

GMAT考试写作例文224篇连载(一零八) PDF转换可能丢失图片或格式，建议阅读原文

[https://www.100test.com/kao\\_ti2020/127/2021\\_2022\\_GMAT\\_E8\\_80\\_83\\_E8\\_AF\\_95\\_c89\\_127220.htm](https://www.100test.com/kao_ti2020/127/2021_2022_GMAT_E8_80_83_E8_AF_95_c89_127220.htm) 108. “ Employees should not have full access to their own personnel files. If, for example, employees were allowed to see certain confidential materials, the people supplying that information would not be likely to express their opinions candidly. ” Discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the opinion stated above. Support your views with reasons and/or examples from your own experience, observations, or reading. The issue is whether employees should have full access to their own personnel files. The speaker claims that they should not, pointing out that such access could diminish the candor of those supplying information. To some extent, I agree with this viewpoint. Although employees are entitled to be accurately informed about the substance of performance reviews or complaints in their files, at times there will be good reason not to identify information sources. First of all, employers have a right to control some information pertinent to (adj. 与..有关的) their business success. Unproductive or uncooperative workers can seriously harm an organization. For this reason, employers need to have accurate information about employee performance. But when employees have full access to their own personnel files, co-workers and even supervisors will often find it difficult to give frank criticism of underachievers (n. 成就过小者, 在学业方面未发挥潜力的学生) or to report troublemakers. So although employees have legitimate claims to know what has been

said about them, they are not always entitled to know who said it. Secondly, employers are obligated to control some information when their employees are accused of unlawful conduct. Since employers are responsible for wrongdoing (不正当行为 ; 坏事) at the workplace, they must investigate charges of, for example, drug activity, possession of firearms, or harassment. But again, without assurances of anonymity, accusers may be less forthright.

Furthermore, they may be in jeopardy of retaliation by the accused. So while workers under investigation may be generally informed about complaints or reports, they should not know who filed them. Even so, employers do not enjoy an unlimited right to gather and keep confidential information about employees. For example, it would be unjust to investigate an employee ' s political viewpoints, religious preference, or sexual orientation. Such invasions of privacy are not warranted by an employer ' s right to performance-related information, or duty to protect the workplace from criminal wrongdoing. In conclusion, limiting employee access to personnel files is sometimes warranted to encourage candor and prevent retaliation against information sources. At the same time, employers have no right to solicit or secure information about the private lives of their workers. 100Test 下载频道开通 , 各类考试题目直接下载。详细请访问 [www.100test.com](http://www.100test.com)