behavior at an early age.

By contrast, TV stations and game companies these days intensely promote controversial topics and violent fights to secure their market shares and children being exposed to these kinds of content would become victims.

However, there is a need to consider what stories cannot offer to children. The main issue with a story book is that the fabricated information can easily mislead young readers to believe in a non-existed society where Santa Clause and super heroes save the poor and

punish the evil on a daily basis. Television shows what a real world is like despite the cretely and unpleasant accidents on the news, which will prepare a child to face the reality. Moreover, compared with some computer games for groups, reading does not increase a child's understanding in teamwork which is important to their future development.

To conclude, I do not deny the contribution story books can make to a child's development, but there are serious consequence when we rely too much on fairy tales and exclude other learning resources like TV programs and computer games.

Nowadays, most people learn academic study in university, but others think we should be encouraged to learn vocational skills more, do you agree or disagree?

立场：应该让学生意识到，大学不是唯一的出路。有部分学生肯比较适合去技能型学校
正：

1. 有很多工作要求学生接受传统学术类教育，技能型培训用处不大

反：

1. 有很多工作不需要大量理论，更多的是工作中的实际动手能力
2. 不是所有人都适应纯学术类的学习

Nowadays, many young people prepare for their careers by studying at the university. But there are some people who think that some of these same students would be better served if they opted to learn vocational skills instead of academic skills. In examining this issue, it seems that both courses of training have their own benefits.

Traditional academic training can provide the education necessary for many professions, including teachers, doctors, and lawyers. With these professions, many years of academic training are necessary before a person can enter those professions.

On the other hand, academic education is not the best means of training for all professions. In some instances, on-the-job training offered by a vocational school or trade school will be more appropriate and valuable. This includes professions such as carpenters, electricians, plumbers and secretaries or administrative assistants. In many instances, this vocational training requires less classroom time than most academic training and on-the-job training is almost always a major component of vocational training.

In comparing the benefits of academic training with the benefits of vocational training, it is important to note that there is a place for both. It is also important to point out that some people do not thrive in academic learning environments or professions, but they will flourish in a vocational school or trade school. So, we need to make young students aware that there are education options available to them other than just traditional academic education options. Those non-academic education options relate to many different professions which are required for a society to flourish. And these professions are better served with a trade school or vocational school education.