



Ben: Sample IELTS Writing Task 2 questions for the topic of government. Hello there. My name is Ben Worthington and in this tutorial, we're going to look at sample Task 2 questions and answers. Now, in your writing task, it's a good idea to have a wide range of ideas because this will help you if you're a student who struggles with my mind goes blank. Having a depth of knowledge of certain topics is going to help you considerably.

Now, what I'm going to share with you in this tutorial is just a list of questions about the topic of government and possible sample answers, not really whole paragraphs, but just ideas. And this basically is very similar to an exercise we've got in our online course where we give you lots of questions and we want you to just brainstorm ideas because when you're brainstorming ideas, you're using that muscle and it's like an idea generation muscle. The more you use it, the stronger it gets.



What I'm going to give you now is a shortcut. It's almost like an invitation to go and learn more. I'm going to give you clues of where to research and what to research. This is a very rough shortcut. Maybe you end up using my ideas in your next IELTS Writing Task 2 essay. That is fantastic. I would be happy for that, but ideally, you're going to remember these ideas and research them a little bit further.

When you do research them, just remember to keep an eye out for the vocabulary terms, for the collocations, for the phrases, for the key points. And this will just help you develop these skills of critical thinking.

Let's jump into it. Should the government support artists such as musicians, writers, and painters? Is it economically beneficial or is it just a waste of money? Why or why not? Lots of



questions. Paragraph one: governments should support musicians, writers, and painters.

Paragraph two: it is economically beneficial. It is not a waste of money. Right. I've got my ideas.

So, governments should support artists because... let's see. Cultural development of the society to improve the lives of these industries that are usually not as well compensated as other industries such as computer development, such as the medical profession, such as lawyers, okay? Just giving examples.

Is it economically beneficial or is it just a waste of money? I did say it's going to be economically beneficial because... There is no right or wrong answer here. The only right answer is an answer that's reasonable, is realistic, and it's backed up and it's developed. It's backed up with some reasonable arguments.



So, it absolutely is economically beneficial because by supporting artists, we are developing creativity in the economy and creativity can spill over into other areas such as engineering, such as legal profession, such as medical profession. For example, a former musician who turned into a doctor and developed musical therapy to help anxious and depressed children.

I don't know. It sounds realistic. I just made it up. I could talk about a former painter who turned into an architect and discovered a new way to build bridges. I don't know. It sounds realistic. That's what we're going for. It's not a test of intelligence. It's just a test of communication. Can we develop the answer? Can we give realistic answers? Let's move on.

Every person is essential to the development of a country. Talk about what you think is your role in the development of your country. Use specific reasons and examples in your explanation.



Wow! This one is tricky. If I had this one, I would talk about myself as a student and then what students do in the development of the country.

I wouldn't say I am an architect and I like to study mathematics on the side. I will be an architect working for Jones & Jones Company in the center of town when I graduate in 2024. No. This is kind of a trick question. I'm going to talk about students or maybe I am an architect in which case I'm going to talk about the role architects have in the development of a country.

I'll talk about infrastructure. I'll say without the architects, infrastructure projects such as the London Underground could never have been made. And then again, I'll just give another example of what architects do. And I'm developing my answer and answering the question as well. Okay?



Talk about what you think is your role in the development of your country. Okay. So initially, I would say I'm studying to be an architect and then I'd get away from me as soon as possible and talk about architects and keep it as objective as possible.

Both paragraphs; the role of development-- paragraph one, I'll talk about architects and architecture, the role architecture has in a country can attract tourists. For example, the Sydney Opera House designed by a famous Scandinavian architect has paid for itself more than 10 times over and it is now a prominent landmark and tourist destination. I could really develop that.

Second paragraph I talk about infrastructure and how it helps a country develop its tourism industry, how it helps the country develop its services for the public such as hospitals and bridges and whatnot. Straightforward.



Why do people from developing countries have a more positive outlook on economic growth than people from developed countries? Does economic growth really improve the standard of living? Explain and give specific reasons and details to support your answer.

Two questions here in this IELTS Writing Task 2 question. Body paragraph one: people from developing countries have a more positive outlook because... Body paragraph two: economic growth rate really does improve the standard of living.

If it does or it doesn't, I can't really say right now. I'm in an exam center. I've only got my pen in front of me, I've only got my keyboard in front of me. I can't really go out and do any research. I can't quote any scientific studies. So, I'm just going to use the knowledge from my head. Is that okay? Of course it's okay as long as it's realistic.



Let's answer the first question. People from developing countries have a more positive outlook on economic growth because... or have a more positive outlook than people from developed countries because... Again, maybe it's not true. I don't really care. I'm here to communicate clearly in this language exam. It's not a test of my intelligence about developed countries. Anyway, let's go.

People in developing countries have a more positive outlook than people from developed countries for a multiple of reasons. Firstly, they're starting from a very lower level and almost skipping generations when it comes to technological breakthroughs.

For example, the phone network installed in the Baltic States went straight to cellular rather than the traditional landline approach and this can be very exciting going from zero



telecommunications to cellular in one generation rather than going through the standard evolution.

In developed countries, a lot of these benefits have become common day and therefore lessen the excitement whereas in developing countries, people who get new technology possibly did not have any technology to start with. So therefore, the excitement can be justified and this excitement could lead to a higher sense of-- a more developed a more pronounced feeling of positivity. I'm just kind of going off the top of my head here.

Moving on to question 2. And I can give lots and lots of examples and I should give lots of examples to really develop my points. Does economic growth really improve the standard of living? I'm just going to go for the easy one and say yes, because... Why? This is the important bit. Why? Because...



Why does economic growth really improve the standard of living? Because when the economy grows, more taxes get paid, the government gets more money and can spend this on big infrastructure projects that help improve the standard of living.

For example, in Portugal in the 1950s, a bridge was built to connect both harbors. This reduced the commute time into the center by two hours and is a clear example of improving the lives of ordinary people. Without the economic growth, the taxes could not be collected and the bridge could never have been built.

Quite straightforward. Is it true? I know that Lisbon has a massive bridge connecting two parts of the city. Most cities with a river do. How is the bridge built? Usually by collecting taxes. How are taxes collected? Through economic activity. So, an increase in economic activity will



probably lead to an increase in taxes which will probably lead to an increase in spending which will hopefully lead to an increase in the standard of living.

I don't really know about this. This is not my subject, but it's a logical development. It's rational. It's believable. And that's what we're out for at the end of the day and it's clearly communicated. All these ideas have been clearly communicated.

Next question. Countries should restrict foreign companies from opening offices and factories in order to protect local businesses. Do you agree or disagree? I disagree. Body paragraph one: opening offices and factories often leads to jobs. For example, when Coca-Cola wanted to start selling in Norway, they opened up a bottling factory and employed over 300 local people.

Is that true? I don't know. I've got no idea. Is it believable? Yes, it was believable of course. How else are they going to sell the Coca-Cola if they cannot import it? And it's logical. You see



bottling factories-- bottling plants they're called of Coca-Cola all over the world usually one per country. They don't really want to, but it's just more cost effective. Anyway, we're not going into that.

Body paragraph two: let's see. Restrict companies from opening offices. Okay. So, I strongly agree governments should not restrict foreign companies or I strongly-- yeah. I strongly agree that companies should not-- Actually, I'll just go with countries should not restrict foreign companies from opening offices because it can lead to countries missing out on new skills brought from abroad.

For example, when Bosch decided to open up a factory in Hungary, not only did they bring manufacturing jobs to the new factory, they also opened up a sales and marketing department



whereby staff from Germany trained the local workforce in soft skills such as selling and marketing and now the office is a permanent feature and employs more people than the factory.

Is it true? That specific example I have no idea. Is it believable? Yes, it's believable. This happens all the time. Businesses will open up in certain cities just to hire the local talent. For example, if the newspaper Metro wanted to start selling in another country, they're going to have to employ local journalists and train them in more modern speedy journalism I guess.

Anyway, I digress. The key point here is that we've got two body paragraphs, we've got realistic arguments that are realistically developed with clear examples and it's straightforward and it's crystal clear. I could go around the houses and I could give different viewpoints, but in this case, I'm just going for simplicity. This is a language test, not a test of government essays. It's not a question of government topics. I'm not applying for a job in a government.



All I'm doing is answering the question in a clear succinct manner and making sure I'm getting all my points for task response because I'm splitting up the question, I'm addressing it, and then just brainstorming ideas and developing those ideas in order to pick up full points.

Okay. We've got time for just a few more questions. How can one's government stop or prevent smuggling of illegal drugs from one country to another? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer. Okay. Slightly more interesting question.

So, a government can stop or prevent smuggling of illegal drugs by various ways. These include decriminalization whereby the government would just take control of the industry or legalization whereby the government would take control of the industry and tax the profits of companies selling these drugs thereby introducing competition to the illegal black market. This was the case



of Colorado which legalized cannabis in 2010 and now collects over \$7 billion every year from the taxes of cannabis.

Is it realistic? Is it true? The general idea is true and Colorado has legalized cannabis. Did they collect \$10 billion? I don't know. Did it happen in 2010? I don't know, but the principle is there and it's believable and it's logical and it's rational and it's a valid argument. It's a valid developed argument answering the question.

Body paragraph 2: a government can stop or prevent smuggling of illegal drugs from one country to another by investing more in the local police force. This could include better equipping the local police force and even paying for a new canine department in order to improve the effectiveness of the police force. This would make it more difficult for drug mafia, drug barons, illegal drug dealers to operate and ideally eventually stop their actions.



So, just two different suggestions there. One is total legalization, the other is investing in crime prevention methods. Again, do I believe in those? That's irrelevant. Did those actually happen? That's irrelevant. Are they believable and logical and rational? Absolutely. Are they clearly communicated? They would be perfectly communicated because they are simple ideas.

I'm not going to go into details here. I'm just giving you an overview and then simple ideas are easier to communicate than complex ideas. And as I keep saying, this is not a test of intelligence. This is a test of communication. It's a language test and we are going to get full points.

Now, if this line of thought interests you, then this is exactly what we drill home in the online course. We've got tutorials describing this in much more detail, in a much more complete manner, much more eloquent. It's not me just rambling on a podcast and you know. I'm sat there



and I communicate it, I break down each question and I do give you ways to develop the answer in order to make it complete.

And not just that. In the online courses, we've got whole sentences that match the same philosophy of this development. So, you put in these sentences and they force you to develop your argument in a logical rational way using coherent high-scoring sentences and it just makes the whole operation so much more straightforward.

So, that's it from us today. If you want to progress, if you're interested in learning more about passing the IELTS or if you're frustrated and you just need help, then reach out to IELTS Podcast. Go to the website ieltspodcast.com, sign up for our newsletter and there once you join us, you'll get our email where you can ask us anything and we usually respond within 24 hours.



Alternatively, you can join the newsletter and there you'll get discount coupons for our famous online courses the Speaking Confidence, the Jump to Band 7 or It's Free. Working through these courses will help you improve your score. We've been doing it for years now. We know exactly what works. We know exactly what doesn't work.

And when you work through these courses, it's not just a case of sitting there watching the tutorials. No. You're doing exercises. You're writing essays. And this is how we improve your score. This is how we improve your essays. We've been doing this for a long time. We're not going to stop and we enjoy doing it. So, get in contact and hopefully, you'll be on our podcast and I'll be interviewing you and you'll be telling us how you did it. How did you pass IELTS? Have a great day and thank you for listening.

[Music]



Female Voice: Thanks for listening to ieltspodcast.com

