"Children are facing more pressures nowadays from academic, social and commercial perspectives.

What are the causes of these pressures and what measures should be taken to reduce these pressures?

## @IELTSIELTS

## **Model Answer by RYAN HIGGINS**

It is commonly said that today's children are pressurized as were yesterday's adults. That's true in the sense that children are facing harder and harder academic, social and commercial challenges. It is happening simply because of the ever increasing demands of life, from the same perspectives, on humans in general. While it is important that children excel in their age to become successful as adults, they must be shielded from the mounting pressure by maintaining a balance between material and psychological growth.

As the global village becomes more and more competitive everyday, it becomes important for us to prepare for the fight, so to speak, earlier and earlier. This is realized by all, which triggers societies to push their juveniles during their learning stage.

The other thing that is contributing to this ever rising pressure on children is the lack institutional opportunities, especially in developing countries. Now, more than ever, children are having to race each other for reaching the privilege of higher education.

While healthy competition is helpful for the psycho-social development of young ones, it is rather unhealthy when the race becomes more prominent than the objective. Of course the objective of children competing against each other ideally is bringing the best out of themselves. But, very frequently, a child is compelled to compete for becoming better than the other. In other words, the competition becomes a brawl rather than being a sprint.

To stop such spiteful struggle among our young, we must first establish a sense of camaraderie within all our developmental institutions, such as schools and colleges. Students must contest for academic betterment, not social supremacy. Also, parents should get proactively involved in promoting sportsmanship among learners. They must not allow vile aggressiveness and their own vengefulness in the lives of their children. To sustain such social reformation the government must establish ample alternatives to the traditional route to success.

The conclusion here is simple. The children today are being put into a 'survival-of-the-fittest' situation much earlier than they must be when they should really be trying to do their best. Such untimely loss of innocence is only going to make civilization more antagonistic. Therefore we must ensure that personal development may be ushered in harmony and not in vile rivalry.

"Mothers play key roles in the upbringing of children. But in the recent times both parents are getting busy with professional life. Who in your opinion should take the responsibility of child care now?" Give your opinion in no less than 250 words.

## **Model Answer: @IELTSIELTS**

There's no denying how important a role the mother plays in the upbringing of her children. But torn by modern economics, mothers are leaving home for professional practice, raising the question "who now takes care of the children?" In my belief, though, all efforts to replace the proverbial mother are destined to be futile.

Observing Nature, scientifically or other wise, tells us that being a mother, if it were a social role, is ideally possible by the child bearing female and others may only be nurses or patrons. The physiological and psychological exclusiveness of the mother means all the other social entities and all the greatness of science and civilization can only supplement, and never replace, her part in the upbringing of children. Any one else trying to don her role is simply unnatural.

But of course there is opinion in the contrary also. Modern science flaunts its age old practice of replicating nature and natural processes. Now more than ever humans and their society are evolving frequently against the tide of Nature, and civilization sustains this evolution. Such evolution has also effected the socio-economic distinction of men and women. Now in the industry women are producing as much as men do. So "women are better off in the house" is no longer true.

While such human evolution is true and should morally be supported, going against Mother Nature, when we're clearly not in a position to, is immoral. Science has not yet found a biological and psycho-social alternative for the natural mother. And while gender equality is great, it never means fusion of the two poles of our species. I don't believe science never has strived to eliminate sex because it is simply impracticable. So men and women, so uniformly productive as they recently are, don't have to utilize their worth in the same end of civilization.

If one person, or sex, is naturally gifted to play a special and vital role in the society, it is her duty to thrive in it. I therefore conclude that in a child's life its mother is irreplaceable, and, hence, it is she who should rear her child.

"By investing in tourism we can earn a lot of revenue and growth in national economy. At the same time it destroys the local culture. What is your opinion?" Give your opinion in no less than 250 words.

## **Model Answer: @IELTSIELTS**

Tourism is one of the biggest industries worldwide. It has grown, especially over the last few decades, by leaps and bounds. This is happening because the global citizen now takes even the slightest of chances to visit uncharted territory. So, all the countries are eager to invest more and more in tourism. It has its rich rewards, but there are drawbacks too. At the forefront of all demerits of tourism is the impact on local culture. Still, in my opinion, such demerits cannot outweigh the benefits of the tourism industry.

In the modern age the culture of one country or society is open for all to observe and take part in. When in coming tourists get in touch of a local culture they do not necessarily destroy it. It is understandable that they leave a bit of their own cultural identity in the place they have visited. But that is not destruction rather a healthy demonstration of cultural mixing that is happening incessantly all over the world in other ways too, e.g. international media.

On the other hand, if we miss out on the far reaching benefits of the tourism industry being foolishly bogged down by the illusionary ghouls of cultural destruction, we are only loosing. In reality tourism does not taint a local culture, rather it fortifies it. Tourist visiting places do not only sight-see but want to experience the diverse heritage and customs also. So, since destroying or transforming the local culture only makes a locality less attractive to spectators, tourism provides ample motivation to preserve our cultural identity.

To conclude, we must declare tourism as a boon that encourages the peoples of the world to be themselves, not like the others, while rewarding those who have valued and glorified their culture in terms of much needed revenue.

**4.** You should spend about 40 minutes on this task.

Present a written argument to an educated reader with no specialist knowledge of the following topic:

"In light of the current socio-economic situation of the world, do you think this the right time for wild life preservation? If yes, what are the ways and means you suggest for this?" Give your opinion in no less than 250 words.

#### **Model Answer:**

The present day is the age of contradictions of opinions, inventions, and actions. As if to exemplify, the civilized man pampers the wilderness while devouring it. But this paradox is practically inevitable since we exploit the wild for sustenance and, hence, we must sustain it for our continued future. So, regardless of economics or societal factors, wild life must be preserved at any and all times. We must conserve, and cohabit with, the wild which, in fact, will preserve it in the long run.

It is true that for us to survive we must exploit the environment and all life in it. So preservationist campaigns that suggest leaving the wilderness alone or becoming a part of it has not been so popular and viable. A wiser approach is conservation, using the God sent resources sparingly like fiscal savings. Being wasteful, in any facet of life, is reproachable, and same goes for wild life. If we exploit nature only so economically that we obtain our nourishment while keeping her so sound that she continues bearing fruit, we will be best off, as not only us, but also generations to come will have sustained this way. Being wasteful and destructive will only usurp the natural resources catastrophically faster which may cause the untimely demise of all humans.

Also, if we keep the spirit of harmony and learn to cohabit with wild life, all may live. This planet is in fact big enough for sustaining all life. So, being destructive to that which does not fight back is foolish, especially when the non-aggressor is our sole source.

To conclude, here, we should never be scrutinizing whether it is the right time for preserving wild life because any time is a good time, and, practically, the only time, for guaranteeing that nature sustains so that she withholds us and others with nurturing care.

"Advertisements of toys and fast foods are obstacles to children's physical and mental development, and, at the same time, cause loss of time and money of parents." Give your opinion in no less than 250 words.

## **Model Answer:**

Today's TV is full of commercials both for adults and children. These adverts are supposed to attract people's attention toward the target product. It's certain that they work, but, perhaps, they work a little too much on the younger viewers. I believe toy and fast food adverts profusely affect the overall development of young ones, and, also, harm parents in many ways.

It is known that children are not matured enough to always distinguish fiction from reality, especially when the imaginary images are so colourful and vividly projected like it is done in today's media. It has been noticed and identified that fast food adverts are making today's children more and more inclined to adopting low-nutritional value snacks as main food items. As result, their health has been deteriorating over all.

Toy commercials, on the other hand, affect the children on a more subtle ground. While it is acceptable that young ones play with toys for intellectual development and for indulging into the colourful world of imagination, it is undeniable that the over-blown adverts tend to fuse reality and fiction. As a result, in the real world, when actual challenges of society and academia are to be dealt with, children may lack rational responsibility. This is of course solely the effect of toy commercials. Also, it must not be forgotten that deserting the play ground for the playpen will and does have dire consequences on the children physiological growth.

With children not being parallel to the established line of development, parents have to pay for their disarraying. Because of the negative effect of toy and fast food advertisements, parents lose substantial amounts of money simply buying objects and food items of no concrete or nutritional value. Less obviously, because of being lesser healthy, children these days have higher possibility of falling ill, which is a matter of massive expenses, of money, time and serenity.

To conclude, it must be said that while commercials of toys and fast foods cannot be stopped, they must be properly graded for ensuring harmlessness to our children and their parents.

@IELTSIELTS

"Adult youths are often called up for working for the development of communities. Do you think they should work voluntarily or should they get paid? Give your opinion in no less than 250 words."

## **Model Answer:**

The development of communities requires the vibrant energy of young blood. There are many volunteer programs, in most communities, where the young utilize their vigour for the good of men. But, to ascertain the involvement of the young adult in community development, I believe monetary incentives should be there. **@IELTSIELTS** 

It is true that one should not wait for material advantages before trying to contribute to his society. The drive for helping others should be an integral part of one's moral integrity. But too often the modern man is compelled to shun that which is moral and embrace what is beneficial materially, directly, and to himself. Aside from the weakness of character shown in such cases, by man, often his morality succumbs to the rising need for sustaining oneself independently. Ages ago the youth was spared from such desperation, by the cooperative social structure of then. But now, every adult is out on his own. So, to neutralize the economic pressure blocking the adult young from participating in community development, the people should arrange for them monetary incentives. That way they can sustain themselves and the community at the same time.

A more practical perspective may tell us that today's age is really not so much compatible with volunteering. In many developed countries, even the police force is run profitably. And CSR of profit motivated enterprises has started replacing non-profit philanthropy. So to expect adults, young or not, to volunteer for community development is only cacophony amidst the modern melody of social building and maintenance.

In the end, though, a conclusion to this argument relies on circumstantial judgement, and balancing of individual and social interests. While money will motivate a permanent source of energy for developing communities, youths should not wait for a cost benefit analysis before saving a community in dire straits.

7. You should spend about 40 minutes on this task.

Present a written argument to an educated reader with no specialist knowledge of the following topic:

"Due to so many young people dropping out from school, rate of unemployment is going up and it affects our society in different ways. In your opinion, how can this situation be improved?"

## **Model Answer: @IELTSIELTS**

It has long been noticed worldwide that young people, at the age of being in academic schooling, often drop out, sometimes to get involved in wage earning, other times for reasons not so fruitful. The blame is not of the context here. But the effect, which is relevant to this discussion, is most often perilous to society. Such a situation should, and can, be improved by training, employing and re-schooling those disarrayed young.

Firstly, Government should take steps to train the out of school juveniles in skills that can easily be utilized in industrial or farming environment. That way the "drop-outs" will contribute to their own and country's development and not become menaces to their society.

Secondly, public and private enterprises should take concerted measures to embed the unschooled youths in the national, even international, workforce. Everybody, regardless of his or her academic rapport, must be good for something, ranging from clerical desk jobs to technical handy work.

But, most importantly, in my opinion, the "dropped-out" juveniles must be given opportunities to get back on track. This may include free to access entrance exams in to different levels of institutional education. In the United States, the GED examinations offer high school drop-outs, beyond the age of 17, entrance in to university, basing on their aptitude scores in the GED, disregarding their otherwise track record. Even prison inmates there get this opportunity.

A young person dropping out of school is a big enough tragedy in itself, considering the untimely loss of a potential scholar. But this tragedy turns in to being the horror of all lest steps are not taken to rehabilitate this youth. We may, therefore, conclude here that the only way of improving the situation created by high school drop outs is practical rehabilitation by industry and sympathetic consideration by institutions.

"Should Government be responsible for providing pure drinking water to all or should the people obtain their own water?"

## **Model Answer:**

Water is life. Purity of it may sustain and impurity may perish all. In that all consuming concept, it is necessary, and, it is commonly said that all necessities should be provided by the government. While such popular opinion is ideally justifiable, I believe that, with the exception of those of desert and disaster areas, governments should not be burdened with the duty of providing drinking water, as it can very easily be done by individuals in most areas.

Speaking generally, modern society has progressed far enough not to consider thirst as a threat. We get bottled water delivered to our doors in many places. And tap water is clean enough to just boil at home and drink. Small servings of drinking water are also cheaply bought at convenience stores almost anywhere. In terms of Bangladesh, for example, water is one of the cheapest of all home utilities. So, now, water is no problem!

There are of course those areas where all provisions for sustenance are scarce, may be due to war or other disasters, natural or not. Those cases must be held as exceptions, which they really are, and call for government sponsored supply of all general means for living, e.g. food, shelter, education, clothing, pure drinking water, even portable air conditioners, like often are supplied in USA and some wealthy middle eastern countries. So as said, there are exceptionalities, and they should not be used to argue against rationale, that is, distributing drinking water in times of peace is too trivial a matter for the government, or a bureau of it, to be occupied with.

We can, therefore, conclude that drinking water, in the contemporary perspective, is available enough to be left as responsibility on the shoulder of the governed, not the government, except the situations that go beyond all generalities.

"Some people think that hard work and determination are the keys to success in life. Some, on the other hand, think that there are other factors behind a successful life. Give your opinion."

## **Model Answer:**

To succeed in life the need for hard work and determination is undeniable. Of course the definition of success there is substantial improvement of one's professional, financial, intellectual, or spiritual status. Often it appears that there had been other catalysts for success, like opportunity and guidance. But my belief is that, with enough perseverance and diligence all variables in the way of becoming successful may be neutralized.

A person, in education, career or soul searching, faces many hurdles, some barely discomforting and others disarming. That is surely beyond argument. Hence there should not be disagreements in saying, hurdles are called such because they require us to put in more effort than usual. The greater the hurdle is, the more effort we must put in. Drawing from this, success and the hard work – determination factor are positively related to each other. It is as irrefutable as mathematics.

A contradictory point of view may project that the formulaic relationship between hard work – determination and achievement may be engineered by the opportunity and/or guidance one might get. That is reasonably agreeable. But such secondary factors can never become the primary. For example, it is commonly said that George W. Bush, the Senior, has been far more prolific, than his son is, in his military, bureaucratic, and political career, while it is evident that he had to diligently work his way up the ladder, from being a soldier to the fabled US White House. Mr. Bush Junior, on the other hand, had most of his way to the oval office already paved by the grace of his patron. Then it may be said that Bush Sr. worked harder than Bush Jr. did, and we all are spectators of their discriminated rapport, as humans and as leaders.

Therefore, I conclude here that, though some secondary factors sometimes may influence the dynamics of success, achievement of it solely depends on hard work and determination.

"Countries become more developed due to mix of different people and their culture. Do you agree or disagree?"

## **Model Answer:**

In this era of globalization, few countries are left from extensive mixing of people and their cultures. Countries are becoming mere political regions and nations, reminder of bygone traditions. I believe this is happening clearly for the better.

The most beneficial contribution of population mixing is perhaps the complimenting of peoples, which encounter and fuse with each other, for mutual development. When people cross borders, they carry their ideas, knowledge and skills and let them blend with those of others. The compound is ideally beneficial because people generally take up and sustain what is good for them. For this blending of knowledge and ideas, today's world is much more convenient and harmonious than it was less than a century ago.

Enhancement of society, which is done easiest through blending of people, also has to be stated. A country may be conservative and grow financially, but today development is a socio-economic affair. This means that societies and countries do not develop merely by increasing monetary wealth but must also grow through the improvement of their people, which is done through "curing people by people."

Detractors of such opinion say that we're losing our cultural and national identities as more and more exotic ideas, values and customs are being domesticated. This perhaps does have a factual base since blending of cultures definitely modifies customs. But such modification can hardly be called loss. Identities are made of long time traditions, which were "grown" somewhere back in time, so the loss that some may blame population mixing for may not be a loss at all, but possibly be the process of taking up newer identities or augmenting the already cherished ones. It is foolish, therefore, to be critical of mixing of people and culture, at least in this way.

Hence, I conclude that mixing of people and their cultures, despite its critics and occasional blemishes, is taking the whole world to a better place.

"It is noticeable that fast food consumption has increased substantially during the last 10 years. Discuss its impact on environment and health."

#### **Model Answer:**

Fast food has grown in the last decade thick and fast. A good part of mom's kitchen has already succumbed to it. But this is taken sportingly as the fast food revolution has both advantages and disadvantages effective on personal and environmental health as do all other changes brought by industrialization and, more recently, globalization.

As said before, fast food is growing thick and fast. It has been embraced by people all around the world fast, but it is thick in grease and artificial additives which already have been proven to have occasionally terminal effects. Fast food is a profit earning consumer product produced by the impersonal professionalism of the industry and not the personal favor of mothers or other traditionally familial culinary experts. This means fast food concerns itself primarily on how it will bring in more kudos, frequently bartering health and safety in exchange of financial prospects. There are environmentally harmful implications also resulting from the mass production of fowl and cattle, which are the staple items in most fast foods. On the other hand, fast food has helped lubricating the quick winding cogs of today's industrial civilization. It provides nourishment to the innumerable contributors of modern economy who have little time to cease for the more time consuming domestic dining. Also, it has done so staying within the affordability of most men. Considering that, fast food is, at least, cost-effective, which is guite a complement in the contemporary perspective. Yes, again, this amenity has its draw backs too, mostly related to health of individuals, but the price to pay for this urban convenience has not yet been proven to be dear. Hence the unstopped growth of the fast food industry as we speak!

There are few in this world that do not have a two-faced implication of chance. It is, therefore, acceptable that the use of fast food has substantial benefits while the abuse of it may be harmful. One must then conclude that fast foods are here to stay, but we should indulge in it with caution and concern for health.

"When there is a rise in the standard of living, people in the cities are more benefited than those in the rural areas. Please give your opinion on the problems arising from this discrimination."

## **Model Answer:**

Villages and cities have been the two complementary components of human civilization since the beginning of it. In simple terms, villages are the basis of habitat. Everything from commerce to culture in villages is basic. Whereas, urbanity is all about progression. All things advanced, of life and living, are standard in urban areas. Some say such discrepancies are unfair; others justify the difference of living standards. I equivocate with the latter.

It is important that one understands the economic motivation of having geographically separate cities and villages. As said before, villages are basics, and cities are the advanced options of habitat, like product lines of a shoe brand. Such artificial diversification is necessary to keep up with the diverse tastes and needs of people. Cities are costly, but come with many amenities. Villages are not well-ornate but comfortably within the affordability of most people. Also, if there was only one mode of living all over, then people would have no higher option to look up to, which in effect acts as motivation for personal economic development, or no safer and more affordable choice that we can resort to in troubled times.

Aside from the economic formulae, there are social reasons for having distinct cities and villages. Rural and urban people have identifiably different cultural identities. True that there often are bilateral transitions of socio-cultural traits and behaviors between villages and cities, but for thousands of years, they have never been identical. This proves the existence of people's choice – to have urban and rural areas in their geographically and socio-economically separated spaces.

Living standards are rising everyday and it is felt in cities first. That is because cities are the places of development, unlike the rural niches, which we cannot afford to experiment with. It is true that advanced amenities are almost solely urban properties, but it is alright, in my judgment, as long as the basic necessities are available in the villages.

13. You should spend about 40 minutes on this task.

Present a written argument to an educated reader with no specialist knowledge of the following topic:

"People attend both work and personal calls through mobile phone anytime of the day. What are the positive and negative effects on social and individual life?"

## **Model Answer: @IELTSIELTS**

The citizens of the global village are expected to be mobile, freely transient over space, and always connected, wired to the world-wide communication chain anywhere anytime. Thence, mobile phones have become part and parcel of our everyday life. Many consider cellular phones as perfectly proper, if not essential, as a round the clock business and personal tool, others question such unrestricted usage. All have their justifications.

The basis of mobile phone's popularity, surely, has always been the uninterrupted scope for being "connected." What cell phones have given us is freedom to roam while being within the secure bond of modern communication. The manufacturers and service providers of mobile communication devices have enhanced the portability of communiqué to the degree of virtual extremity. And, we, the users, have embraced this advancement and have magnified our professional and social life to freely reach both sides of the meridiem. Unrestricted mobile communication has enabled us to live life to the practically fullest.

The flip side of the coin presents a different picture. While cell phones keep us connected, they remain as the autonomous usher of intrusion, to privacy and solidarity of individuals. It is also common, everyday, to see the decorum of distinguished environments being violated by ringing cell phones and people talking over them. So, mobile communication devices, which are meant to be ideally personal communication devices, are often the means of public disturbance.

The unavoidable human tragedy is all our endeavors end in toxic byproducts. The best innovations have all too frequently caused the worst incidents. Mobile phones are beneficial, no doubt, but have been inarticulately used, if not abused, to the point of attrition. Thus, the reasonable conclusion, of the argument for and against the unrestricted usage of mobile phones, to be made is that the goodness of it is subjective and is reflective of the likeness of the users' intentions.

"Some people prefer to help by making donations to local charities while some prefer to donate to national & international organizations. Discuss both measures and give your opinion."

#### **Model Answer:**

In the modern society charity has been institutionalized both locally and internationally. Through such organizations, helping our fellow citizens has become more convenient. Some make donations to local welfare bureaus and others to international organizations, like Red Cross. Both may be effective, but appeal to donors in varied ways.

Locally originated charities always have the regional advantage. Being founded and usually run by native patrons and administrators, these charities relate to the local needs and hardships easily. So, for those who want to help the needy and distressed within their immediate surroundings, local aid groups may seem to be the more nimble option. But this inseparably has drawbacks also. Occurrences and accusations of irregularities have long plagued regional aid agencies. Also, they are limited in outreach. Anyone wanting to be more globally philanthropic will not be helped much by them.

International aid agencies, like Red Cross, UNICEF, et al, on the other hand, have the universal edge. They operate in the war fields of Africa and shanties of India alike. So, they have the ability to transgress the goodwill of a local patron to world wide frontiers. But, being peregrine bodies themselves, sometimes international charities fail to relate and appeal to local people. Also, they may fail to perceive the intricate socio-economic ailments of a particularly exotic territory. This is no secret and often makes patrons uncomfortable.

I have always believed that charities, both local and international, are effective and essential, and, thence, should coexist as viable options for all who care for humanity. Afflictions and catastrophes happen in different likes, and no single organization can be suitable to encounter all always. Situation, at times, demands the familial empathy of native charities, and, other times, wants the global expertise of international organizations. It is, therefore, wise to conclude that choosing the basis of charities while making donations is a subject that must be understood in context and will always vary according to the unfathomable turn of time.

"City Planners' new designs include setting up schools, markets, and commercial places (offices) in different areas of the city. Do you think it will help the city dwellers?"

## **Model Answer:**

Cities all around the world are similar in terms of the cosmopolitan humbum, the abundant machinery, and the constant reshaping of landscapes. Planners, in recent times, have started setting up and relocating common places of public gathering, e.g. schools, shopping malls, and offices, out of the inner-city spheres for cascading the citizens over a wider and uncongested territory. I believe this, despite some inconvenience, is ultimately beneficial for city dwellers.

Traffic, of humans and automobiles alike, haunt us in an otherwise unnatural urbanity, day and night. Cities, ailing of congestion, are hard up for air. We venture out every day, in the city streets, schools, offices, stores amidst millions others, on the prowl for sustenance, prosperity and indulgence. So we bump along, with or without harmony, like workers do in a termite colony, and that's ok! But the problems rather are the clogs that halt our lives, in office going traffic and school going ques. But urban socioeconomic does not allow us to stall, yet stall we must. This paradox is born of the centripetal convergence of establishments in cities and will remain until and unless cities are decentralized.

Some recoil from the prospects of relocation of city establishments looking closed-mindedly at only the geographical distance. But reality moves over space that must be measured in respect to travel time also. Due to relocation of schools, shops, and so on, we may have to travel further, but, thanks to the evolution of modern transports, for shorter periods of time. Hence, relegation of places of communion to more strategically poised vicinities actually reduces the time-distance that the modern man is more concerned about.

No development comes without compensation, and if sacrifice we must – to see better days, then accept we should – the extra mile that we have to stride on, for becoming a faster and more agile citizenry.

**16.** You should spend about 40 minutes on this task. You have been asked to write about the following topic:

"Some people prefer to go to health clubs and gyms for health care, but some say that walking and climbing stairs are more effective. Discuss both and give your opinion."

Give reasons for your answers and include any relevant examples from your experience.

Write at least 250 words.

#### **Model Answer:**

These days people are becoming more and more health conscious, more inclined to develop health through physical exercise. Many go to gymnasiums to work out using machineries, while others just maintain a physically active lifestyle walking and climbing stairs. Both ways are effective.

Going to health clubs and gyms have become very popular lately. We, as humans, like to make occasions out of every prominent activity and distinguish physically locatable settings to observe such rituals. For example, we go to mosques, temples, churches to pray, highly decorated departmental stores for groceries, community centers to celebrate unions, restaurants to eat and lounges and cafés to hang out. And there are the overwhelmingly equipped bureaus for work. Going to gymnasiums to work out is, thus, a very consistent behavior. Apart from its spatial identity a health club has its intrinsic benefits also. The equipments and the guided environment there make exercising easier, and, hence, the recent popularity.

Some, on the other hand, find it impractical to make the time and go to a separate place to have physical exercise, and are bent on maintaining health by being physically active, not being conveniently lazy. They walk over to shortly distant places, rather than hiring transports, and briskly climb the staircase sometimes avoiding the elevator. This, in itself, has great advantages too. It, firstly, saves the additional time and expenditure needed to go to gyms. And, since this, once habituated, is barely distinguishable as a separate activity, we persevere at it even without knowing.

In my opinion, physical activity, integrated within the regular lifestyle is better than making a separate occasion out of it. Obviously, I am encouraged by the financial advantage of it. But, moreover, I believe in maintaining my health and hygiene in private, on my own, and within my everyday happenings.

In sum, going to health clubs and having physical activities in regular life, are both popular and have their own effectiveness. I believe the choice between the two is a matter of personal taste and affordability rather than comparative advantage.

"Nowadays it is noticed that cultural mixing is reflected within local cultural practices. Do you think it is good for our society?"

## **Model Answer:**

In this era of globalization, boundaries – political, geographical, cultural – are being removed as peoples blend and persons share, with each other, the very values that once segregated them. Cultural mixing has begun tearing down all the ethnical and racial pigeonholes and move us closer, by the day, towards one universal race of humans. Like all else, even this has its occasional downsides, which, when put in comparison with the upsides, are negligible.

Firstly, we have to consider that cultural mixing is perhaps the only non-coercive way to move global humanity towards ideal equality, a belief sought for by all the great persons, and political and religious ideologies. While many have struggled throughout human history to uproot tyranny, oppression, bigotry and segregation, their paths have been tainted by the blood of the bold and tears of the beautiful. True that we, through our ravaging revolutions, have progressed, but at a cost that undoubtedly has been dear. Cultural mixing, on the other hand, is the benedictory prophet, who ushers the great communion of all men in empathy, leaving behind all ethos, and he comes only in peace.

Yet, some conservatives argue that free-mixing of cultural values degrade people's sense of morality. They must be conveniently forgetful of all the immoralities, in the name of conservation, that evidently have tarnished human history. Although, it is undeniable that cultural mixing, like any other progressive enterprise, has coincided with social unpleasantries, for example declining stability among families in the third world countries, the blame has not yet been rationally put. And, of course, there are many other socio-economic controllers such as wage-earning, and individualism that may very well be responsible for today's social ills.

In sum, we must not be closed-minded to the global brethren cultures, because, only by doing this we may, one day, realize the ever-cherished dreamland of universal humanity, where "... all the people, sharing the world in peace" will not be only a thing of imagination.

18. You should spend about 40 minutes on this task.

Present a written argument to an educated reader with no specialist knowledge of the following topic:

"Changing jobs and residences frequently is a very common scenario nowadays. Do you believe that this is good for one's future?"

You should write at least 250 words.

## **Model Answer:**

"Change" seems to be the mode these days, in politics, economics, society, even personal lives. Conforming to the global tide of change, we shift our residences, preferably moving from worse to better domiciles, and, more importantly, switch jobs for better pay and benefits. Some argue that keeping a volatile lifestyle endangers our personal safety and social stability. I also believe that, despite the need for it only whenever the end result is fruitful, frequently forced change ails us more rather than helping.

It is important that the idea of development is carefully distinguished from all arbitrary change. What is noticeable recently that the craze for abolishing all that is old for any that is new is rampant. In the job market, also, employees seem to be more restless, less patient of the due process of career progression. They fail, commonly, to appreciate the bureaucratic inertia that serves as a professional's "9 lives" and misunderstand it as obstacle toward promotion. As a result employers are also becoming cynical of employees' commitment. This, as a whole, destabilizes the job market, which is favorable neither for the enterprise nor for the entrepreneurs and staffs.

We are also facing this lack of commitment in residential communities. Before, a family would move in to a neighborhood, socialize and localize themselves intimately for years, sometimes generations, and develop a sense of mutual belongingness with the locale. Now, because of rampant migration, from one locality to another, people are becoming strangers in their own alley. As a result, community support is diminishing every day, especially in urban areas, and families are transforming to estranged groups of people in an otherwise crowded landscape.

Change is good, as long as it is circumspect. Change is bad, whenever it is done just for the sake of it. Therefore, we must check the frequency of change, while keeping our minds open, and remember that all that we may perceive as old and used are also all that we have to lose, which may very well be all that we have.

"World history suggests that violence and and conflict were more evident under male leadership that under female leadership. So. for peace to prevail, female leadership can be considered as a better option that male leadership."

## What are your opinions on the above topic?

You should write at least 250 words.

## **Model Answer:**

The history of humans has been violence and conflict stricken since the beginning of time. As far as we can look back in time we see wars, power struggles and revolutions. We also see that society has always been predominantly male dominated, with leaders and rulers mainly being men. It is, hence, easy to blame the ruler and put the responsibility of atrocities on the shoulders of men. But a deeper perspective always reveals to historians that conflict is a generic tendency of humans. So peace being disturbed is not the liability of men only, but humans in general, and a power shift, from men to women, is destined to be futile in prevailing peace.

Most of the women who are known to be great till date, e.g. Queen Isabella of Spain, Queens Marry, a.k.a. Bloody Marry, Victoria, and Elizabeth of Britain, all have ruled over vast spectrums of power. And they often have done so ruthlessly, achieving goals with an iron hand. They have waged wars that are barely comparable to only few of those devised by men. These women are not anomalies of history, but examples from numerous others, who went beyond the boundaries of gender in the path of prevailing in power while expending peace whenever they deemed it to be expendable.

The two greatest wars of modern history, World Wars I & II, have taught us that wars are impersonal. Race, religion, nationality, sex are only pretense to the universally human lust for power. It is true that during both the global conflicts men were in the rulers' thrones. But it will be foolish to say that Margaret Thatcher, the famed Iron Lady who spared no rod against a minnow enemy in the war of Falkland, would be more peacefully diplomatic than how the greats Winston Churchill and Franklyn D. Roosevelt had been tackling the Axis of Hitler.

The gender issue is only a determinant in the battle of the sexes, not the battles among nations and peoples. It is therefore impertinent, if not irrational, to conclude that world conflicts result from the rule of a particular gender and the finer sex would do a better job at prevailing peace if selectively put at the helm of human nations

"Cricket has become more popular than the national sports in the sub-continental countries ."

## What do you think are the reasons behind this?

You should write at least 250 words.

## **Model Answer:**

Cricket, traditionally an English sport, is becoming increasingly popular in other parts of the world. But the popularity of Willow-n-cherry is evidently the highest among the countries of the Indo-Pak sub-continent, for reasons that are historical, anthropological, geographical, and even commercial. The game of Cricket came to South-Asia in the hands of the English colonists centuries ago and has seeped into the hearts of the people here while the cricketers of here have won over the hearts of the English. This inter-continental love-affair perhaps has made the south-Asians elope with the Bat and Ball from their national and ethnical sports. Also, World Cup wins in the 80s and 90s, and phenomenal performers like Hanif Mohammed of the 50s and Sachin Tendulkar of late, all have made Cricket more psychologically ethnical than the native sports of this region. Mother Nature had her hand in it too.

Some say south-Asians are natural cricketers. It has indeed been proven that the sub-continent players are more adaptive to the physiological demands of Cricket compared to how they get naturalized to other international sports e.g. Football, Basketball etc. Also, the climatic conditions here are relatively more suitable for playing cricket compared to the climates of many other parts of the globe. Not to forget, the virtually uncountable population of this region that continually fuels the eversprouting 11-member teams needed to stage only half of a Cricket game and supplies the hundreds of millions of spectators to cheer the players. Altogether, it is like a match made in heaven, "divine" enough to surpass any hereditary bond.

Commerce plays its own amazingly profitable part too. Cricket enthusiasts of here have become the primary consumer base of many global enterprises who mass-charm the sub-continent customers through extravagantly sponsored tournaments. ICC, the governing body of world Cricket, also cajoles the people here because of their financial utility and cossets them from their sporting heredity.

Regardless of where it came from, the most certain conclusion to be made here is that Cricket is to stay and sustain in the nourishment of the South-Asian pandemonium and will indefinitely reign over the people here like the God-sent hero who conquers not only the matter but also the nativity.

"Use of Machinery has increased and physical labour dropped at large."

What are the positive and negative effects of the above phenomenon?

You should write at least 250 words

#### **Model Answer:**

With the advent of the 21st century, technology has leaped to a level that was unimaginable only even 50 years ago. It was not too long ago that computers took up the size of an entire room; now, however, we have PDA�s (Personal Digital Assistant) that we can fit comfortably in our pockets! This dramatic progress of technology has meant that many aspects of our lives are becoming automated and the necessity of physical labor is rapidly dwindling. This phenomenon has diverse effects, including both positive and negative ones.

The increased use of machinery has many beneficial effects. Firstly, if a job is performed by any random person, the possibility of human error is quite high; whereas, all jobs performed by machines are going to be flawless assuming that they are programmed properly. Next, comes the differences of time- our most valuable asset. Naturally the same job performed by a particular person will not always take the same amount of time. Depending on his stamina, a person can complete a job quickly or move at a snails pace. On the other hand, the same job performed by a machine will always take the same amount of time and no inconsistencies will be seen.

The decrease of usage of physical labor has some downsides as well. As machines take over tasks previously carried out by humans, unemployment rate will increase giving rise to poverty and even starvation for many families. Also, usage of machines for complicated jobs will mean that large sums of money will be required to setup these machines in the first place. This will undoubtedly create a strain on the overall economy of a particular country and this may lead to a decrease in the standard of living in the short run.

Clearly, the increased use of machinery has some positive effects. However, we must remember where to draw the line so as to ensure that we do not have to suffer from its detrimental effects.

"To solve the ever-increasing environmental hazards throughout the world, the best way is to increase the price of fuel." What is your opinion on the above assumption?

You should write at least 250 words

## **Model Answer:**

Environmental or natural hazards are the result of physical processes that affect humans every day. As the use of fuel increases to keep up with modern demands, the world is becoming more vulnerable to environmental hazards and disasters. Floods, earthquakes, severe thunderstorms, toxic or oil spills immediately come to mind when comprehending this issue, implying that all these things are inherently hazardous.

One of the most effective solutions to these environmental hazards is to raise the price of fuel. The use of petroleum and gasoline can release toxic chemicals into our atmosphere. These chemicals escape into the air during refilling, from the gasoline tank and carburetor during normal operation, and from engine exhaust. Transportation sources account for about 30-50% of all harmful emissions into the atmosphere.

"Smog" is another environmental hazard. It causes human respiratory stress, and damages many plants, significantly reducing farm crop yields and the "health" of trees and other vegetation. Burning gasoline emits significant quantities of a wide range of harmful gases into the atmosphere. For example, carbon monoxide is a poisonous gas produced by incomplete combustion. Carbon dioxide, a normal product of burning fuel, is non-toxic, but contributes to the greenhouse effect, which is also known as global warming.

Raising the price of fuel would mean that people would use less petroleum and gasoline. They would find other alternative means of transport to save money, which would mean using less high-priced fuel for everyday purposes. For example, cycling is a healthy activity and it saves the earth too. Also, for a long journey, people could try to find friends together for car-pooling. Car-pooling saves a lot of fuel and would save a lot of money too.

Many environmental hazards like "smog" and global warming are increasing around the world due to the excessive use of petroleum and gasoline in our daily lives. Raising the price of fuel could make all the difference to the environment. It would force people to use petrol in a more responsible way and use it less, and therefore be the most effective solution to the problem of ever-increasing environmental hazards.

Over-fishing has become a very common practice in Bangladesh. What do you think are the effects of over-fishing?

## @IELTSIELTS

Use your own knowledge and experience and support your arguments with examples and relevant evidence.

## **Model Answer:**

Fish population in the seas and rivers are falling sharply due to over fishing this fact worries many Asian and European countries. Governments should have controlling policies so that the fish population may have chance to replenish.

More importantly fish are killed early so they don't live long enough to reproduce, as a result the stock it comes from doesn't get chance to recover. Scientists have been warning politicians about the disastrous effect of over fishing for years. Many of the popular species that were abundant in our rivers and seas several decades ago, have slowly became rarity, if not extinct. Fishermen have a tendency to over fish for economic reasons. There are not enough adult fished to meet the demand so fishermen are catching the baby ones and government doesn't have a strong surveillance to stop baby fish killing.

Many market popular species of fish are victim of over fishing and underaged fishing. For instance, Hilsha, the national fish of Bangladesh is facing acute threat of over fishing and the availability of adult hilsha has falled dramatically. The average size of hilsha caught has also been reduced by almost 40% in last two decades. Hilsa population has been reduced significantly due to over fishing. Most of the Hilsha fish is kiled under-aged, before they become adult and many are killed before spawning.

Due to exhaustive and indiscriminate fishing, our rivers and canals are already void of fishes and many common fish species has become a rarity. As an effort to stop this, government is trying to enforce a fishing policy that rivers and canals will be declared as reserved areas and commercial fishing will be banned in rivers and canals for next two years so that the young fishes can breed and replenish the stock. Meantime the affected fishermen will be offered alternate means to earn livelihood.

To make any difference in the current practice, government must take decisions to make radical changes.

Safety standards are important when building peoples' homes. Who should be responsible for enforcing strict building codes – the government or the people who build the homes?

## **Model Answer:**

People or commercial constructors build homes for private dwelling or for commercial use- in all cases safety of dwelling is important. It is home maker's or contractors responsibility to build houses complying with standard engineering requirements and building codes set by the respective governments. I believe that the government should always be there to strictly enforce building codes, and in case of non-compliance authorities should take punitive measures. Enforcement of law is government's responsibility. Since non-compliance can not only cause hazards to the home-owners, but also to tenants and if in a cooperative or apartment, many co-owners may suffer.

The building codes are regulatory requirements concerning safety and quality of the construction, use of space and others. For example, in an earthquake-prone area the buildings should not be very high and the design and structure must have higher earthquake resistance. Big houses and long buildings (i.e. academic departments, hotels and hostels) require dilatations every 15-20 meters so that in a heavy earthquake, only part of a building collapses, not the whole. More over the quality of the materials used in construction and electric wiring, and gas connection should pass minimum safety standards. Adequate entry-exit facilities, and emergency exists, fire extinguisher are also very important is establishments like factories, hall rooms, discos, party centers.

In cases of wooden house, wood must be coated with fire-resistant paint. In large apartments, office buildings, hall rooms and lobbies of hotels, fire-barriers made of rubber and steel are used to prevent spreading of fire. Similarly, in areas of frequent hailstorm, skylights must not be used, and if so, must be protected by steel shutters.

Many constructors often tend to ignore the minimum safety requirements to minimize costs which jeopardize people's life. Many private homemakers do not know details of these standards and precautions. It is the responsibility of the government to disseminate such essential knowledge and monitor the compliance of builders, developers and makers of houses. However, the builders cannot avoid their responsibility anyway.

In conclusion, as in modern world, the government is ultimately responsible for its entire citizen's safely and good life, its governments responsibility to enforce strict building code. If the negligence of the government's agencies jeopardize people's life, government will be held responsible.

"Should criminals be punished with lengthy jail terms of reeducated and rehabilitated using, for instance, community service programs."

You should write at least 250 words

Use your own knowledge and experience and support your arguments with examples and relevant evidence.

#### **Model Answer:**

Crime is a social vice yet societies have been dealing with this throughout the history of societies. The ways in which legal system deals with those who break the law has long been a contentious programs, as well as notions of just and adequate punishment. There are many people who question both the principles behind, and the effectiveness of programs that seek to reeducate criminals before they are re-introduced to society. It is my opinion that even assuming limited effectiveness, these programs are socially and practically valuable.

Criminologists, based on criminal profiling, broadly categorize two types of offenders. The first category offenders are those who have repeated causes of breaking the law. So releasing this type of criminals is in a sense releasing the identified social dangers with high propensity to relapse-back to their old habits. Rehabilitation efforts have a high rate of frailer in case of this type of criminals. The second category is circumstantial offenders where the offender is mentally healthy and not prone to crime, yet the crime happens due to circumstantial influences. In the second cases, rehabilitation programs work better and many argue that longer jail terms are not a good idea at all for this group of offender.

Arguments against rehabilitation are often based on two points. Firstly, opponents question the effectiveness of such program. Given the great expense rehabilitation programmer incur on the taxpayers, they are not effective enough in preventing repeat offences. Secondly, it is unfair and against social justice that criminals receive expensive education programs at public money. The opponents maintain that the offenders should be given exemplary punishment with long jail sentences instead. However, neither of the opinions has absolute suitability over other.

Though it is true that rehabilitation programs are often not effective and that upon release some inmates quickly re-offend and it does seem unfair that criminals receive taxpayer financed education programs, it is society's best interests to gradually re-integrate offenders safely to society. Moreover, punishing criminals with long jail terms creates a "them and us" society by establishing and reinforcing a criminal community within prisons. However, it cannot be denied that having a rehabilitation program is more effective than not having one at all, and that at least it offers prisoners more options when they are released. More importantly, long time inmates often report

that they repeat offence from the above discussion that crime should really be seen as a social problem and criminals as members of society who need help to fit in. As such, locking these members of society up in jails for long periods of time is not the best way to help make these adjustments, and moreover neither is it a cost efficient way of dealing with these members of society up in jails for long periods of time is not the best way to help make these adjustments, and this was the recent construction, in Western Australia, of the Biblemum Trail, a 600km hiking rack with facilities all along the way. During this construction project inmates received instruction in various different areas of the building trade, including workplace integration and deadline responsibilities.

Finally, though rehabilitation programs use up public money, longer jail terms would entail even greater costs. However, now a day many rehabilitation programs use up public money, longer jail terms would entail even greater costs. However, now a day many rehabilitation programs offer opportunity to make up some of these costs. Prisoners can be put to work in community service projects, which both provide the prisoners with valuable training, public with much needed services.

Many office authorities impose restriction on smoking within the offices premises. Some governments have even banned smoking in all public places. This is a good idea but it takes away some of our freedom.

What are your opinions on this?

## **Model Answer:**

There is no denial that cigarette smoking is harmful and smoking as a habit has been on a decline all over the world, particularly among the aware and health conscious populace. Cigarette smoking has two major effects on non-smokers-injurious passive smoking and smoking display that has an invitational or persuasive effect on non-smokers. I believe banning smoking in public places and offices not only will discourage smoking, but will also keep the smoking practice out of site, though it might apparently look like transgress into smoker's freedom.

There are several reasons that government and private authorities are being strict5 on smoking in offices and even public places. Firstly, this is an accepted fact that smoking is injurious to health. Secondly, smoking causes health hazard to non-smokers who inhale smoke passively from the smokers. Thirdly, smoking has a strong psychologically influence on others, particularly on children and young who learns form their elderly. Fourthly, in many countries the cost of health care and insurance has gone up due to smoking related illnesses. So health authorities and governments are trying to has been seen that due to the restrictions, the habit of smoking is on a decline among office goers.

Though non-smokers think that restricting smoking in offices and public places is a good idea, smokers often view it as a intervention into their right. Smokers argue that cigarette smoking has direct relation to their workplace performance, though passive smoking can cause objections from colleagues.

Though pressure groups such as tobacco companies may discourage restrictions on smoking, since the advantages of ban outweigh the disadvantages, mass public support such bans. Moreover offices have the right to regulate staff behavior and activities and governments too can ban smoking in public places for greater societal benefit.

In conclusion, restricting smoking in workplaces and in public is a good idea. I can also understand the opinion of smokers that banning smoking in such places limits their freedom. However, if the negative effects of smoking were limited only to smokers, I would oppose bans, but as smoking affects the health of others, I support them.

Nowadays, more and more foreign students are going to English-Speaking countries to learn the "international" language – English. It is undoubtedly true that studying English in an English-speaking country is the best way, but it is not the only way to learn it.

## **Model Answer:**

There is no denial that being in a real English language environment will help any one to master the language in the fastest and most effective way and many international students prefer to go to English speaking countries to study and lean the international language. I agree that this is the best way, yet students can learn English in order useful ways.

Being in an English speaking country helps students learn English in many ways. Firstly, the surroundings and environment influence our learning. we are forced to speak, read write, and slowly we start even thinking in English since we have to. Secondly, quick learning of the language can become a strong motivation because in turn, we will get quick feedback that lets us find what we learn really benefits us in life and education. This inspires us to continue to learn more. It's a positive reinforcement Learning builds on progressively. The initial earning serves as the basis for further learning. Thirdly, in an English-speaking country, you will be learning from the life and culture which is not present outside that land.

However, in this age of cross-culture communication and Internet, learning English in an English-speaking country is not the only way. The English language learning opportunities are available in many countries. Now a days people are able to find various ways of learning English language in their home country that are highly effective and productive. Watching movies, television, and browsing Internet can open up vast plethora of English materials. For instance, one can make use of the vast storage of materials (video, sound, graphics, etc.) on the Internet to facilitate language study. Some times non-English speaking students may need different approach in learning English. The principle of "different students, different teaching", by the famous saying by Chinese guru Confucius, maintains that different teaching approaches are useful for different segment of students. The way a foreign student learns a language is quite different from those of an English native speaker. For example, a foreign student higher level; however, it is unnecessary for a native speaker. Last but not the least, on some occasions, students may find teachers in their own countries do a better job in figuring out their exact weak points and the remedies for them.

In conclusion, we believe studying English in English-speaking country can be the best; however we have a great variety of other good choices as well.

Many animals loss their life in merciless wilderness unnoticed. Why can't we use some of them for research and testing?

#### **Model Answer:**

Most people dislike unnecessary Killing of animals. Every creature on this earth feed on some other plant or animal. Life in the wilderness is cruel and merciless. Many animals die of starvation due to draught, winter, and carnivorous animals kill smaller animals for meal. Many hatchlings and baby animals give their life to predators. Only a minuscule fraction of baby animals survive in wilderness escaping the hands of predators. Again killing and farm animals and fish is a way of life all over the world.

Human race is continuing to develop medicine, food and knowledge to help animals survive and grow. There are a many life saving drugs, vaccines and improved food items are now available for animals developed by biological scientists. Cattle herds and poultry are taken good care because of their economic value. Many organizations and activists strive to save wildlife and protect their habitat from human disturbance. There is a worldwide awareness about the conservation of animals and their habitat. Special programs are being taken for endangered animals. So we can say that its no that we are only interested to cause harm to animals, we also are quite aware of their interest.

In conclusion, we can say that If we want to introduce new food items, drugs, or any such thing, we have to get them tested, preferably on test animals, before you apply them on human beings. We don't have any other option other than testing the developments in the biological sciences on animals. If there is any life-less alternative available, presumably scientist will prefer to test on inanimate things, given that both alternatives are producing same reliable results. We should bear in mind that not all the test animals suffer from effects; often the outcome is harmless to the animal.

The development of science and technology has been accompanied by a decline in traditional culture. Do you think that this has a negative impact on our life?

#### **Model Answer:**

Technology has progressed very rapidly over the years. Modern technology has definitely made our life convenient with its amenities.

Technology has had a profound effect on our lifestyle and culture. Modern technology has changed many things in our lives. Modern technology has changed our way of thinking about what to expect from life.

Technology has a profound effect on our culture, values, beliefs and lifestyle. Modern technology has changed the way we think, move, live and enjoy. Development of science and technology has been accompanied by a decline in traditional culture. In my opinion, this is not necessarily a negative change, because societies change over time and so do cultural practices. It's the technology that helped the society to change fast and for the better in most cases.

In the first place, science and technology have cleared up many phenomena that were mysterious to us in the past. As a result, large number of harmful superstitions have disappeared, and nobody regrets their passing. For instance, we now know that thunder and lightning are not caused by gods being angry, but are normal natural phenomena.

In the second place, our everyday lives have been made more convenient by scientific and technological inventions such as trains, airplanes and computers. Nowadays electric lights have replaced the traditional oil lamps, and computers enable us to make quicker and more accurate calculations. The television brings the family together in the evening.

In third place, science and technology actually help to preserve the useful and pleasant parts of traditional culture. Technology has enabled us to invent many new techniques to preserve historical artifacts.

Therefore, for the above reasons, I welcome the development of science and technology. Advances in science and technology have brought us many benefits. At the same time, they have eliminated the bad parts of traditional culture while preserving the good parts.

## Men do most high level jobs. Should the government encourage a certain percentage of to be reserved for women?

#### **Model Answer:**

Equality for both man and women is the accepted underpinning philosophy of modern society that we live in. Most constitutions maintain equal right for men and women. Most public institutions and formal organizations hold equal view in treating either sex. Despite the fact that male high officials outnumber female high officials by a great margin, in most countries there is no legal or statutory bar against women going up in the ladder. I am against any kind of positive bias towards women in the form of reserving percentage of higher positions for women. That will only encourage anomaly, imperfection in practices and most importantly it is not going to serve the ultimate goal of escalating women's positions in society of economy, unless they earn that by themselves rightfully.

In the bygone days women were primarily engaged in household responsibilities. Women's involvement in economic, organizational and public activities is not a very old practice. But in the recent decades things have changed dramatically and many women in the west are going to the top in career and profession. Even in the third world countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, presence of working women are every where, competing with the male counterparts and even surpassing them in many aspects. They are acquiring the necessary education, gaining proper knowledge abut their rights and are in the process of being recognized as organizationally as valuable contributors. In Bangladesh, in many instances girls toppled in open public examinations, and their success rate is generally higher than man. Women are earning professional reputation in their job places as well. Against this backdrop, there is no reason that government should go for reserving positions for women. Instead government should take initiatives to eradicate any bias against women and make favorable work environment for women. Firstly, governments can ensure women's access to education and thus empower them and make them prepared for life as in many societies women lack education and empowerment.

Secondly, women suffer from gender discrimination, chauvinistic behavior and worse even, sexual harassment in work places. Governments should have clear and strict policies to ensure an environment where workers from both sexes coexist with ease. Thirdly, women should be entitled to have special conduct during motherhood. Due to the very role of a woman in family, supports form the workplace are important for working women.

Women and man both should be viewed as equally capable. If we look over our shoulder, we can see that the number of eligible, skilled and executive-class working women is actually increasing quickly in recent years. Govt. should no go for reserving a certain percentage of high level jobs to be for women. That will only undermine women's ability and women will grossly find that their self-respect is on decline. They can find their own way towards the prosperous carriers by the dints of their own virtue and efforts.

## 31.

# Do you support the use of nuclear technology to be used for constructive purposes?

## **Model Answer:**

Many people are afraid of nuclear technology because of the dangers associated with its use. And belligerent leaders and terrorists may cause great human disaster by the use of nuclear weapons of mass-destruction. Though it is true that nuclear weapons pose the greatest threat to life, I personally support the use of nuclear technology for constructive purposes can bring human benefit.

The most worrying aspect of nuclear technology is its use for military purposes by many high and mighty countries. Enough atomic bombs have already been made which are capable of completely destroying the planet. An increasing number of countries now have nuclear weapon or have the technology required to make such bombs, and there is an ongoing debate about how to control the threat of nuclear weapon. After the fall of Russia, many Russian scientists have found their nuclear technology expertise is in high demand in countries that have an ambition with nuclear technology. Many believe that, at that time, technology has been secretly made available to many aspiring countries like, Iraq, North Korea, India, Pakistan and others. Experts believe that now a days, many confrontational countries and terrorist organizations have nuclear know how which they could use for terrorism and mass destruction. However, it would have been better if it had never been used to create nuclear weapons. If life on earth is to continue, we must control nuclear weapons of mass destruction. To eliminate the threat of nuclear war, all the nuclear power nations of the world should agree to disarm as soon as possible.

Nuclear power stations provide an important source of cheap power in many industrialized nations and some developing countries. However, like most sophisticated technology, there are dangers associated with it. Even though very high safety precautions are taken, there have been few cases of disasters, two or three were major human disasters. Yet many experts believe that in the coming days, nuclear power will be the most efficient source of energy for the mankind.

Nuclear technology has been widely used in medical science. X-rays are widely used technology that medical diagnosis. Radiotherapy is widely used to help cure some diseases such as cancer. Controlled and measured radiation is applied on malignant cancerous cells to kill them or stop their spreading.

In conclusion, nuclear technology certainly has many positive uses and offers lots of promise. But we have to bear in mind that it is dangerous if not handled properly or goes in the wrong hands. Nuclear technology should be only used for the true benefit of the mankind. If we forget this, we have to take the responsibility of our own destiny. (Total 442 Words)

Youth drug abuse is a serous problem. What are the possible causes of this behavior? Do you have any suggestion to control that?

## **Model Answer:**

Model Answer

In recent years, Youth drug abuse has become a serious problem in many countries, both rich and poor, across the world. Not only the illegal drug use is no the rise, but children as young as 10 years old are also experimenting with alcohol and tobacco and other forms of available drugs. The effects of drug abuse are well known. Many young talents are wasted, and prolonged addiction to hard drugs can cost a user his or her life. Suggesting remedies for youth drug abuse requires a clear understanding of the underlying reasons.

The reasons for this irresonable behavior among the youth are unclear, but many sociologists blame the examples set by their elders. Firstly, parents who drink and smoke are, in effect, telling their children that it is a socially acceptable behavior. Consequently, children may have a similar view towards illegal drugs, even if their parents are against their use. In addition, drug use shown on television, films, magazines and public displays can only attract children, if not confuse them about the serious health-hazards that are associated with drug abuse.

From another perspective, the pressure on young people to perform well at schools and other competetive platforms is a possible cause of the problem. Many believe they cannot live up to their parents' expectations, and feel a sense of hopelessness and frustration. Scientists have established a relation between drug use and stress, frustration, lack of clear goal. Drugs are used as a means of expressing dissatisfaction with the pressures that they face in society. Also, the widespread availability of drugs means teenagers are often encountered by the temptation to experiment.

To suggest, I recommend to educate young people about the dangers of drug use, and to take steps to reduce the pressure of competition placed upon them. Any tempting public display of smoking or drug use shown on television, films, magazines, and displays should be banned. Moreover restricting drug availability by guarding illegal drug-trafficking and retailing will also bring positive result.

In the conclusion it can be said that solution to youth drug abuse problems actually lie in the root causes and identifying the causes would make it convenient to control the use.