









产。智课网

下载智课 APP



官方网站: http://www.smartstudy.com₽

客服热线: 400-011-91914 新浪微博: @智课网4 微信公众号: 智课网4



GRE 官方写作题库 Argument 31

The following appeared in a letter to the editor of city-run local newspaper:

"In our region of Trillura, the majority of money spent on the schools that most students attend—the city-run public schools—comes from taxes that each city government collects. The region's cities differ, however, in the budgetary priority they give to public education. For example, both as a proportion of its overall tax revenues and in absolute terms, Parson City has recently spent almost twice as much per year as Blue City has for its public schools—even though both cities have about the same number of residents. Clearly, Parson City residents place a higher value on providing a good education in public schools than Blue City residents do."

Write a response in which you discuss what specific evidence is needed to evaluate the argument and explain how the evidence would weaken or strengthen the argument.

【满分范文赏析】

This argument concludes that Parson City residents value public-school education more highly than Blue City residents do. To justify this conclusion the argument points out that in both cities the majority of funds for public schools comes from taxes, and that Blue City budgets only half as much money per year for its public schools as Parson City, even though the population in both cities is about the same. The argument relies on a series of unsubstantiated assumptions, which, considered together, render the argument wholly unconvincing.

【本段结构】

本文采用了标准的 Argument 开头段结构,即 C—A—F 的开头结构。本段首先概括原文的 Conclusion,之后简要提及原文为支持其结论所引用的一系列 Assumption 及细节,最后给出 开头段到正文段的过渡句,指出原文的 Flaw,即这些 Assumption 无法让原文逻辑上没有问题。

【本段功能】

作为 Argument 开头段,本段具体功能就在于发起攻击并概括原文的结论,即 Parson 城市的居民比 Blue 城市的居民对公立学校更加看重。本段接下来提到了原文中为支持之前的 Conclusion 所提供的证据,即每年 Blue 城市从税收中给予当地公立学校的资金仅仅是 Parson 城市的一半。文章提及这些信息,为是在正文段中对这些 Assumption 即将进行的具体攻击做



铺垫。

One such assumption is that the total budget for the two cities is approximately the same. It is entirely possible that Blue City's total budget is no more than half that of Parson City. If so, that would account for the discrepancy in the allocation of funds and could not be understood as an indicator that one city cares more or less about education. Even if Parson City devotes a greater percentage of its budget each year for its schools rather than amount of money, the argument relies on the additional assumption that this percentage is a reliable indicator of the value residents place on public-school education. Yet, it is entirely possible, for example, that Blue City's schools are already well funded, or that Blue City has some other, extremely urgent problem which requires additional funding despite a high level of concern among its residents about its public schools. Without clear evidence regarding the circumstances that the two city's face, any comparative analysis is not useful.

【本段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 正文段结构,即先是提及原文的第一个逻辑错误,之后分析该逻辑错误的原因,接下来,进一步分析这样的错误为什么让原文的 Conclusion 不成立。

【本段功能】

作为正文第一段,本段攻击原文所犯的第一个重要逻辑错误——样本类错误。原文当中假设,Parson 城市和 Blue 城市的每年总预算是相同的。但实际上可能情况并非如此。有可能 Blue 城市用于公立学校的这部分资金所占的总预算的比例是要高于 Parson 城市的,也就是说 Blue 城市的居民比 Parson 更关心公立学校的教育。因此在没有考虑这些样本因素的情况下,原文简单地将 Parson 和 Blue 的资金分配情况进行比较是不合理的。

The second assumption upon which the argument rests is that the percentage of residents who attend public schools is about the same in both cities. The argument indicates only that the total population of the two cities is about the same. If a comparatively small percentage of Blue City residents attend public schools, then the comparatively small amount of money Blue City devotes to those schools might actually be a higher rate, per capita.

【本段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 正文段结构,即先是提及原文的第二个逻辑错误,之后分析该逻



辑错误的原因,接下来,进一步分析这样的错误为什么让原文的 Conclusion 不成立。

【本段功能】

作为正文第二段,本段攻击原文所犯的第二个重要逻辑错误——类比类错误。原文假设在 Parson 和 Blue 两个城市中,上公立学校的学生人数是一样的。但是这样的类比并不一定成立。因此,原文的这个观点是没有说服力的。

Finally, although the argument states that in both cities the majority of money spent on public schools comes from taxes, perhaps the actual percentage is smaller in Blue City than in Parson City, and other such funds come from residents' donations, earmarked for public education. Thus it is possible that Blue City residents donate more money for public-school education than Parson City residents do. If so, this possibility further weakens the argument.

【本段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 正文段结构,即先是提及原文的第三个逻辑错误,之后分析该逻辑错误的原因,接下来,进一步分析这样的错误为什么让原文的 Conclusion 不成立。

【本段功能】

作为正文第三段,本段攻击原文所犯的第三个重要逻辑错误——类比类错误。原文假设,仅仅从税收资金对公立学校的分配比例和具体数额就能得知当地居民对公立学校的关心程度的差异。但实际上这样的笼统的类比忽略了能够产生类似结果的其他因素。所以,原文的这个观点是不能让人确信的。

To conclude, the argument is unpersuasive. To strengthen it the argument, clear evidence regarding the percentage of the budget allocated to public schools, as well as the percentage of money spent on public schools (with information as to which funds had been derived from taxes,) should be provided. To better assess the argument an audience would need to be provided with a reliable comparative analysis of both the schools and the circumstances in both cities.

【本段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 结尾段结构,即 C-S 的结尾结构。首先再次重申原文



Conclusion 是站不住脚的,接下来给出可以增强原文说服力的合理的 Suggestion,包括原文作者需要进一步提供的证据和细节信息等。

【本段功能】

本段作为结尾段,具体功能即为总结归纳+提出建议。段落首先再次重申强调原文作者的论证不合理,接下来给出合理的建议:作者需要给出预算当中用于资助公立学校的自己所占的比例,以及考虑到两个不同城市的不同情况之间的比较分析。此外,不难发现,结尾段总结提出的建议与正文各段中依次攻击的错误遥相呼应,即分别对应了样本类错误和类比类错误,这使全篇文章显得浑然一体。

【满分要素剖析】

【语言表达】

本文的语言使用规范、清晰,词汇也用得准确地道,并使用多变的句式让考官读起来津津有味,这些都是 GRE 写作官方的语言要求。同时,文章的结构型语言和内容型语言相得益彰,结构是骨架,内容是血肉,二者完美结合。

This argument concludes that...(标志性的 Argument 开头段引出原文结论的语言表达形式。)To justify this conclusion the argument points out that... The argument relies on a series of unsubstantiated assumptions, which, considered together, render the argument wholly unconvincing...(标志性的指出文章错误的语言表达。整体开头段是标准的 C—A—F 的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

One such assumption is that the total budget for the two cities is approximately the same. It is entirely possible that... the argument relies on the additional assumption that this percentage is a reliable indicator of the value residents place on public-school education. Yet, it is entirely possible, for example, that... Without clear evidence regarding the circumstances that the two city's face, any comparative analysis is not useful. (标志性的样本之间的差异导致样本类错误的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

The second assumption upon which the argument rests is that the percentage of... is about the same in both cities. If a comparatively small percentage of..., then the comparatively small amount



of... might actually be a higher rate... (标志性的因为参照对象不同导致类比类错误的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

To conclude, the argument is unpersuasive. To strengthen it the argument, clear evidence regarding the percentage of... as well as the percentage of... should be provided. To better assess the argument an audience would need to be provided with... (标志性的 Argument 结尾段 Conclusion-Suggestion 体系的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

【逻辑结构】

本文的写作体现出了非常严谨的开头段一正文段 1、2、3一结尾段的逻辑体系:

(开头段) This argument concludes that...

(正文段 1) One such assumption is that...

(正文段 2) The second assumption upon which the argument rests is that...

(正文段 3) Finally, although the argument states that...

(结尾段) To conclude, the argument is unpersuasive...

特别注意的是,在本文攻击第一个原文假设的时候,作者先是攻击这个类比假设的第一层逻辑错误,也就是 It is entirely possible that Blue City's total budget is no more than half that of Parson City. If so, that would account for the discrepancy in the allocation of funds and could not be understood as an indicator that one city cares more or less about education。在这之后,作者进行了让步,即 Even if Parson City devotes a greater percentage of its budget each year for its schools rather than amount of money,之后开始攻击这个类比假设的第二层逻辑错误,即 Yet, it is entirely possible, for example, that Blue City's schools are already well funded, or that Blue City has some other, extremely urgent problem which requires additional funding despite a high level of concern among its residents about its public schools。这样的写法,能够很好地展现出作者在进行驳论文写作的清晰逻辑思路。



