



50+ Band 7, 8 + 9 IELTS Writing Task 2 Essay Samples

Some people think that parents should teach their children how to be good members of society. Others, however, believe that school is the best place to learn this. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Some people believe that children should be taught by their parents about how to function as useful members of society, while others believe that sending children to educational institutions is the best way for them to study this. Although the latter opinion can be beneficial in some cases, I believe that family upbringing plays a more important role in educating children to be good parts of the community.

Schools can be considered suitable places for children to learn to be good citizens. With standardized educational methods, schools can foster children's cognitive development so that they are able to contribute to society in the future. For example, Trung Vuong school and Vinschool are well known for having nurtured successful alumni such as Professor Ngo Bao, Professor Nguyen Hung who have devoted their talents to the development of the country. However, these people only represent a small fraction of the total number of students attending schools, and thus sending children to schools cannot be the best method of educating them to be good members of society.

I believe that parents play a more important role in teaching them how to be good citizens. In Vietnam, the average class size is 20 students, which makes it difficult for educators to provide proper schooling for each student. One to one lessons at home, on the other hand, allow children to progress faster. Furthermore, parents form stronger bonds with their offspring and thus, it is easier for them to shape children's personalities at an early age. For example, by

telling stories such as Robin Hood, Cinderella before bedtime, parents can instill a sense of compassion and integrity into them. These children are likely to become good members of society when they grow up.

In conclusion, although sending children to schools can be seen as a way of teaching them how to be good citizens, I believe that domestic upbringing has a bigger impact on determining who they are in the future.

There is an increasing trend around the world of married couples deciding not to have children. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages for couples who decide to do this.

An increasing number of married couples around the world are choosing to remain childless. The main benefits of not having a child for couples are that they can focus on their careers and have more time for themselves. The main drawbacks are that they could not fit into their peers' group and have no one to look after them when they get old.

One primary advantage of remaining childless for married couples is that they can focus on their work. This is because they have less responsibility and distractions in their lives compared to the couples that have a child. Another advantage of this is that they have more spare time. Looking after a child is a full-time job for parents and takes most of their time, while child-free couples have lots of free time after work. For example, many couples stop going out late with their friends after having a child as they have to stay at home to look after their children.

One disadvantage of couples deciding not to have children is that they can struggle to hang with their peers after most of them have children. Most parents prefer to spend more time with other couples that have children as well. Moreover, not having anyone to look after them in their old age is another disadvantage. Children are the ones who take care of their parents when they get old because their parents did the same for them when they were young. For instance, the vast majority of the people who live in care homes have no children.

In conclusion, the main benefits of staying child-free for couples are that they can be more career-oriented and have more free time for themselves, and the main drawbacks are that they could have problems about fitting into their friends' group and having no one to take care of them when they become older.

Some people think that parents should teach their children how to be good members of society. Others, however, believe that school is the best place to learn this. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Some would say that parents should teach their offspring how to be good members of society, while others are of the opinion that school is the best in this regard. This essay agrees with the latter point and will show that, despite the practical experiences that parents give their children, school lessons can give deep insights into what it takes to be good citizens.

Some believe that parents can educate their children about being good members of society based on their life experiences. This is because the life experiences that parents can give their children are straightforward, down-to-earth, and so they can easily apply what their parents teach them in reality. For example, many children in Thailand become more polite, honest, and caring to everyone as a direct result of the practical lessons that their parents give them at home. However, I believe that parents now are so busy and do not spend much time with their children teaching them.

Lessons at school can provide children with valuable insights into being good members of society. In class, students can receive lessons about different traits of a truly good person that society needs, and then they put what they learn into practice by creating real-life problems and solving them together. For instance, after receiving lessons in civic education at school, many Vietnamese students are more willing to help their neighbors and even strangers, and they feel extremely happy after doing something good for others. For this reason, I believe that school lessons are more influential to young children.

In conclusion, despite the practical experiences that parents can give their children at home, this essay believes that school lessons can help students deepen their understanding of being good members of society.

In many professional sports, there is an increase in the number of athletes using banned substances to improve their performance.

What are the causes of the phenomenon and what are some of the possible solutions?

In many professional sports, it is becoming commonplace for athletes to abuse prohibited substances to boost their overall performance. This essay will discuss how stiff competition and lax testing systems are the main cause of this problem, and the most suitable solutions are imposing heavier punishments on violators and revamping testing facilities.

The main cause of this problem is the fierce competition that exists in any sport. In other words, many professional athletes feel that they have to take substances like steroids to give themselves an advantage over other strong opponents. Another reason is the lack of strictness in testing procedures. Many athletes who take advantage of banned substances can still get off scot-free due to the holes in testing systems. For example, a high-profile mix martial artist named Jon John who is notorious for using PED described how easy it was to get away with cheating in an interview in 2015.

A viable solution is to heavily punish lawbreakers. If sports clubs and establishments raise the fine for using banned substances, many athletes will think twice before making an attempt to cheat. Another way to deal with this issue is to upgrade testing amenities. This will eradicate any holes existing in the system and ensure that the test result is highly accurate. For instance, after the UFC had made major investments to provide their staff with the latest testing equipment, many fighters in their organization got caught.

In conclusion, strong competition and ineffective testing systems are the main cause of this problem, and the most suitable solutions are enforcing harsher punishments on violators and reforming testing facilities.

Details of politicians' private lives should not be published in newspapers. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is thought that the information regarding politicians' personal lives should not be shared in print media. This essay strongly agrees with this suggestion because publishing these details could be harmful to their families, and obtaining this type of information might require breaking the law.

First and foremost, what makes that the details related to private aspects of politicians' lives should not be shared in newspapers is that it could be harmful not only to these individuals but also to their families. This is because revealing some details from their personal lives could expose them to unwanted comments or allegations, which might lead to a great deal of distress. In Poland, for instance, in 2015, the vice-prime minister committed suicide due to not handling the pressure caused by the paparazzi invading his and his family's private life.

Furthermore, obtaining this type of information, in most cases, means breaking the law. This is because the right to privacy is one of the most fundamental policies in society, and anyone who wants to access the lives of politicians must obtain their consent. However, not only are paparazzi hired to invade properties belonging to politicians to take photos without their permission, but also politicians' colleagues and relatives are bribed to share confidential facts from their lives. For instance, an accident in which Princess Diana was killed was partly caused by the paparazzi who followed her car, trying to take photos of her and her boyfriend against their will.

In conclusion, I strongly support the suggestion that politicians' lives should not be subject to the interest of newspapers because revealing personal facts from politicians' lives could destroy their family life and the process of obtaining these details often required wrongdoing.

Some say that music, art and drama are as important as other school subjects, especially at the primary level. Do you agree or disagree?

Some people believe that arts-related subjects are as important as other school subjects, especially for primary school children. I totally agree with this statement because this can help children to discover their talents from an early age and can increase their confidence.

One of the reasons I agree that creative subjects have the same importance as other school courses in primary school is that it allows students to find out their potential talents early on. That is to say, school-age is the most convenient time for students to learn more about their interests by trying different activities as they are young enough to pursue their hobbies. They will probably not have any other chance later in their lives to discover that because they will be busy with difficult exams when they get older. For example, most famous singers were discovered by their music teachers at school from a young age, and they claimed that they could not be that successful if their teachers did not find out their talents when they were young.

Moreover, music, art and drama subjects help students to boost their confidence. That is because creative lessons teach students how to perform in front of lots of people and give them a chance to socialize with other students. As a result, students can realize their real potential and act more confidently. For instance, many psychologists suggest to students who are struggling with social anxiety to take drama lessons as it helps to enhance confidence.

In conclusion, this essay completely agrees that music, art and drama have the same value as other subjects in primary school because it allows children to discover their hidden talents early on and increases their self-confidence.

Some people think that parents should teach their children how to be good members of society. Others, however, believe that school is the best place to learn this. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Some individuals believe that the right place to teach children how to become good citizens is the school, while others argue that parents should be the ones responsible for that. Although parents might influence their children more than anyone else, I believe that educational institutions are more trained and equipped to teach children how to become successful members of the community.

Parents influence their children more than anyone else. This is due to the fact that mothers and fathers are the ones who raise and spend most of the time with their children which dramatically influences the way children act and think. If parents act in a good manner, their children will indirectly imitate them. This

fortifies the fact that no one might exert such a strong influence on their children. For example, a study in Britain showed that children are two times more influenced by their parents than their teachers. However, I believe that this is not enough and that school should be the place teaching children to become good people in society.

Schools are trained to build good citizens. Teachers spent their undergraduate years studying how to deal with children and train them to become better individuals in their communities. For this reason, educational institutions should be the place where children can safely acquire the needed behaviors to become better individuals in the future. For example, a recent study in the USA showed that 90% of schools train teachers how to help students to become better citizens. For this reason, I believe that the best place to do this is the school.

In conclusion, although parents have a strong influence on their children, I believe that the best place to create better citizens is the school because tutors are trained to do that.

**Details of politicians' private lives should not be published in newspapers.
To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

It is argued that newspapers ought not to publish the details of private lives of politicians. This essay strongly disagrees with this view because politicians build a public image through such news and they could be held accountable for any wrongdoings.

On the one hand, politicians can gain public trust by building a positive image through newspapers. Being the focus of media, sometimes details of their personal interests end up on the front pages of newspapers, which allows them to gain popularity among masses, especially when their interests match with the general public. Recently, the pictures of a famous politician of Milan, while playing football with local school children were published in many newspapers, and he instantly became famous among school and college students. Hence, it helps them gain popularity by depicting themselves in a positive way.

On the other hand, publishing details of private affairs disclose the corruption of politicians and make them accountable. Many politicians usually hold a public

office and are entrusted with managing public funds. If they do not spend the money on the wellbeing of people and are involved in corruption, newspapers expose their private life and put them under accountability. For example, when details of the lavish spending of the Mayor of London, while on a vacation, were revealed in the SUN, it prompted questions from many sections of the society, eventually exposing his corruption with the public money. Therefore, it is important that newspapers publish these details.

In conclusion, private matters of politicians should be published in newspapers because it allows them to gain popularity and expose their corrupt affairs.

Some say that music, art and drama are as important as other school subjects, especially at the primary level. Do you agree or disagree?

Some people believe that arts education is as significant as the study of other subjects, especially for primary students. I completely agree with this viewpoint because some educational content could be better illustrated in the forms of arts, and the study of arts is one key consideration which fosters all-rounded growth of young students.

The arts could deliver information to students, especially to those attending primary schools, in a way that words in textbooks sometimes cannot. Children may become bored and tired if they have to read or listen to too much educational content in textbooks. A colorful painting or a catchy song, on the other hand, can be much more appealing and thus more effective in conveying information to these children. For example, the Ghen Covy song has been taught at most schools in Vietnam and has become one of children's favorite songs. This song has effectively highlighted the importance of hand washing as a means of disease prevention, and has made it easier for many children to remember every step of hand sanitization for its catchy melody and appealing dancing moves.

Furthermore, the study of arts is one factor that contributes to a comprehensive development of young students. While academic subjects focus on children's cognitive development, arts education help children to develop their social-emotional skills. By singing a song or drawing a picture, these children are likely to express their feelings and nurture their sense of community. For

example, thousands of Vietnamese children, who were encouraged by their teaching staff, drew pictures of sunflowers to deliver messages of love and support for pediatric cancer patients.

In conclusion, the arts can sometimes be better at transmitting knowledge than textbooks, and the provision of both academic and arts education is necessary for an all-rounded growth of young students. I firmly believe that the study of arts should never be underestimated in any child educational institution.

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

Some would argue that all students in universities have to study the subject they like, while others think that they have to only study something useful for their future, for example, those related to science and technology sectors. Although learning about the latter subjects is crucial to secure a good job and salary, I believe that enrollment in whatever subject they favor leads to students being successful in their fields.

Studying science and technology during third-level education makes students able to easily find a job that pays high wages. That is to say, working in the majority of modern workplaces requires up-to-date technological information aiming to improve the quality of work and to compete with others, and, in turn, those employees will earn good remuneration. For instance, many IT graduates from the University of Toronto were able to have high positions and good wages in many renowned business companies. However, I think that the passion for what students study is more important than how much their earnings are in the future.

It is very important for university students to study the subjects they like because this is the reason behind a successful career. That is because the love for this particular subject allows them to go beyond their limits, be creative, and be eager to improve, and, thus, they might be promoted. For instance, many well-known musicians decided to study music because they were passionate about it and this positive spirit helps them climb their professional ladder.

Therefore, I support this school of thought because studying a favorite subject is more important.

To conclude, despite the fact that a course in science and technology can provide postgraduates with a good future career and enough income, in my view, studying whatever they prefer is better because this leads to success in their field.

In some countries, younger people are neglecting their right to vote. What problems does this cause and what are some of the possible solutions?

It is argued that in certain nations youth are not using their right to vote. This would hinder the political change, and it would also result in policies made that are not beneficial for these young people. The most viable solutions would be to create awareness among the younger generation and promote them to participate in politics.

Not participating in elections would mean that it would be difficult to change the government which is necessary for some countries across the globe. This is because, in any functional democracy, the only way to change the ruling party is by casting votes in the electoral process. Furthermore, if young individuals forge their right to vote, it would result in policies made that do not benefit them. As a result, they would feel that the state is not addressing their concerns and end up leaving the country. For instance, every year thousands of young adults from developing countries immigrate to Europe and North America because they are unhappy with their government's performance.

One way to tackle these issues is to inform these people about the power of vote. Campaigns should be held in universities, and colleges to educate youth about their political rights. Another solution is to promote these young people to come into politics. Doing this would ensure their representation and their voices being heard. For example, Nelson Mandela was a young political activist who successfully fought against racism and became the first black President of South Africa.

In conclusion, neglecting to vote by the young generation would delay the necessary government change, and laws made that are not in their favor. However, encouraging youth participation in politics and awareness campaigns can be possible solutions to tackle these problems.

In some countries, younger people are neglecting their right to vote. What problems does this cause and what are some of the possible solutions?

In certain parts of the world, the younger generation is not using their right to vote.

This phenomenon may result in younger people being apathetic toward politics and election results that do not reflect public opinion, and the most viable solutions are to educate young people about the importance of voting and incentivize them to vote.

One major problem of this is that younger people may adopt an uncaring attitude toward politics. If younger people do not take part in the election, which is the most significant political event, they are unlikely to pay heed to anything related to politics later on. Another issue is that the result of the election might be undermined. Since only older people give their votes, the winner may not be the one that the majority want to put in charge. For example, it is commonly seen in my country that politicians with older supporters tend to win against candidates that appeal to the young since most of them do not give their votes.

One suitable solution for this is to run a public awareness campaign to emphasize to younger people the significance of voting. Once they realize that if they abandon their right to vote, the consequences will be immense, they will change their minds and begin to vote. Another way to overcome this is to provide them with certain incentives to start voting. Many younger people find voting a waste of time and, therefore, if they are given incentives, they are more likely to take the time to vote. For instance, younger people in my country are often given a small amount of money as a way of motivating them to vote.

In conclusion, the problems that may stem from this are younger people's indifferent attitude toward political matters and an ineffective election, and

some ways to deal with them are educating and incentivizing younger people to vote.

Some people say that the best way to improve public health is by increasing the number of sports facilities. Others, however, say that this would have little effect on public health and that other measures are required. Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

It is argued that the sports facilities should be increased in number to improve citizens' health, while others claim that other initiatives are more essential to be conducted. While I support the idea that installing more sports facilities would help ordinary people to enhance their general health, I am more convinced that other effective measures should be taken.

On the one hand, people's general health status could have been improved greatly via exercising. It is proven that working out fastens the amount of oxygen to the brain, helping people be more concentrative and optimistic. Therefore, lack of physical exercise or insufficient physical movements one's working performance may be impacted and less productive. For example, Hanoi citizens are reported to be healthier than they were because of the availability of exercise equipment right at the local parts. However, I believe that this measure just improves partially not whole the public's health.

On the other hand, there is a wide range of conducts to prevents poor health conditions. Improving diet quality is one of the effective measures that should not be neglected. A good physical health is indeed contributed by many elements, and a full nutrient meal makes consumers stronger and strongly resistant to some diseases. In Vietnam, there used to be a program of introducing milk into daily meals to deter malnutrition for children. After 2 years of conducting this campaign, the number of underweight children was minimized noticeably. Therefore, I completely advocate other solutions to implement to warrant the public's general health.

In conclusion, although launching more sports facilities would benefit the overall health of citizens, I think that this matter could be addressed better by other methods.

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

A number of people argue that it is better for boys and girls to get an education from different schools, while others believe that it is more beneficial for children if they attend combined schools. Although studying in separate schools will help boys and girls to focus more on their studies, I believe learning from co-educational institutions will help them to become more social in society.

On the one hand, when boys and girls attend separate schools, they will spend more time focusing on their studies. This is because there will not be any opposite gender to be attracted to and to get involved in any affairs. The schooling hours will be fully utilized to learn something rather than being diverted from studies and spending time with the ones they might have an affair with in the school. For example, in Nepal, students from St. Mary's Girls School showed a better academic performance than the girls who completed their school years from a co-educational institution. However, I believe that children attending mixed school will learn to be more social in the future.

On the other hand, co-education is more beneficial for children because they will learn some social skills during their school years. This is to say that children of both genders will be allowed to have combined studies and will learn how to deal politely with a person of the opposite sex, an important skill which is highly accepted by society. For example, boys who finished their studies at co-educational schools showed more courtesy towards ladies by offering some help when required. For this reason, it is better for children to attend mixed schools as it helps them to learn essential social skills.

In conclusion, although educating children in separate schools will help them to focus on their studies, I believe that co-education is much better for girls and boys as they will learn essential social skills in school.

Being a celebrity, such as a famous film star or sports personality, brings problems as well as benefits. Do you think that being a celebrity brings more benefits or more problems?

Lives of celebrities, like famous movie stars or sports people, bring benefits as well as problems. Although earning huge amounts of money is an advantage for celebrities, I believe the lack of privacy in their lives is a major problem that outweighs the benefit.

The main advantage for celebrities is that they receive a huge remuneration. That is to say, such people are paid large amounts of money for their efforts or performance. Celebrities usually decide how much they should be paid, and the people who pay them do not negotiate as they are confident in their star value. For example, Avengers star casts were paid in high amounts even before they read the script of the film series because of their previous performances in the older series. However, I think celebrities are also human beings and money cannot replace the happiness or freedom they need in their lives.

One of the downsides of being a celebrity is that it is not possible for them to lead a private life. This means that because of their fame and popularity, they are continuously followed by the media, and by their fans who eagerly wait to know what is happening in their favorite stars' lives. As such, celebrities lose their freedom and cannot enjoy their personal time with their families or friends. For instance, when Sachin Tendulkar became famous after his remarkable performance in cricket, he claimed that he could not walk down the streets of Mumbai as he used to do in the past. Thus, I believe celebrities cannot be carefree, and they always have to face the media in one or the other way.

To conclude, I think the problem of being a celebrity is that their privacy is interrupted, and this overshadows the benefit of making large amounts of money as a celebrity.

Being a celebrity, such as a famous film star or sports personality, brings problems as well as benefits. Do you think that being a celebrity brings more benefits or more problems?

Being a famous person, such as a movie star or sports athlete, has many disadvantages and advantages. Although famous people will earn more money, I believe that there are more drawbacks because famous people will not be safe in public places.

The biggest advantage is that well-known individuals will earn loads of money. This is because they will get colossal amounts of money from their sponsors for promoting their products, such as mobile phones, laptops or cars. As a result, notable individuals will become affluent around the nation. Floyd Mayweather, for instance, is a famous boxer as well as a wealthy person in the United States of America. Each year he gets around millions of dollars from Burger Kings and Rolls Royal sponsors for promoting their products during boxing matches. However, I believe that famous celebrities face huge problems whenever they go out because their frenzied fans will annoy them.

The major drawback is that famous individuals' lives will be in danger in common places. This is because their foes will try to harm them whenever they go out either alone or with their family members, such as in parks or malls. As a result, they will have to hire some security guards to protect themselves against vicious-minded individuals. Jennifer Lopez, for instance, always goes out with five bodyguards. The reason is that in the past, some deranged fans attacked her in New York park and broke her left arm. Therefore, I believe that celebrities always face difficulties in common places because someone will assault them.

In conclusion, although well-known individuals earn big amounts of money from sponsors, notable people's lives will be in danger because evil-minded people will harm them. For these reasons, I believe that drawbacks are more than benefits.

**Details of politicians' private lives should not be published in newspapers.
To what extent do you agree or disagree?**

It is being argued that media houses should not disclose the personal lives of statesmen. I completely agree with this statement because it will not only violate their right to privacy, but also they should focus their resources on more pressing issues that need immediate attention such as poverty.

It is the fundamental right of every human being to have their privacy. Even though they are public figures, their private lives should be away from the eyes of the media. They should only be judged against their service towards their countries and not for what is happening in their day-to-day affairs. The prime

example of this can be seen in the Constitution of the USA, which gives its citizens the right to privacy.

In addition to this, it is the responsibility of newspapers to address important matters including poverty. Media can be a very powerful medium, so rather than talking about other people's lives, resources should be diverted towards putting pressure on public officials to engage them in solving real-life problems. Using their influence to the benefit of the general public should be the main focus of newspapers. For example, during the Great Depression, The Guardian was the main voice of people in protesting against the poor living conditions.

In conclusion, I do not support the argument of newspapers publishing the personal information of government officials. This is because it will result in the violation of their privacy and also the primary focus of news agencies should be to highlight key issues concerning the nation.

Some people say that television is useful for education, while others say it is useful only for entertainment. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Television is considered useful for education by some, while others claim that it only serves entertainment purposes. While certain people believe television is only for entertainment as it steals time, this essay claims that it is valuable as educational programs on television can help a child's intellect.

Some believe television is only useful for entertainment since it takes away time. This is because they feel that children who spend too much time in front of the television may miss out on life's opportunities and that it is much more productive to spend time with friends, to work on homework, to go outside, or to relax instead of watching television. For example, kids who watch too much television tend to work less on their homework, which results in poor performance in school. However, I would argue that television is important as education programs can aid in boosting children's intellect.

Educational programs on television can help children become more intelligent. Kids who watch informative and educational shows learn to solve problems and develop strong mental math skills. For instance, several studies have shown that

kids are more likely to outperform their peers on tests when they watch educational shows. Additionally, studies have shown that children who watch cartoons most of the time score less than those who watch educational shows. Therefore, I strongly believe educational shows on television encourage intellectual development in children.

In conclusion, while television is seen as only useful for entertainment because it eats up time, watching informative educational shows on television can develop a child's intellectual skills.

Being a celebrity, such as a famous film star or sports personality, brings problems as well as benefits. Do you think that being a celebrity brings more benefits or more problems?

Being a famous person, for example a popular actor or a sports star, is problematic as well as beneficial. This essay believes that fame has more negative effects because it comes with the cost of being a burden to the star's family, and it can threaten the star's mental health.

The first negative effect fame has on the star's life is the burden it puts on his family. That is not only because of the paparazzi that keep chasing them everywhere they go and eventually putting them at physical risk, but also because of the pink media which posts news about them that completely breach privacy and are often related to intimate relationships. For example, it is very well known how detrimental the role of paparazzi and pink media was on Princess Diana's sons and they report that those publications and breaking news scarred them for a lifetime just because they come from a famous family.

The second reason behind the negativity of being a star is that it creates an unsafe environment that may endanger the star's mental health. Being constantly under the spotlights and lacking the minimum amount of privacy in the person's life is documented to be detrimental to this latter's mental health. For instance, the famous movie star Marilyn Monroe is known to have committed suicide because she could not cope with a life with no privacy at all, and the same applies to the famous Egyptian star Souad Husni and many others.

In conclusion, in my opinion, the negative aspects of fame outweigh the positive ones especially because it puts a burden on the star's family and puts their mental health in danger.

Multinational companies are becoming increasingly common in developing countries. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this?

It is becoming more popular in developing nations to see multinational corporations. There are some benefits for this trend such as the progress in the economy they create in these countries and the availability of jobs, however, the shut down of some small local businesses and the lower selling rate of local products can be its drawbacks.

The main advantage of the increasing number of these types of companies is the economic progress. That is to say, if multinational organizations operate in less-developed nations, this can bring wealth which boosts industries, trade, and other aspects of the economy. Moreover, more jobs will be available for the local people. That is because more workers and managers are needed to work for these companies which can be a good opportunity for locals to find a job. For instance, after opening a branch of Apple in Dubai, many local graduates were thrilled by the good news of being accepted to work under this renowned company.

However, one of the main disadvantages of this trend is the drop in the selling rate of the local products. That is because of the good reputations and qualities of international items, and, thus, citizens might refrain from buying their local products. Another disadvantage is that some small local shops could be closed. That is due to the unfair competition with these huge strong establishments, and as a result, some might be shut down or go bankrupt. For example, many amateur Syrian entrepreneurs, and after the harsh competition they had with international textile corporations, were forced to close their fabric factories.

In conclusion, although the advantages of the popularity of multinational organizations in developing countries are the economic progress and the improvement in the job market, nonetheless, its downsides are the drop in the average selling of local products and the closure of some small businesses.

Some people say that television is useful for education, while others say it is useful only for entertainment. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

A number of individuals believe that television can help with education, while others feel it is only used for entertaining people. Although entertainment television programs are the most popular programs on TV, this essay argues that television is helpful in education if people utilize it properly.

On the one hand, nowadays, entertainment television programs have become the most well-liked TV programs. That is because those programs give people an escape from their home lives or occupations, and it is also a great way to spend time with them. For example, in the United States of America the Ellen Show is one of the most popular shows which has lasted almost twenty years. However, I believe that entertainment television programs are people's favorite television programs does not mean television cannot be useful for education.

On the other hand, television can be a helpful tool in education if people use it in a proper way. Television can help people to study through informative videos, TV shows, or documents, and those videos can help people form a visual representation of their thoughts. For instance, it can be commonly seen in many schools that teachers introduce TVs in their lectures to help students understand complicated and difficult subjects. For this reason, this essay believes that television is a useful tool for education.

In conclusion, although programs for entertaining people are the most well-liked television programs, I maintain that television is useful for education because it is a helpful tool for education if it is utilized properly.

In many countries, the government prioritizes economic growth above all other concerns. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of this.

Economic growth is a sphere that receives more attention than any other national domain in many states all over the world. The principal benefits of this phenomenon are lower unemployment and wealthier citizens, and the main downsides are higher costs of living for most and insufficient support for the poorest.

On the one hand, what makes prioritizing economic expansion beneficial for the public is the fact that fewer residents remain unemployed. This is because governments boost establishing various businesses, which will require many workers to operate. In addition, not only does a country become more powerful economically, but also many residents have an opportunity to become affluent. When companies generate more profit, it reflects how much money employees can make. In Poland, for example, 30 years after communism collapsed, average salaries offered for a middle-management position have tripled.

On the other hand, as a country's economy thrives, costs of living increase. The most compelling reason for that could be the fact that since workers are paid more, their services become more expensive, which results in higher prices of many products. Moreover, in many cases, a state whose main priority is its economy offers little support for those who need it. If authorities believe that a strong economy is of the greatest importance, they are rather reluctant to offer help to those who do not contribute to the nation's prosperity. To illustrate, when Donald Trump, who was a big advocate of a strong economy, became the president of the USA, the funds for jobless migrants were cut.

In conclusion, as with anything in life, prioritizing economic growth by authorities has its pros and cons. While more have jobs that allow them to become wealthy, costs of living are going up, and those who need to rely on the social care system are marginalized.

Some people think that parents should teach their children how to be good members of society. Others, however, believe that school is the best place to learn this. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

It is argued that parents should be the ones to familiarize their children with basic teachings of morals and ethics and how to implement them to become better individuals in the society, while many believe educational institutes are the best places to learn them from. While parents can pay individual attention to their kids, I believe that schools provide an ideal environment in learning and grooming.

On the one hand, parents serve as role models and they are perfectly capable of paying undivided attention to their kids. That is to say that they can tell their kids stories containing lessons about differentiating right from wrong and good from bad. Furthermore, by demonstrating responsible behavior, elders are instilling good habits in their young. As a result, children follow their elders and grow up to be better human beings. For example, on the dining table parents should tell their kids to eat quietly and not make unnecessary noises which can develop into a good habit. However, I believe that parents cannot consistently teach and monitor their kids' behavior patterns due to lack of time.

On the other hand, educational centers provide a specialized environment for minors in both academic and moral fields. That is to say that a child is more keen to learn and grow when one steps outside the comfort zone. By interacting with fellow students and actively participating in multiple social activities youngsters are able to perform to the best of their abilities. For instance, primary schools around the world include social activities and role plays in their curriculum to teach students how to become model citizens. Therefore, this option is preferable because it benefits the child in the long run as well as the society..

In conclusion, although parents can demonstrate moral teachings to their children in an effective manner, learning them at schools would make them rather more confident and productive members for the community.

In some countries, even though the rates of serious crimes are decreasing, people feel less safe than ever before. What do you think are the causes of this problem and what measures could be taken to solve it?

Although grievous offenses are reducing, some people feel more insecure than they used to. The main reason behind this is the increase of cyber bullying and hate-crimes, and the solution would be to raise the general awareness among the masses and by promulgating new laws.

The primary cause of people not feeling safer than they used to is because the arena of crime has changed. More people are interacting virtually over the internet, which is mostly unregulated. Therefore, people are easily subject to harassment and bullying on social media. Moreover, people are also subject to

hate-crimes which is a consequence of constant portrayal of a certain group of people as evil by the media. For example, labeling the activities of criminals, who profess the Islamic faith, as terrorists has resulted in an increase in hate-crimes against Muslims across America.

The solution to such problems would be in educating the general people so that they are more aware. This will allow them to act more responsibly. Also, the government can play their part by enacting new laws that addresses the needs of time. This will make their citizens feel more secure because they can have their problems redressed. For instance, the government of Bangladesh recently enacted Digital Security Act, 2018 and Digital Security Rules, 2020 in order to penalize offenses that take place in cyberspace, as crimes like online harassment and cyberbullying were not previously defined as an offense.

In conclusion, insecurity among some sections of the population is still prevailing due to the change in the nature of crimes that are being committed nowadays. However, this can easily be addressed by making people aware and also by making new laws.

Most high-level positions in companies are filled by men even though the workforce in many developed countries is more than 50 per cent female. Companies should be required to allocate a certain percentage of these positions to women. To what extent do you agree?

Although women account for more than 50 per cent of the workforce in developed nations, a number of managerial positions are still occupied by men. Some believe that a certain proportion of these vacancies should be allocated to females. This essay, however, strongly disagrees with this statement because this can discourage qualified men to work hard, and such a policy can encourage organizations to find some wrong ways to outsmart the system.

Reserving a certain proportion of high-level positions for women because of their gender may prevent educated males from making a contribution to the progress of a company. This is because any employee naturally wants to have equal opportunities for promotion irrespective of gender. If males at the workplace are deprived of it, they are not motivated to work hard. For example,

psychologists claim that the motivation and hard work of subordinates directly hinge on the promotional system of a company.

Furthermore, imposing a quota will make companies seek for some illegal ways to outwit this regulation since the priority of most companies is to reward employees with high-level positions according to their knowledge and experience, not their genders. Hence, if any law contradicts the policy of a company based on gender, the owners of that company are more likely to make modifications to outsmart the system, which benefits neither of them. For example, not to compulsively hire female employees to the top management of a company, owners can change the title of a position to just to fill a vacancy.

In conclusion, I strongly disagree with the idea of allocation of certain high-level posts to females because of their gender since this can discourage qualified males to work hard and make companies find alternative ways to outwit the law.

Some people think that the teenage years are the happiest time of most people's lives. Others think that adult life brings more happiness, in spite of greater responsibility. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

It is argued that adolescence years are the happiest years in one's life, while others believe that adulthood is the most joyful phase to live despite having bigger responsibilities. This essay believes that, although adolescents are free of responsibilities, adults enjoy their life more because they are free to make their own choices.

On the one hand, adolescents are thought to live the happiest moments of their life because they are not asked to be responsible. Basically, a teenager lives with his parents, who not only provide him shelter, food, and education, but also, in some cases, would try to fulfill his fantasies. For instance, in my country, teenagers make a great example of spoiled people who spend their money carelessly and always ask for more, though they do not seem to be happy. However, I believe that not being obliged to worry about any responsibility is not what happiness is all about, and consequently adolescents do not live their happiest days.

On the other hand, others see that adulthood is a happier phase because adults are free to make the choices that fit their aspirations. Having the freedom of choice will eventually be followed by achievements and a sense of self-accomplishment, which is a primary source of joy. For example, many adults in my country are happy because of the choice of career or commitment they took on their own, and they see themselves happier than when they were teenagers. Therefore, I believe adulthood is the most enjoyable time because one can not be happy if they have to follow others' plans even if it comes with no responsibilities.

In conclusion, despite having no responsibilities on their shoulders, adolescents do not live the happiest moments of their life. This essay believes that it is adulthood which is the most enjoyable in light of the fact that adults are free to make their own choices.

In some countries, it is becoming increasingly common for people to follow a vegetarian diet. Do the advantages of this outweigh the disadvantages?

In a number of countries, following a vegetarian diet has become very popular. Although being a vegetarian can limit the options when eating, I believe the advantages outweigh the disadvantages because it allows the body to work properly.

For vegetarian people it is difficult to find varied options to eat. Since the majority of the worldwide population have a diet that includes animal products, this type of food is the one that is normally available at food businesses. Therefore, people with a vegetarian diet have to choose between a limited number of plates or products when buying food or eating out. For example, in many popular restaurants in Colombia, the menu has only a short vegetarian section which includes only two or three plates that are completely vegetarian. However, I believe that those options that are offered are healthier than plates that are sold in large quantities.

Following a vegetarian diet allows the body to work better. This is because science has shown that when our human system digests animal products, such as meat, it has to work harder to process the food that it is not designed to receive. Thus, people that have a diet based on plants and seeds are more prone

to have a healthier life because they allow their bodies to focus their energy in its normal processes. For instance, people who become vegetarian are less prone to get sick because their immune system has all the energy focused on fighting bacteria and not causing chronic inflammation because of the food. That is why I consider that following a vegetarian diet can have more benefits in the long term.

In conclusion, although vegetarian people have fewer options when buying products without animal ingredients, it is my belief that following a vegetarian diet has a positive impact on body functions.

Some people think that parents should teach their children how to be good members of society. Others, however, believe that school is the best place to learn this. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Some claim that families should educate their offspring on being good members of the community, while others say that school is the most suitable place to do that. Although school has professional ways to teach children about being good in society, I believe that teaching them by parents is more appropriate because parents have more influence on children.

On the one hand, school should teach children how to interact in a good way in society because it has academic methods to better educate children on that. Any school curriculum is examined by experts before being used, so it contains no mistakes or unsuitable context. For example, to design a school national curriculum, governments hire the most experienced and knowledgeable teachers nationwide. However, I believe that children follow parent's instructions better than school's instructions.

On the other hand, parents are more influential in teaching children about being good in society. That is because parents are close to children, so children are more likely to believe in them. As a result, children are effectively learning how important it is to behave well in society. For instance, the vast majority of children gain their good habits from their parents as they are eager to transmit the good attitude to their children. Therefore, I believe that families are the most suitable teachers for children when it comes to being good in society.

In conclusion, despite the fact that school has professional methods to educate children on being good in society, I believe that parents are more successful doing that because they have better influence on children.

Some people think that the teenage years are the happiest time of most people's lives. Others think that adult life brings more happiness, in spite of greater responsibility. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

It is thought by some that their happiest years were during their teenage years. Others, however, believe that happiness comes during adult life later on, despite the great deal of responsibilities. Although being an adult means having enough money to enjoy many life activities, teenagers have an enormous amount of time to spend on leisure activities, and for this reason, I stand with the latter view.

Undoubtedly, adults usually have the money to spend on entertaining activities and create joyful moments. Due to the fact that adults usually have the financial means to travel somewhere far, attend a concert, or even rent an expensive car, many express their happiest moments to be during their thirties and the years after while their health is still perfect and they have enough money to spend. For example, a 35-year-old man can always travel to Spain during summer time and be able to create unforgettable moments. However, in my opinion, most adults are so engaged mentally with work and family responsibilities that they do not have the time to spend or travel but rarely.

On the other hand, during adolescence, teenagers have all the time they need to have fun. Having no serious tasks or long working hours, teenagers often spend their time partying with their cool friends throughout the week while having absolutely no responsibility on their shoulders. As a result, people usually remember these days as their happiest. For example, teenagers usually have their own party places that open during weekdays, especially when they become university students, they become happier as their social network also expands. Personally, I believe that having no responsibilities is the key to creating happy moments to remember.

To conclude, while being an adult means having more money to spend on entertaining events, teenagers have all the time in the world to be with their

friends and party, and that, in my view, is the reason why people remember these days as their happiest.

Multinational companies are becoming increasingly common in developing countries. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this?

Global companies are gaining more popularity among third-world countries. The main advantages of this are that they generate more employment in a country and provide good benefits to employees. However, the major drawbacks are long working hours and unsecured jobs.

One benefit of multinational companies is that they employ a large workforce. This is because these big companies have more than two or three branches around the country, thereby increasing the employment rate within the country. Moreover, these companies have good benefits for their staff, as compared to local companies, such as yearly travel compensation and full coverage family insurance. For instance, Amazon provides a yearly international trip to the employee and their family, covering accommodation and return tickets.

On the other hand, having to work extremely long hours is the major disadvantage of being in such companies. This is because these companies handle clients who work in different time zones. Hence, the employees have to work in their local time zone as well as per client time zone, which can be several hours apart. Furthermore, losing a job at any time is the biggest fear of employees working for such organizations, unlike the government sector, where an employee cannot be fired from the job easily. For example, in Apple Inc., it is reported several times that the employees are fired due to their grudges with their boss.

In conclusion, multinational organizations have benefited developing countries by increasing the employment rate and making the lives of employees better by providing good benefits. However, it does not have strict policies for their staff as they have to work long hours and fear of losing their job at any time.

In modern times, children are spending less time with their families and more time with their friends. Why has this change occurred? Do you think parents should force their children to spend more time at home?

Nowadays, children spend more time with their friends than with their families. This change has occurred because children do not want to feel left out amongst their peers and parents should not force children to stay home because they will resent their parents for it.

Young ones do not want to miss out on social activities with their friends. Since the invention of technology, many activities that people carry out, especially teenagers, are now being posted online. As a result, children want to engage more in activities with their peers so they would also have fun stories to post on their social media pages and not be the odd one among their peers. For example, many young people in South Korea are known to shop and visit fun places with their friends rather than their parents, so as to show off the fun activities they engage in on Wechat, a popular social media platform.

Children whose parents mandate spending more time at home might hold a grudge towards their parents. This is because if children are forced by their parents to spend more time at home, they may interpret this as a form of punishment and develop a negative attitude towards their parents, which defeats the goal of family time. However, if they are encouraged to play with their siblings and bond with the family, children will be more willing to stay at home. For example, most children in Nigeria, even though they spend time with their friends, look forward to family time because parents in Nigeria emphasize the benefits of spending more time with family.

In conclusion, children want to engage in activities with their friends and not be left out, and parents should encourage their children to stay at home more, rather than force them so that their children will not resent them.

Some people think that the teenage years are the happiest time of most people's lives. Others think that adult life brings more happiness, in spite of greater responsibility. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

It is believed by some that adolescent years are the happiest period of most people's lives, while others believe that adulthood brings more content, despite having more responsibilities. Although teenagers obtain new experiences in

their teenage years, I believe that adults can enjoy the things they have accomplished.

On the one hand, experiences that adolescents gain before they reach adulthood make them happy. This is because many teenagers get more freedom to do the things that they like without being controlled by their parents. A sense of freedom gives them the opportunity to socialize with their contemporaries and many of them fall in love for the first time. These are unprecedented experiences that make them feel very happy. For example, many dwellers of Sarajevo have said that teenage years were the happiest years of their lives. However, I think that adolescents do not know what real happiness is at such a young age.

On the other hand, adults can appreciate the things they have achieved. This is to say that many adults set goals when they were younger, such as having prosperous careers, because they knew achieving their goals would make them content. They worked hard to get closer to their goals, and when they finally achieved their targets, they felt contentment. For instance, many Bosnians dreamed about owning a property, and after purchasing housing they were ecstatic. Therefore, I believe that adults can value happiness at a greater level.

In conclusion, although pre-adulthood brings new experiences, I believe that adults enjoy the perks of their hard work.

In many professional sports, there is an increase in the number of athletes using banned substances to improve their performance. What are the causes of the phenomenon and what are some of the possible solutions?

The number of sportspeople using illegal substances to improve their performance has increased in many sporting events. This essay believes that many athletes are taking banned substances to win the competition and exceed capabilities beyond their limits. This can be prevented by requiring athletes to take drug tests before the competition and punish them if they have violated the rules.

Some sportsmen are taking banned substances because they want to be the best athlete in the competition. It is in their nature to be on top among other

competitors, and winning is their main goal. In addition, using illegal substances helps exceed their abilities by boosting their physical strength. They are tempted to do this because it helps them to handle such excruciating training needed to achieve their goals. For instance, Michael Phelps, a professional swimmer, confessed that the use of an illegal substance has helped him become an Olympic Gold medallist.

One solution to eradicate this problem is to test all athletes before the competition so that they will be discouraged from using banned substances, allowing fair competition among athletes. Moreover, sports organizations should also punish athletes who are taking performance-enhancing drugs, such as banning them from playing any sports event. This will give them lessons and take away the temptations of using illegal substances. For example, the Tour de France organization has banned Edward Armstrong from entering the bike racing competition and stripped down all his trophies because of his drug violations.

In conclusion, many athletes nowadays use illegal substances to win the competition and exceed their physical capabilities. However, it is vital to have fair competition, and this can be eradicated by requiring the athletes to do drug tests and ban them if found guilty.