

9月3日Patrick写作范文：穷人的孩子早当家 PDF转换可能丢失图片或格式，建议阅读原文

https://www.100test.com/kao_ti2020/179/2021_2022_9_E6_9C_883_E6_97_A5Pa_c7_179715.htm Children who grow up in families

without large amounts of money are better prepared to deal with problems in their adult life than children who are brought up by wealthy parents. Do you agree or disagree?题目点评：这道题是IELTS writing task 2当中比较少见的“看着容易写好太难”的题目（很多IELTS作文题目看起来很难，写好却不一定特别难）。咱们首先要注意区别“families without large amounts of money”和“poor families”这两个概念的差异，前者不仅仅指“low-income families”还要包括“middle-income families”，所以题目的意思和一些同学概括的“穷人的孩子早当家”不同；另外一个误区在于因为这道题目和中国文化比较贴近，很多同学会举过多的简单生活事例但是却忽视了普遍性推理，导致论证缺乏深度。7月份写作变题之后GZ的判分明显不如以前严格，所以估计这次打分也会放松，但是我们在准备写作考试的时候不应该降低对自己的要求。从论点上看，考虑到多数考生更熟悉中国的国情，肯定是totally agree更好写，布什的内阁里面现在也有拉洋板儿车出身的（不过在美国富豪的孩子当中牛人还是出了不少，四十三位总统里面也有大量富家子弟，从整体上看在西方有钱的家长更舍得让自己的孩子经历风雨）。既然观点写一边倒，那么结构当然就是五段式开头段转述题目主旨句，主体段1讲一般家庭的孩子比富家孩子有更强的心理承受能力，主体段2讲一般家庭的孩子有更强的独立性，主体段3讲普通家庭的家长对小孩的要求

往往更严格，结尾段总结上文三层意思。thesis statement 和topic sentences（范文里用横线标明）要是少了，扣分没商量哦！关键词：income gaps 指收入差距 income inequality 指收入不均 intergenerational 两代人之间的 turn the tables 是个idiom, 有点像中文说的"打翻身仗" offspring 孩子 counterpart 相对应的人（或事物）meritocratic society 说白了就是“凭本事吃饭的社会” self-restraint 自制能力 infancy 婴儿期 frugality 勤俭 financial strains 说白了就是缺钱，名词 well-off / affluent (adj) / well-to-do / well-heeled / wealthy 都是有钱的意思，实在弹尽粮绝了还可以再用一个 moneyed (adj), autonomy 自己管理自己，名词 initiative 主动性 well-acquainted 对某事很熟悉，mitigate 缓解，要说解决问题，雅思里面词汇也特多 tackle / address / solve / resolve / grapple with / combat 再加题目里的 deal with, 大家自己挑着用啦

It is widely accepted that we have been living in a “ the rich get richer whereas the poor get poorer ” age in terms of income gaps within a generation. However , to this day, there has been no consensus yet over the extent to which income inequality is intergenerational. Some contend that the offspring of low-income and middle-income parents can largely grow up to manifest better problem-solving abilities during adulthood than their high-income family counterparts, thereby turning the tables socially and financially. Personally, I believe this is generally the case in any meritocratic society. First and foremost, children raised in households not in possession of a good fortune are conditioned early on in their lives to exercise self-control and self-restraint. These individuals learn from their infancy onward that not everything they

crave will become theirs instantaneously. Every so often their wishes go beyond their parents' means and they have to come to terms with the resulting sense of frustration or rejection. Throughout the childhood and early adulthood years they are tempered by the repeated experiences of parents' denial of their requests and frugality is inculcated into their minds as a virtue. Consequently these children, for the most part, are apt to interpret scrimping and saving, emotional uneasiness, not infrequent financial strains and menial first jobs as an integral part of life rather than a devastating ordeal. Hence they end up being better able to manage stress in their adult years and less likely to panic or get daunted when problems occur. Further, children brought up by parents of low or middle economic status often grow up to be physically, mentally and professionally more independent than children brought up by affluent parents. It goes without saying that children whose parents are not particularly well-off are more likely than children of affluent households to know how to get the most out of a modest allowance, if they ever get such a thing at all. To the former group of children, most desirable things in life have to be "earned" that is, more often than not they must put forth great effort before their desire is fulfilled. On the other hand, busy, low or medium salaried parents translate into more autonomy and initiative on the children's part. This originally disadvantaged group becomes spontaneous and handy through crafting toys on their own, resourceful by cooking their own meals, tactful with coaxing their parents into buying them gifts, intelligent thanks to the absence of private tutors, savvy in doing summer jobs, and above all,

unrelenting in pursuing their dreams. Lastly, non-wealthy parents typically have higher and more definite aspirations for their children than well-to-do parents. Well-acquainted with all the disadvantages a meager or fair-to-middling bank account generates, many non-wealthy parents pin their hopes on their children to get their families upwardly mobile. These adults mostly have high behavioral, educational and (subsequently) occupational expectations for their children. As a result, they cannot afford to be permissive parents. Spoiling their offspring rotten is the last thing they care to do and they are always ready to discipline their children when they misbehave. They keep tabs on their children ' s grades at school and do not spare the rod when their offspring do not measure up academically. The odds of children raised in such rigorous environments having good problem-solving skills are apparently better than children raised otherwise. To conclude, the chief determinant of individuals ' problem-solving skills is not the amount of money their parents can amass when they are little. Rather, hands-on experience in comprehending, analyzing, resolving ,mitigating or circumventing problems is more essential to the cultivation of problem-solving abilities. Hence, I am convinced that families without great wealth are more advantageous to the development of individual capacity to tackle problems。 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