

GRE Sample Writing

Guangting Yu

December 2017

Contents

1	The Pool of Issue Topics	2
1.1	Issue 1	3
1.1.1	Score 6	3
1.1.2	Score 5	4
1.2	Issue 2	7
1.2.1	Score 6	7
1.2.2	Score 5	9
1.3	Issue 3	11
1.3.1	Score 6	11
2	The Pool of Argument Topics	13
2.1	Argument 1	14
2.1.1	Score 6	14
2.1.2	Score 5	16
2.2	Argument 2	18
2.2.1	Score 6	18
2.2.2	Score 5	19

Chapter 1

The Pool of Issue Topics

1.1 Issue 1

The best way to teach is to praise positive actions and ignore negative ones.

1.1.1 Score 6

The recommendation presents a view that I would agree is successful most of the time, but one that I cannot fully support due to the “all or nothing” impression it gives.

Certainly as an educator I agree fully that the best way to *elicit* positive response from students is to make use of students’ positive energy and then encourage actions that you would like to see repeated. It is human nature that we all want to be accepted and achieve on some level, and when people in authority provide feedback that we have done something well, the drive to repeat the action that was praised is bound to be particularly strong.

This blanket statement would obviously pay dividends in situations in which a teacher desires to have students repeat particular behaviors. For example, if an educator is attempting to teach students proper classroom *etiquette*, it would be appropriate to openly praise a student who raises his or her hand when wishing to speak or address the class. In such cases, the teacher may also help shape positive behaviors by ignoring a student who is trying to interject without approval from the teacher. In fact, the decision to ignore students who are exhibiting inappropriate behaviors of this type could work very well in this situation, as the stakes are not very high and the intended outcome can likely be achieved by such a method. However, it is important to note here that this tactic would only be effective in such a “low-stakes” situation, as when a student speaks without raising her hand first. As we will discuss below, ignoring a student who hits another student, or engages in more serious misbehavior, would not be effective or *prudent*.

To expand on this point, it is important for teachers to be careful when working with a second half of this statement, only ignoring negative actions that are not serious. Take for instance a student who is misbehaving just by chatting with a fellow classmate. This student might not be presenting much of a problem and may be simply seeking attention. Ignoring the student might, in fact, be the best solution. Now assume the negative action is the improper administering of chemicals in a science experiment or the bullying of a fellow student. To ignore these negative actions would be absurd and *negligent*. Now you are allowing a problem to persist, one that

could potentially lead to much bigger and more dangerous issues. In a more serious situation addressing the negative actions quickly and properly could stop the problem in its tracks. It is for reasons like this that I do not *advocate* the idea that a teacher can be successful by simply ignoring negative actions.

I do, however, greatly support the idea that the central focus of teaching should be to build on and encourage positive actions. However, the author's *encompassing* statement leaves too many negative possibilities for the classroom. Perhaps a better way to phrase this statement would be to say, "The best way to teach is to praise positive actions and ignore negative ones that are not *debilitating* to class efficiency or the safety of any individual".

Thus, in the original statement, there are indeed some good intentions, and there could be a lot of *merit* in adopting its basic principles. Data proves that positive support can substantially increase motivation and desire in students and contribute to positive achievements. In fact, most studies of teaching efficiency indicate that praising positive actions and ignoring negative ones can create a more stable and efficient classroom. It needs to be stressed, however, that this tool is only effective at certain levels of misbehavior. As mentioned above, when a behavior is *precipitated* by feelings of revenge, power or total self-worthlessness, this methodology will likely not work. It is likely to be very successful, however, when the drive behind the misbehavior is simple attention seeking. In many of these instances, if the teacher demonstrates clearly that inappropriate behavior does not result in the gaining of attention, students are more likely to seek attention by behaving properly. Should the student choose this path, then the ignoring has worked and when the positive behavior is exhibited, then the teacher can utilize the first part of the theory and support or praise this behavior. Now it is much more likely to be repeated. If the student does not choose this path and instead elects to raise the actions to a higher level that presents a more serious issue, then ignorance alone cannot work and other methods must be employed.

In conclusion, one can appreciate the *credo* expressed in this instance, but surely we all can see the potential error of following it through to the extreme.

1.1.2 Score 5

I partially agree with the statement "The best way to teach is to praise positive actions and ignore negative ones". Children should be rewarded when they perform well; however, they should not be

ignored for performing sub-optimally. For purposes of this essay, the term “actions” is defined as behaviors within the classroom.

Utilizing positive reinforcements, such as *tangible* rewards, can be a good method to teach children. If the teacher praises children for actions that are desirable, then the children are more likely to repeat those actions. For example, a student who completes an assignment on time and does a good job is likely to want to do a good job on the next assignment if he gets positive feedback. Likewise, the children who are not currently engaging in the desirable actions may be more inclined to do so in order to receive the positive reinforcement.

Conversely, children should not be ignored for negative actions. If a child is not exhibiting appropriate behavior in the classroom, then it is the teacher’s responsibility to encourage the child to perform optimally. Ignoring something doesn’t make it go away, actions and consequences do. A student who is being disruptive in class will continue to be disruptive unless the teacher does something about it. However, the teacher’s actions need to be appropriate.

Before the teacher attempts to modify a child’s behavior, the teacher needs to try and identify the reason behind the behavior. For instance, children who leave their seats often, stare into space, or *call out of turn* may be initially viewed as having poor behavior. However, the teacher may suspect that the child has an attentional problem, and request that child be tested. If the child does not have an attentional problem, then the teacher can work with a related service, such as occupational therapy, to alter the classroom environment in order to cater to the needs of the child. For instance, the teacher could remove some of the stimulating bulletin board displays to make the room more calming to the child. If the child becomes more attentive in class then the teacher was able to assist the child without *scorning* them or ignoring them. The teacher met the needs of the child and created an environment to enable the child and created an environment to enable the child to optimally perform in the educational setting.

On the other hand, if the child is tested and does not have any areas of concern that may be impacting the educational performance in the classroom, then the negative behavior may strictly be due to *defiance*. In such a case, the teacher still should not ignore the child, because the negative actions may *hinder* the learning opportunity for the remaining children in the class. As a result, a child who is being disruptive to the learning process of the class should be set apart from the class so that they do not receive the positive reinforcement of peer attention.

The teacher should not ignore the student who is misbehaving,

but that does not mean that the teacher just needs to punish. It is better to address the child privately and make sure the child is aware of the negative actions. Once the child is aware, then the teacher should once again try to determine the reason why the child is behaving in a negative manner. Perhaps the child's parents are in the middle of a divorce and the child is outwardly expressing his frustration in the classroom. Or the academic content of the class may not be challenging enough for the child and so he is misbehaving out of boredom. Whatever the reason behind the behavior, the key factor is that the teacher works with the child to try and identify it. Simply punishing or ignoring the child would not solve the problem, whereas working to create a plan for success in the classroom would. Likewise, rather than punishing and defeating the child, the teacher is working with and *empowering* the child; a much more positive outcome to the situation.

1.2 Issue 2

The best way for a society to prepare its young people for leadership in government, industry, or other fields is by instilling in them a sense of cooperation, not competition.

1.2.1 Score 6

Whenever people argue that history is a worthless subject or that there is nothing to be gained by just “memorizing a bunch of stupid names and dates,” I simply hold my tongue and smile to myself. What I’m thinking is that, as cliché as it sounds, you do learn a great deal from history (and woe to those who fail to learn those lessons). It is remarkable to think of the number of circumstances and situations in which even the most *rudimentary* knowledge of history will turn out to be invaluable. Take, for example, the issue at hand here. Is it better for a society to instill in future leaders a sense of competition or cooperation? Those who have not examined leaders throughout time and across a number of fields might not have the ability to provide a thorough and convincing answer to this question, in spite of the fact that it is crucial to the future functioning of our society. Looking closely at the question of leadership and how it has worked in the past, I would have to agree that the best way to prepare young people for leadership is to instill in them a sense of cooperation.

Let us look first at those leaders who have defined themselves based on their competitiveness. Although at first glance it may appear that a leader must have a competitive edge in order to gain and then maintain a leadership position, I will make two points on this subject. First, the desire to compete is an inherent part of human nature; that is, it is not something that needs to be “instilled” in young people. Is there anyone who does not compete in some way or another every single day? You try to do better than others in your school work or at the office, or you try to do better than yourself in some way, to push yourself. When societies instill competitiveness in their leaders, it only leads to trouble. The most *blatant* example in this case is Adolf Hitler, who took competition to the very extreme, trying to prove that his race and his country were superior to all. We do not, however, need to look that far to find less extreme examples (i.e., Hitler is not the extreme example that disproves the rule). The recent economic meltdown was caused in no large part by the leaders of American banks and financial institutions who were obsessed with competing for the *almighty* dollar. Tiger Woods, the ultimate

competitor in recent golfing history and in many ways a leader who brought the sport of golf to an entirely new level, destroyed his personal life (and perhaps his career – still yet to be determined) by his overreaching sense that he could accomplish anything, whether winning majors or sleeping with as women as possible. His history of competitiveness is well documented; his father pushed him from a very early age to be the ultimate competitor. It served him well in some respects, but it also proved to be *detrimental* and ultimately quite destructive.

Leaders who value cooperation, on the other hand, have historically been less *prone* to these overreaching, destructive tendencies. A good cased in point would be Abraham Lincoln. Now, I am sure at this point you are thinking that Lincoln, who served as President during the Civil War and who refused to compromise with the South or allow *secession*, could not possibly be my model of cooperation. Think, however, of the way Lincoln structured his Cabinet. He did not want a group of “yes men” who would agree with every word he said, but instead he picked people who were more likely to disagree with his ideas. And he respected their input, which allowed him to keep the government together in the North during a very *tumultuous* period (to say the least).

My point in choosing the Lincoln example is that competitiveness and conflict may play better to the masses and be more likely to be recorded in the history books, but it was his cooperative nature that allowed him to govern effectively. Imagine if the CEO of a large company were never able to compromise and insisted that every single thing be done in exactly her way. Very quickly she would lose the very people that a company needs in order to survive, people with new ideas, people ready to make great advances. Without the ability to work constructively with those who have conflicting ideas, a leader will never be able to strike deals, reach *consensus*, or keep an enterprise on track. Even if you are the biggest fish in the pond, it is difficult to force your will on others forever; eventually a bigger fish comes along (or the smaller fish team up against you!).

In the end, it seems most critical for society to instill in young people a sense of cooperation. In part this is true because we seem to come by our competitive side more naturally, but cooperation is something we struggle to learn (just think of kids on the playground). And although competitive victory is more showy, more often than not the real details of leadership come down to the ability to work with other people, to compromise and cooperate. Getting to be President of United States or the managing director of a corporation might require you to win some battles, but once you are

there you will need diplomacy and people-skills. Those can be difficult to learn, but if you do not have them, you are likely to be a shot-lived leader.

1.2.2 Score 5

Cooperation, the act of working as a group to achieve a collective goal, is an important value for young children to learn. Another vital life lesson children can learn is how to be competitive, which is a mindset in which a person feels the need to accomplish more than another person. Both are necessary to become well rounded individuals, but concerning preparing for a future in government, industry or various other fields, a sense of cooperation is much more important.

Wild not all children are overly competitive in nature, every person has some level of competitive drive inside them. This is a natural thing and is perfectly normal. Unfortunately, if this competitive nature is emphasized, the child will have problems relating socially to other children, and *subsequently*, will have issues interacting with adults later in life. A fierce competitive drive will blind and individual, causing them to not see situations where group effort will be more greatly rewarded than an individual effort. Take for instance the many teams of people working for NASA. If the people that make up these teams were all out to prove that they were superior to others, our entire space program would be *jeopardized*. One needs to look beyond at what will most benefit a broad group of people. This is where a sense of cooperation in young children is vital. Cooperation is taught at an early age and must be emphasized throughout life to fully embrace the concept.

In the world of sports a competitive drive is vital; unfortunately, life is not a sports game that simply leads to a winning or losing score. Life is far more complex than this simple idea and there is no winner or loser *designation* to accompany it. We all have to work together to come to a conclusion that will assist not just ourselves, but others and future generations. In every scenario there will be individuals that have brilliant ideas, but those ideas require other people to build upon, perfect and implement. Take for instance Bill Gates; Bill Gates is responsible for the Microsoft cooperation which he invented in his garage. His competitive drive assisted in building his idea, but it was the collaborative effort of many people that helped propel his invention into the world known product it is today. Without the cooperation of others, his genius invention might never have made it out of his garage.

It may be true that an individual can change the world, but only so far as to say that an individual can construct an idea that will inevitably change the world. Once the idea is formulated, it then takes a team of people working collectively towards a common goal to make sure that the brilliant, life-altering idea makes it to *fruition*. Without the cooperation of many, an idea could simply remain as a picture on a drawing board. It is because of this possibility that instilling a cooperative *demeanor* in children is much more important than developing a competitive attitude. Competition is a natural thing that will develop with or without encouragement but the same cannot be said for a sense of cooperation.

1.3 Issue 3

Some people believe that corporations have a responsibility to promote the well-being of the societies and environments in which they operate. Others believe that the only responsibility of corporations, provided they operate within the law, is to make as much money as possible.

1.3.1 Score 6

It is not uncommon for some to argue that, in the world in which we live, corporations have a responsibility to society and to the environment in which they operate. *Proponents* of this view would argue that major environmental catastrophes (e.g., the oil spill in the Gulf) are key examples of the damage that can be wrought when corporations are allowed to operate unchecked. Yet within that very statement lies a contradiction that undermines this kind of thinking—it is necessary for outside forces to check the behavior of corporations, because we do not expect corporations to behave in such manner. In fact, the expectation is simply that corporations will follow the law, and in the course of doing so, engage in every possible tactic to their advantage in the pursuit of more and greater profit. To expect otherwise from corporations is to fail to understand their purpose and their very structure.

The corporation arose as a model of business in which capital could be raised through the contributions of stockholders: investors purchase shares in a company, and their money is then used as the operating capital for the company. Shareholders buy stock not because they are hoping to better make the world a better place or because they have a desire to improve the quality of life but because they expect to see a return in their investment in this company. The company may itself have generally *altruistic* goals (perhaps it is a think tank that advises the government on how to improve relations with the Middle East, or perhaps it is a company built around finding alternative forms of energy), but the immediate expectation of the investor is that himself will see dividends, or profits, from the investment he has made. This is even more true in the case of companies that are purely profit driven and which do not have goals that are particularly directed toward social environment—a description that applies to the vast majority of corporations.

Is it a bad thing to have a corporation negatively affect the environment (and by extension, its inhabitants)? To pump noxious fumes into the atmosphere as a by-product of its manufacturing

process? Of course, and this is why agencies such as the EPA were established and why governments—federal, state and local—are expected to monitor such companies. Any and all corporations should be expected to temper their input pursuit of profit with the necessity of following those safeguards that have been legislated as protections. But the assumption that corporations have an inherent obligation or responsibility to go above and beyond that to actively PROMOTE the environment and the well-being of society is absurd.

Engaging in practices to adhere to legal expectations to protect society and the environment is costly to corporations. If the very purpose of a corporation is to generate profits, and the obligation to adhere to safety expectations established by law cuts into those profits, then to expect corporations to embrace such practices beyond what is required to presume that they willingly engage in an inherently self-destructive process: the unnecessary lowering of profits. This is *antithetical* to the very concept of the corporation. Treehuggers everywhere should be pleased that environmental protections exist, but to expect corporations to “make the world a better place” is to embrace altruism to the point that it becomes *delusion*.

This is not to say that we should reject efforts to hold corporations accountable. In fact, the opposite is true—we should be *vigilant* with the business world and maintain our expectations that corporations do not make their profits at the EXPENSE of the well-being of society. But that role must be fulfilled by a watchdog, not the corporation itself, and those expectations must be imposed UPON the corporations, not expected FROM them.

Chapter 2

The Pool of Argument Topics

2.1 Argument 1

The following appeared in an article written by Dr. Karp, an anthropologist.

Twenty years ago, Dr. Field, a noted anthropologist, visited the island of Tertia and concluded from his observations that children in Tertia were reared by an entire village rather than by their own biological parents. However, my recent interviews with children living in the group of islands that includes Tertia show that these children spend much more time talking about their biological parents than about other adults in the village. This research of mine proves that Dr. Field's conclusion about Tertian village culture is invalid and thus that the observation-centered approach to studying cultures is invalid as well. The interview-centered method that my team of graduate students is currently using Tertia will establish a much more accurate understanding of child-rearing traditions there and in other island cultures.

2.1.1 Score 6

It might seem logical, at first glance, to agree with the argument in Dr. Karp's article that children in Tertia actually are raised by their biological parents (and perhaps even, by implication that an observation-centered approach to anthropological study is not as valid as an interview-centered one). However, in order to fully evaluate this argument, we need to have a significant amount of additional evidence. The argument could end up being much weaker than it seems, or it might actually quite valid. In order to make that determination, we need to know more then analyze what we learn.

The first piece of evidence that we would need in order to evaluate Dr. Karp's claims is information about whether or not Tertia and the surrounding island group have changed significantly in the past 20 years. Dr. Field conducted his observational study 20 years ago, and it is possible that Tertia has changed significantly since then. For example, if we had evidence that in the intervening years Westerners had settled on the island and they introduced a more typical Western-style family structure, it would certainly weaken Dr. Karp's argument. In that case, the original study could have been accurate, and Dr. Karp's study could be correct, as well, though his conclusion that Dr. Field's method is ineffective would be seriously weakened.

Another piece of evidence that might help us evaluate this claim involve the exact locations where Dr. Karp's interviews took place. According to this article, Dr. Karp and his graduate students conducted interviews of "children living in the group of islands that includes Tertia." If we were to learn that they never interviews a single Tertian child, it would significantly weaken the conclusion. It could tun out to be the case, for example, that children on Tertia are raised *communally*, whereas children on other islands nearby are raised by their biological parents.

In order to fully evaluate this article, we would also need to learn more about the interview questions that Dr. Karp's team used. What exactly did they ask? We don't know, nor do we know what the children's responses actually were. What did they say about their biological parents? The mere fact that they speak more frequently about their biological parents than they do about other adults does not mean that they are raised by their parents. It would significantly *undermine* Dr. Karp's argument if it turned out that the children said thing like how much they missed their parents or how their parent had left them in a communal environment. Without knowing WHAT the children said, it is hard to accept Dr. Karp's conclusion.

It is slightly more difficult to discuss the evidence we might need in order to evaluate the more interesting claims in Dr. Karp's article, namely this extension of the results of his study to a conclusion that interviewed-centered methods are *inherently* more valid than observational-centered approaches. In order to fully evaluate this claim, in fact, we would need to look at many more examples of interview-based and observation-based anthropological studies and we would also need to look into different study designs. Perhaps Dr. Field did not conduct an effective observation study, but other observational approaches could be effective. In order to make such *grandiose* claims, Dr. Karp really needs a lot of additional evidence (ideally a meta-analysis of hundred of anthropological studies).

Clearly, then, we need to have additional evidence in order to get a more complete understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of Dr. Karp's article. We need to know about Tertia and the surrounding islands, whether or not they have changed over the past 20 years. We also need to know about study design (Dr. Karp's and Dr. Field's). And we really need a lot more information if we want to extend the results of a study about one island culture to all anthropological fieldwork.

2.1.2 Score 5

There seems to be an *abundance* of evidence that, if we were to examine it closely, might make us reconsider Dr. Karp's argument here. If we look first at the evidence that might weaken this argument, we can see a lot of problems with Dr. Karp's article. It would certainly weaken the argument if we were to discover that Dr. Karp and his students did not actually conduct any of their interviews on the island of Tertia itself. Looking closely at the article, we see that Dr. Karp claims that the island group that includes Tertia. There is no evidence that they interviewed Tertian children. It would definitely weaken the argument if we were to learn that they interviewed children only on islands close to Tertia. Those islands may or may not have similar child-rearing traditions, and geographic proximity does not guarantee *societal* similarity.

Another piece of evidence that would weaken the argument could come transcripts of the interviews themselves. Dr. Karp's article makes the claim that the children "spend much more time talking about their biological parents than about other adults," but he gives no indication of what exactly they say about their biological parents. After all, the children may be talking about how they never see their parents.

One more important piece of evidence that might *undermine* the argument Dr. Karp is making in this article. He admits that twenty years have passed since Dr. Field's study was conducted, but he does not provide evidence that proves child-rearing techniques have not changed significantly in that time. Any number of factors could have led to a significant shift in how children are raised. Influences from other cultures, significant catastrophic events, or a change in government structures could have led to a change in family dynamics. Any evidence of such changes would clearly undermine Dr. Karp's argument.

If we went looking for evidence that could strengthen the argument, we might also find something interesting. Obviously, some of the evidence above might strengthen the argument if they were NOT as discussed above (e.g., if there were evidence that the Tertian islands have NOT changed since Dr. Field's study of if there were transcripts that showed the children spoke about how much they loved living with their biological parents). However, if we discovered that there are numerous interview-based studies that confirm Dr. Karp's findings, it would go a long way toward *bolstering* his claim about Tertian child-rearing AND his claim about interview-centered studies being more effective. Another piece of evidence that

would strengthen Dr. Karp's argument is undermining Dr. Field's original study. Maybe Dr. Field was sloppy, for example.

Dr. Karp's article, then, ends up looking something of an empty shell. Depending on the evidence we find to fill it out, we may discover that it is quite convincing, or we could determine that he is full of hot air.

2.2 Argument 2

The following is taken from a memo from the advertising director of the Super Screen Movie Production Company.

According to a recent report from our marketing department, during the past year, fewer people attended Super Screen-produced movies than in any other year. And yet the percentage of positive reviews by movie reviewer about specific Super Screen movies actually increased during the past year. Clearly, the contents of these reviews are not reaching enough of our prospective viewers. Thus, the problem lies not with the quality of our movies but with the public's lack of awareness that movies of good quality are available. Super Screen should therefore allocate a greater share of its budget next year to reaching the public through advertising.

2.2.1 Score 6

The advertising director of the Super Screen Movie production company believes that increasing the amount of advertising the company will increase the amount of people attending Super Screen produced movies. He believes this because during the past year fewer people than ever before attended Super Screen produced movies, yet the percentage of positive reviews increased over the past year. *Ostensibly*, the extra advertising would *tout* the good reviews written about Super Screen movies. Before this plan is implemented, however, Super Screen needs to address some questions about its possible *flaws*.

First of all, the company needs to ask what the actual number of people attending its movies as compared to the movies of other production companies is. The number of people going to movies may have been in universal decline. If this is the case and more people are going to see Super Screen Movies than the movies of any other production company, advertising about how fun it is to go to the movie theater may do more to boost Super Screen viewership than advertising promoting its own good reviews.

Secondly, the company needs to ask what the actual original number of positive reviews was. If Super Screen movies received 1% positive reviews last year and this year they received 2% positive reviews, getting the message to viewers is not going to increase Super Screen attendance. Making better movies would be much more likely to increase attendance rates.

Finally, Super Screen needs to ask what the relationship is between its viewers and the movie reviewers cited in the memo. Using

a survey distributed to its target audience, Super Screen could determine if movie reviews have an effect on their audience's decision to go to see a movie, whether movie reviewers tended to have the same taste as the target audience. Super Screen also needs to consider how its movie choices have affected the separate movie reviewer and audience populations. If the studio has switched from making mega-blockbuster action movies to more nuanced dramas, the general public may be less willing to go see their movies even though movie critics prefer the dramas to the action movies.

Finally the studio must ask whether the percentage of positive reviews is really a relevant way to measure the potential impact of movie reviews. There are dozens of movie reviewers but when deciding whether to go to a movie, the general public will usually pick from among the 10 most popular movie reviews. These are the reviews that will impress the public if they are included in advertising. If the most popular movie reviewers disliked Super Screen movies that a larger number of small time film bloggers reviewed positively, Super Screen needs to think of a new advertising strategy.

In conclusion, there are many questions Super Screen needs to answer before using this advertising director's plan. They need to look carefully at actual numbers, both of viewership and of positive reviews. They also need to identify the relationship and their target audience has with movie reviewers and determine how their target audience feels about their movies. Finally they need to take a nuanced look at the movie reviews that they use in their advertising.

2.2.2 Score 5

While the advertising director clearly aims at *relitализing* his production company and ensuring that the public is well informed about the movies which are available, there are several basic flaws to this argument. There remain some questions that need answering before any steps can be taken with regard to advertising strategies for the Super Screen Movie Production Company.

First among these questions is this: were ticket sales of the entire movie industry down? This is an essential question because it helps to pinpoint the cause of the writer's problem. If the industry as a whole is undergoing poor revenues, then perhaps the issue is not Super Screen's advertising company but rather the country's economy. In times of economic *strife*, it is only natural that people would be less willing to spend money on luxuries such as movie tickets. If this is the case, it might be better suited the production company to cut costs rather than refunneling them to a different

part of the company.

Second, the advertising director should ask himself this: what medium do the majority of his most generous movie reviewers utilize? The writer states that movie reviews were generally positive, but where were these reviews located? On television, newspapers, or the Internet? It is possible that the medium used by the most movies reviewers of Super Screen's movies is one that is not utilized by most of the company's target audiences. If Super Screen produce many family films, but most of the good reviews are found in late night television shows, then there is a good chance that the reviews are not going to be seen by the target audience. If this is the case, then the company would be better off conducting research as to what medium is most likely to reach their audiences.

One last question would be this: what advertising is currently being used by the Super Screen company? If the company advertises using only one medium, such as in newspapers, perhaps the solution is not to double the amount of newspaper space but to branch out and try other forms of advertising. The writer fails to mention exactly how the company currently advertises their movies, and this absence detracts from his argument.

In conclusion, the advertising director would be better served by first answering these questions and evaluating the resulting answers before pouring millions of dollars into his solution. It is possible that an alternative solution exists, perhaps one that will not be as expensive nor as risky.