









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 32

The following appeared in a memo from a vice president of Quiot Manufacturing:

"During the past year, Quiot Manufacturing had 30 percent more on-the-job accidents than at the nearby Panoply Industries plant, where the work shifts are one hour shorter than ours. Experts say that significant contributing factors in many on-the-job accidents are fatigue and sleep deprivation among workers. Therefore, to reduce the number of on-the-job accidents at Quiot and thereby increase productivity, we should shorten each of our three work shifts by one hour so that employees will get adequate amounts of sleep."

Write a response in which you examine the stated and/or unstated assumptions of the argument. Be sure to explain how the argument depends on these assumptions and what the implications are for the argument if the assumptions prove unwarranted.

【满分范文赏析】

This editorial recommends that Quiot Manufacturing reduce its work shifts by one hour each in order to reduce its on-the-job accident rate and thereby increase productivity. To support this recommendation the author points out that last year the number of accidents at Quiot was 30% greater than at Industries plant, where work shifts are one hour shorter. The author also cites expert reports which indicate fatigue and sleep deprivation are major causes of accidents. There are several reasons why this argument for a one-hour reduction in work time per shift is not convincing.

【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,即为了减少事故,Quiot 工厂应当减少工人的上班时间。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 Quiot 工厂在比另外一家工厂在工作时间多的情况下事故率要高,同时有专家报告称,工人的睡眠质量能够影响事故发生率。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。

First and foremost, the author provides absolutely no evidence that overall worker productivity is attributable in part to the number of on-the-job accidents. While common sense tells us such a relationship exists, the author must provide some evidence of this cause-and-effect relationship before I can accept the author's final conclusion that the proposed course of action would in fact increase productivity.

【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——类比类错误。原文当中假设,工人的生产效率和事故发生率存在着关系。但是这样的关系是否存在只是凭空假设。因此原文的结论,即减少工作事故能够促进工作效率的提高是不成立的。

Secondly, Panoply's comparatively low accident rate might be attributable not to the length of its work shifts but rather to other factors, such as superior equipment maintenance or worker training. In other words, without ruling out alternative causes for the difference in rates of on-the-job accidents at both companies, the author cannot justify the argument that merely by emulating Industries work-shift policy, Quiot would reduce the number of such accidents.

【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——因果类错误。原文假设 Panoply 工厂较低的事故率是得益于更短的工作时间。但是除此之外可能存在其他因素导致这一现象发生。因此,原文的这个观点是没有说服力的。



Thirdly, assuming that Quiot's workers are fatigued or sleep-deprived, in order to accept the author's solution to this problem we must assume that Quiot's workers would use the additional hour of free time to sleep or rest. However, the author provides no evidence that they would use the time in this manner. It is entirely possible that Quiot's workers would use that extra hour to engage in some other activity—binge drinking, for example, which could increase the overall rate of accidents on the job. Without ruling out this possibility the author cannot convincingly conclude that his proposal will have the desired effects.

【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——因果类错误。原文假设如果工作时间减少了,工人们一定能够有更好的睡眠。但是,这种因果关系并不一定成立,因为人们也许会利用额外的休息时间来做其它事情。所以,原文的这个观点是不能让人确信的。

Finally, a series of problems with the argument arise from the scant statistical information on which it relies. In comparing the number of accidents at Quiot and Panoply, the author fails to consider that the per-capita accident rate. Second, perhaps accident rates at the two companies last year were aberrations. Or perhaps Panoply is not representative of industrial companies in generally and that other companies with shorter work shifts have even higher accident rates. In short, since the argument relies on very limited statistical information, an audience should not take a recommendation based on it.

【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四个逻辑错误,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】

作为正文第四段,本段攻击原文所犯的第四个重要逻辑错误——样本类错误。原文假设 Panoply 工厂的情况是有代表性的,但事实上可能并非如此,因为单一个体的案例并不一定能



适用于其它个体。所以原文的这个假设是不合理的。

In conclusion, the recommendation for emulating Panoply's work-shift policy is not well supported. To convince an audience that shorter work shifts would reduce the accident rate, the author must demonstrate a correlation between shift length and the accident rate. It would also help bolster the argument if the audience were provided an in depth analysis of the accident rates, not just at these two companies but at other companies in order to determine if shift length or other factors are contributing to a reduction in the rate of accidents.

【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:作者必须证明工作时长和事故发生率存在关系,并分析其他类似公司的案例。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,即分别对应了类比类错误、因果类错误和样本类错误,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。

1) This editorial recommends that... (标志性的 Argument 开头段引出原文结论的语言表达形式。) To support this recommendation the author points out that... The author also cites... There



are several reasons why this argument for a one-hour reduction in work time per shift is not convincing. (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。)

- 2) First and foremost, the author provides absolutely no evidence that overall worker productivity is attributable in part to... While common sense tells us such a relationship exists, the author must provide some evidence of this cause-and-effect relationship before I can accept the author's final conclusion that the proposed course of action would in fact increase productivity. (标志性的不存在因果关系而致因果类错误的语言和逻辑模版体系。)
- Secondly, Panoply's comparatively low accident rate might be attributable not to... but rather to other factors, such as... In other words, without ruling out alternative causes of for... the author cannot justify the argument that...(标志性的存在其他原因导致因果类错误的语言和逻辑模版体系。)
- 4) Finally, a series of problems with the argument arise from the scant statistical information on which it relies. Or perhaps Panoply is not representative of... In short, since the argument relies on very limited statistical information, an audience should not take a recommendation based on it. (标志性的因为样本数量单一导致的样本类错误的语言和逻辑模版体系。)
- 5) In conclusion, the recommendation for emulating Panoply's work-shift policy is not well supported... To convince an audience that... It would also help bolster the argument if the audience were provided... (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—正文段 1、2、3、4—结尾段的逻辑体系:

(开头段) This editorial recommends that...

(正文段 1) First and foremost, the author provides absolutely no evidence that...

(正文段 2) Secondly, Panoply's comparatively low accident rate might be attributable not to...

(正文段 3) Thirdly, assuming that...



(正文段 4) Finally, a series of problems with the argument arise from...

(结尾段) In conclusion, the recommendation... is not well supported...



