

토플 적중 90 WRITING DAY 03.

Pre-Study

1. Preview

- 1) 통합형 문제유형 #1 장단점 유형 분석
- 2) 기술/과학 관련 주제 분석 및 고득점 전략
- 3) 이 주제에 활용할 수 있는 Magic Sentence를 이해 & 암기
- 4) Paraphrasing 전략

2. Key Expressions

compact fluorescent lamp •	• 백열등
incandescent bulb •	• 타당한
mercury •	• 콤팩트 형광등
phosphorous •	• 인을 포함한
valid •	• 수은
water table •	• 기존의
wattage •	• 지시하다 / 의무화하다.
mandate •	• 전력량
irritate •	• 지하수면
conventional •	• 자극하다.
place a burden on ~ •	• A를 B로 대체하다
compatibility with ~ •	• ~에게 부담을 지우다.
replace A to B •	• 건강문제를 야기하다.
cause/bring about health problems •	• 이점을 인정하다.
admit /concede /acknowledge •	• ~와의 호환성
this point	

3. 출제 예상 Topics

❖ sucralose 의 단점 vs. 장점

	Reading	Lecture
main idea	sucralose 건강에 좋지 않다.	그리 나쁘지 않으며 오히려 건강 개선에 도움 준다.
1	쥐 실험으로 유해함이 입증됨	쥐와 사람은 다르잖아. 쥐와 같은 결과를 내려면 사람은 하루에 4000 packets를 먹어야 하는데 이것은 불가능하다.
2	organochlorine이라는 독성물질이 면역체계 약화	이 물질이 있는 건 인정하지만, 이것은 소화기에 흡수되지 않기 때문에 체내 독성은 생성되지 않을 것이다.
3	입맛을 더 단것을 찾게 만드니 다이어트 방해	sucralose가 열분해가 안 된다는 점은 오히려 다이어트에 도움이 된다. 쿠키나 케이크에 넣어서 heated해도 계속 단맛 유지되니 적은 당분으로 단맛 즐기는 것 가능하다.

❖ amalgam을 수은으로 쓰는 것의 문제점 vs. 타당성

	Reading	Lecture
main idea	문제 있다.	무방하다.
1	질병의 원인이 된다.	체내 흡수량은 지극히 미미하기 때문에 그렇게 신경 쓸 수준이 안 된다.
2	제대로 처리되지 않아 water system 오염	잘 처리하는 장치가 고안되었다. (화면에 사진이 등장) → 따라서 환경파괴 없다.
3	대체물이 있다. (gold/ ceramic)	대체 불가능하다. 금은 가격 때문에 소비자에게 매력을 못 끌 것이다.

Lecture 통합형 (1) : 장단점 유형 문제 전략 / 과학/기술 관련 주제 정복

학습목표

- ◆ 통합형 문제유형 #1 장단점 유형 분석
- ◆ 기술/과학 관련 주제 분석 및 고득점 전략
- ◆ 이 주제에 활용할 수 있는 Magic Sentence 이해 및 암기
- ◆ Paraphrasing 전략

1. Introduction

문제유형	+, -	이론 반박
	장점-단점 단점-장점 해결책-단점	지문에 세운 가설과 이론을 반박
빈출주제	환경, 기술, 교육, 정책, 건강	역사, 생물, 지질, 천문, 예술

✓ 출제 예상 Topic

- A. Sucralose라는 감미료의 단점 vs. 장점
- B. amalgam의 재료로 mercury를 쓰는 것의 단점 vs. 장점
- C. online degree program의 단점 vs. 장점
- D. Biopolymers라는 신개념 플라스틱의 장점 vs. 단점
- E. 새로 고안된 거짓말 탐지기의 장점 vs. 단점

2. 지문 Skimming & Summary

Reading Passage	Note-Taking
Due to their higher level of energy efficiency, many governments are advocating the use of compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs). While they may be superior to regular incandescent bulbs in many respects, research suggests that they are not the wonder solution that so many people seem to think they are.	CFL -

지문주제: 기존 전구를 CFLs로 전환하는 것은 문제점을 가지고 있다. (replacement)

→ In this set of materials, both the reading and the lecture deal with compact fluorescent lamps(CFLs). The lecturer challenges the reading passage's argument that the replacement of conventional bulbs to CFLs has some problems.

Reading Passage	Note-Taking
Firstly, just like any other type of fluorescent lamp, CFLs contain mercury. They may last a long time, but eventually they must be replaced, and mercury is highly toxic. If they are put in landfills, the mercury could leak out into the water table and rivers, poisoning the fish and people. The mercury is also a hazard for people who work in recycling plants because the bulbs are easily broken.	mercury - toxic

R1: CFLs는 인간의 건강에 해가 되고 생태계를 파괴할 수 있는 수은을 가지고 있다 / 다른 형광등과 마찬가지로 (health risk and ecological destruction)

→ First of all, the reading insists that CFLs contain mercury, which can be health risk for humans and cause ecological destruction, just like any other fluorescent light bulb.

any other
+ 단수 명사

Reading Passage	Note-Taking
Secondly, CFLs are pretty expensive. Depending on the size and wattage, they can cost 3 to 10 times as much as the bulbs they are meant to replace. These prices are unlikely to go down for some time as the technology is still being refined. Unless the government intends to mandate lower prices for the lamps, it would put a financial burden on consumers, especially on companies in large buildings.	expensive x go down → financial burden

R2: CFLs는 너무 비싸고 소비자들에게 불필요한 부담을 지울 것이다.
(place a burden on~)

→ Second, the author maintains that CFLs are too expensive and would place an unnecessary burden on consumers.

Reading Passage	Note-Taking
Finally, although they produce light more efficiently, the quality of that light is lower. Brighter lamps are a good thing, but the chemicals these lights use produce a much narrower spectrum of visible light. This harsher light is likely to irritate people who are using them; just as conventional fluorescent bulbs often give people sore eyes and headaches.	low quality ← narrow spectrum → irritate/sore eyes/ headaches

R3: CFLs가 기존 등에 비해 질이 낮은 빛을 내는데, 이로 인해 건강문제가 야기될 수 있다. (health problems)

→ Lastly, the article contends that CFLs produce lower quality light than incandescent bulbs, which could cause health problems.

인과동사
bring about, trigger, spawn, generate,
be responsible for

3. 강의 예측

	Reading	Lecture
main idea	CFL -	+ (장점/지문이 너무 과소평가하고 있음/그런 문제점은 해결가능)
1	mercury - toxic	1) 매우 극소량 2) 나오긴 하지만 다른 것보단 나음 (다른 것과 비교)

2	expensive x go down → financial burden	1) 일반화 되면 인하될 것이다. 2) 장기적으로 보면 안 비싸다.
3	low quality ← arrow spectrum → irritate/ sore eyes/ headaches	1) quality가 낮지 않다. 2) 기술이 다 해결해 준다. 3) 감수하고라도 써야 할 이유가 있다.

1) 강의가 지문을 정면 반박 하지 않고 일부 인정해 줄 때:
template의 센스 있는 변형

✓ Magic Sentence #1 강연자가 이점을 인정하긴 하지만 ~라고 반박한다.

→ The professor admits that this is true, but refutes that argument by saying that ~

→ The speaker concedes (again) this claim yet rebuts this claim by asserting that ~

→ The professor partially acknowledges this but points out that ~

→ In contrast, the lecturer counters the contention by stating that although this was initially true, S V

2) 장기적으로는 지문이 제기한 문제가 발생하지 않는다.

✓ Magic Sentence #2 장기적으로는 ~ 실제로 ~이다.

→ S V actually in the long term / over the long run.

4. 강의 정보 쓱쓱 전략

✓ 귀를 쫑긋! 노트테이킹 쓱쓱!

- 1) 강의에서의 서론은 그리 중요하지 않다.
- 2) First of all / To start with 가 가장 중요
- 3) 지문을 일부 인정하는 경우가 많다.
역접 (but/ on the other hand/ yet/ although / while) 다음에서 본격적 반박
- 4) 숫자정보는 중요하지 않다 → 그것의 의미를 note-taking
e.g. 그의 키는 193cm → tall
- 5) 전문용어, 당황하지 말고 일반화 시켜서 노트
e.g. phosphorous bearing compounds → ~ compounds



Listening

5. 강의 Note-taking & summary

Lecture	Note-Taking
The author of this reading raised some valid concerns about compact fluorescent lights, but he seems to be using outdated information. When viewed objectively, CFLs are clearly the better product in every way , and they should be used to replace <u>incandescent</u> lamps as soon as possible.	+
The first point he raised is <u>absolutely true</u> . CFLs <u>do</u> contain mercury, about 3 to 5 milligrams per bulb; although, some newer eco-friendly versions have lowered that to about 1 milligram. <u>However</u> , the amount of mercury this would release into the environment is <u>just a tiny fraction</u> of what is pumped into the air by coal-fired power plants . With their increased efficiency , widespread use of CFLs would greatly reduce the overall amount of mercury that pollutes our air and water every year.	do ← → tiny fraction cp coal plants efficiency ↑ ↓ mercury

L1: 지문의 내용이 어느 정도는 사실이라는 점은 인정 하지만, 반박을 한다 /
CFLs를 광범위하게 사용하면 궁극적으로는 환경에 유출되는 전체 수은의 양은
줄 것이라고 한다. // CFLs의 효율성이 전기를 생산하기 위해 연소되는 석탄의
양을 감소시킬 것이기 때문이다.

→ The professor *admits that this is true*, but refutes that argument by saying that
widespread use of them would reduce the overall amount of mercury released into
the environment. This is because their efficiency would reduce the amount of coal burned
for power.

Lecture	Note-Taking
His second point about the high price is <u>also true, but only on the surface</u> of it. To produce the same light output as incandescent bulbs, CFLs use only 20 to 30 percent as much electricity. <u>On top of that</u> , they last from 8 to 15 times longer. So, if you do the math, they are actually much cheaper. Consumers would need to replace them far less often, and they would have lower electric bills as well. <u>Not only that</u> , but many are designed to fit into lamps manufactured for incandescent bulbs, so people can still use their old appliances.	less electricity longer → cheaper → less often replace / lower bill + use old appliances

L2: 다시 한번 화자는 그것들이 비싸다는 점을 인정하지만, 반박하기를 /
CFLs가 장기적으로는 더 저렴하다. // 개선된 효율성과 더 긴 수명,
기존 조명기구와의 호환성으로 인해 (longer life / compatibility with)

→ The speaker *concedes again this claim* yet rebuts this claim by asserting that they are
cheaper in the long term. This is due to their increased efficiency, longer life, and compatibility
with traditional light fixtures.

Lecture	Note-Taking
His third point was true when the bulbs were first being produced, but as he said, the technology is still advancing. The current blend of chemicals used in CFLs is far more pleasing to the eye. By increasing the variety of phosphorous bearing <u>compounds</u> , they emit more of the visible spectrum, producing a warmer, less harsh light.	tech advancing → better quality ← ~ compounds

L3: 비록 처음에는 이점이 사실이었으나, 기술이 계속 진보하고 있다.

구체적으로 진술해보면, CFLs내의 혼합물이 개선되어, 지금은 더 나은 질의 빛을 발산한다. (initially / to be specific, / chemical mixture / emit better quality light)

→ In contrast, the lecturer counters the contention by stating that although this was initially true, the technology has advanced. To be specific, the chemical mixture inside the bulbs has been improved, so CFLs now emit better quality light.

전문용어의 일반화

6. Paraphrase

1) It would put a financial burden on consumers.

→ It would place an unnecessary burden on consumers.

2) This harsher light is likely to irritate people who are using them; just as conventional fluorescent bulbs often give people sore eyes and headaches.

→ CFLs produce low quality light which could cause health problems.

3) CFLs use only 20 to 30 percent as much electricity. On top of that, they last from 8 to 15 times longer. Not only that, many are designed to fit into lamps manufactured for incandescent bulbs, so people can still use their old appliances.

→ CFLs have increased efficiency, longer life, and compatibility with traditional light fixtures.

4) By increasing the variety of phosphorous bearing *compounds*, they emit more of the visible spectrum, producing a warmer, less harsh light.

→ The chemical mixture inside the bulbs has been improved, so CFLs now emit better quality light which can be pleasing to the eyes of consumers.