

Some say that because the internet has made a lot of information accessible, it is not important to learn facts related to history or science anymore. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Mojtaba

Some people think learning historical and scientific events is not necessary for them because there are plentiful websites which contain ~~those that~~ information. I strongly disagree with this view, as ~~those that~~ online information is not reliable and learning historical events and science ~~are is~~ useful for individuals.

On the one hand, the Internet is full of informations ~~which~~ some of ~~which is them are~~ not reliable. People who search via ~~the~~ internet to find historical facts or scientific documents are faced with ~~faithless-unreliable~~ information and evidences which in turn results in wrong outcomes. For instance, Wikipedia, which is very famous among people and works as encyclopedia, can be updated and added information ~~to~~ by ordinary people and some of ~~those that data/~~ information ~~is are~~ not correct. Moreover, most of the internet websites ~~do not~~ have ~~not~~ scientific value and the information on it ~~is are~~ collected in order to attract peoples. Those websites' managers customize ~~/edit/manage~~ information and mix them with their own views to increase website visitors and get more advertising revenue ~~/click based~~. Furthermore, studying historical and scientific information ~~are is~~ useful for people. Learning details ~~s~~ of historical information such as years or number not only ~~is works~~ as exercise for ~~the~~ brain and improves ~~s~~ its abilities but also ~~broadness-broadens~~ their horizons.

On the other hand, there are ~~trustable~~ websites which people can rely on ~~them~~ in their search. Those reliable websites, which are supported by universities and famous scientific organizations, collect and present reliable information ~~for to~~ people who ~~want seek find~~ historical or scientific articles such as Science Direct that are full of reliable researches and articles. However, using those websites neither is very popular among people, nor is free and people cannot use them easily.

In conclusion, I believe that learning history or science is useful for individuals and they cannot merely rely on online data ~~ae~~ due to ~~the fact that~~ they ~~do not~~ have ~~not~~ reliable information.

darya attighi

Some people think that the government should make university education free for all students regardless of their financial situation. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

Most of people agree that the government should make tertiary education free for all students.

So all the ~~student-students~~ can ~~educate-study~~ and we have ~~a~~ higher level of literacy in our society.

The primary factor that we should consider is may ~~be~~ students ~~s~~ cannot afford university education . Although they truly want to ~~educate~~ and if ~~the~~ government ~~does~~ not give them free education they cannot achieve ~~to~~ their dreams which is unfair to them. The government is already ~~receive-receiving~~ lots of tax and they spend it ~~on nuclear energy less important areas~~ and build rockets. ~~s~~ they can allocate part of that money for free education. Many young people after graduation should pay for university education by ~~their selves themselves~~ because they do not have any financial support and the government should help them so they can achieve ~~to~~ their dreams.

However, it is important ~~to-for~~ students to understand the value of this opportunity that the government ~~is give-giving~~to them and try their best to get good marks and graduate from university so they can find ~~a-work/a job~~ themselves and make money and develop the economy of the country . They should not waste the chance that the government ~~is give-giving~~ them.

In conclusion, I would agree with that tertiary education should be free for all students and the government should allocate part of the money that they receive for financial support ~~to-for this-these~~ children

Ali banaie

Some people say that best way to improve public health is by increasing the number if 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 opinion.

One of the worst consequences of modern society is to not spend time ~~on~~-doing some exercise during the day. However, people should be encouraged to pay attention to their training schedule in any possible way. From my point of view, although providing sports facilities is valuable, it does not have a significant impact on people's health.

~~Although Despite my opposition to~~ the influence of sports facilities on public health cannot be denied, it will not be very dramatic-increasing the number of gyms and sports clubs in each region can be motivating. For example, some people, including me, need to register at a gym and spend money to force themselves to exercise. Therefore, for this group of people having a gym close to their home or work area can be helpful. Providing swimming pools near workplaces, not only does encourage individuals to exercise but also the calmness of swimming in the pool leads to their mental and psychological health. As a result, their efficiency can be improved during the day.

Public health is not restricted just to exercise, factors such as food ~~habitation~~habits, individuals' stress level, job satisfaction, and personal happiness, ~~and so on~~ are ~~the more~~other influential factors in public health. However, beneficial results of a regular schedule of exercising, such as decreasing the level of depression, stress, blood cholesterol/fat and rate of heart attack, distinguish it from the other factors. In my opinion, motivation plays a significant role in staying healthy. In other words, everyone is responsible for their healthiness, as a result, by encouraging people to pay attention to their daily life habits, the increase in public health emerges.

Overall, families, schools, governments, companies, doctors and psychologists are responsible for individuals' health by providing facilities, motivating and advertising healthy ways of living, providing sports programs at workplaces or schools, such as specifying and dedicating time for exercise especially in a group along with supplying healthy food and decreasing the anxiety in society, the increase of public health is accessible.

Farkhondeh

Some companies have decided not to allow employees to discuss business by sending emails or messages on weekends. Some people believe that this policy is great, others believe that this policy will discourage employees. What is your opinion and why?

Nowadays, with the close competition between companies, they are looking for the rules increasing the companies' s revenues. Directors are exploiting several policies, one of which is banning work-related emails on weekends. There is not yet a consensus in this regard, however. Some believe this decision benefits employee, while others see some disadvantages in it. I am inclined toward the later idea for some reasons.

Firstly, companies only have a permission to decide for their staff within their work environment and working hours. In other words, each person is free to decide what to do on weekends, and the onus is not on companies to make a decision for their personnel' s free time. It is necessary for the head of the groups to know their boundaries and ~~do~~ not exceed the personal rights. Meanwhile, since there are numerous workers with various personalities, companies cannot make a decision persuading all. Companies should ~~move~~ ~~move~~ in ~~the~~ ~~a~~ direction to give some authorities to their staff in order to elevate their efficiency. As an example, I started to work in a company which ~~have~~ had some rigid limitations about workers' working hours, to such extent it was a ~~requirement~~ ~~necessitate~~ for staff to start and finish their work at a determined time, and they did not have ~~allowance~~ ~~latitude~~ to work on weekends. After a while, the discontent of the workers and the decrease in their motivation forced the director to change the policies, so the personnel had to work 48 hours weekly, but they could choose their working hours.

Secondly, it is likely that this policy leads to decrease in companies' benefits in the long run. To explain more, the nature of some jobs necessitates some people to be in touch with their customers even on weekends. For instance, a person who works in an international part of the company, ~~is~~ required to have ~~a~~ ~~minutely~~ ~~constant~~ connection with their consumers or co-workers to respond their questions. When a company restricts ~~s~~ their staff to answer the messages on weekends, it can negatively affect their professional relationship, damage the reputation of the team and bring irreparable disadvantages.

In sum, although some believe this limitation can benefit office workers ~~in~~ ~~to~~ some extent, I ~~think~~ ~~maintain~~ its demerits ~~out~~weighs the profits. It can be an unsuitable decision according to the staff' s characteristics and their duties at work.

reza boostani

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

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

Some say recycling homes waste is less than expectations and now it is the governments' duty to act by setting laws to ~~diffusion~~ ~~diffuse~~ recycling. In this essay I will try to expand this issue more and finally I will share my own view.

To begin with, there is no doubt that the large-scale amount of waste without recycling in the 21st century is not acceptable for either governments or individuals. Unfortunately, as we are witnessing, recycling among all societies ~~is~~ ~~has~~ not ~~been~~ even a regular task after almost 50 years, but nonetheless people tend to ignore it by consuming more and more products either with non-recyclable or non-

compostable components. Moreover, the convenience and the economic~~al~~ aspect of non-recyclable materials in products or in their packaging adds to /-aggravate/complicate/compound/worsen the problem.

Some citizens say from experience probably all of us agree that ~~the~~ advertisements are not enough to encourage people to recycle more. Given that, other approaches need to be taken into consideration for authorities to increase recycling, and the most influential one is law. For instance, by putting /levy/impose/introduce taxes on products which are not recyclable or ~~to make-making~~ them less reasonable to purchase. Another way is to encourage people to recycle more by giving them extra subsidies on some commodities.

From my point of view, governments should set /introduce some strict laws to encourage people to consume less non-recyclable products and recycle more, furthermore, authorities should allocate a specific budget on to these approaches so that these policies to come to fruition bear them fruit.

To sum up, the amount of recycling nowadays is unacceptable/not acceptable, and governments should set some laws to reduce the waste and increase recycling.

Shaghayegh raeesi

Today people are surrounded by advertising. This affects what people think is important and has a negative impact on people's lives. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is plain that remarkable advances in all aspects of human life particularly in media and technology have changed dramatically the way of advertising, people's minds are mostly manipulated by advertisements. The majority of people argue that it would have a negative point which is ~~that~~ in the long-term in human begins' lives, but not everyone has the same attitude. From my point of view, this trend is, to some extent, ~~is-~~vital.

Firstly, advertisements provide a wide range of opportunities for all people around the world to have information about the latest innovations and products which ease human lives. Online shopping from different mobile apps, is a tangible example. In other words, living in a hectic modern life has brought about time constraints and consequently, people have inadequate time to know about their environments. Having said that, advertising, finding-found anywhere, causes /helps us we have a more accurate idea about what is has happened-happening/occurring in the World and has boosted our life better than ever before. Furthermore, without advertising, there is no chance to announce different options from a product which means that people have a right to compare, analyze, and choose the best one /s.

On the other hand, the majority of people hold the view that indiscriminate utilizing advertising would pose serious environmental problems for citizens of the globe. This means that commercials often ~~be-~~ encouraged us to be more bigger consumers, purchasing unnecessary things /items/goods/merchandise/products/commodities. Furthermore, this vision could lead to overusing global resources and in the long-term, a growing number of valuable natural resources would go out of service.

In conclusion, I strongly believe that these days advertisements are instrumental in our lives, and life could be tough without them. However, governments and people should consider the consequences ~~rigorously~~seriously.