



智课网 GRE 备考资料



下载智课 APP



官方网站: <http://www.smartstudy.com>

客服热线: 400-011-9191

新浪微博: @智课网

微信公众号: 智课网

GRE 官方写作题库 Argument 10

Twenty years ago, Dr. Field, a noted anthropologist, visited the island of Tertia. Using an observation-centered approach to studying Tertian culture, he concluded from his observations that children in Tertia were reared by an entire village rather than by their own biological parents. Recently another anthropologist, Dr. Karp, visited the group of islands that includes Tertia and used the interview-centered method to study child-rearing practices. In the interviews that Dr. Karp conducted with children living in this group of islands, the children spent much more time talking about their biological parents than about other adults in the village. Dr. Karp decided that Dr. Field's conclusion about Tertian village culture must be invalid. Some anthropologists recommend that to obtain accurate information on Tertian child-rearing practices, future research on the subject should be conducted via the interview-centered method.

【满分范文赏析】

It might seem logical, at first glance, to agree with the argument in Dr. Karp's article that children in Tertia are actually raised by their biological parents (and perhaps even, by implication, that an observation-centered approach to anthropological study is less valid than an interview-centered one). However, in order to fully evaluate this argument, an audience should be provided with additional evidence.

【本段结构】

本段采用了简明的 Argument 开头段结构，即 C—F 的开头结构。段落首先概括原文的 Conclusion，接下来给出开头段到正文段的过渡句，指出原文的 Flaw，即其应提供额外的 Evidence 才能让观众对该 Argument 进行充分评价。

【本段功能】

本段作为 Argument 开头段，具体功能就在于发起攻击并概括原文的结论，即 Tertia 的孩子们的确是由他们的亲生父母所抚养的，并且以观察为中心的人类学研究方法不如以面试为中心的研究方法有效。本段对原文结论的归纳为正文段中即将进行的具体攻击作铺垫。

The audience should know, before deciding conclusively about the appropriate methodology for further study, if Tertia has 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 suggesting that, since the original study, foreigners had settled on the island and introduced a new element that affected child rearing in Tertia, 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.

【本段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 正文段结构，即：概括第一个逻辑错误的错误类型和其在原文中出现的位置，接下来给出合理的理由和他因来反驳原文。

【本段功能】

本段作为正文第一段，攻击原文中出现的第一个重要逻辑错误——（时间上的）错误类比。在对合适的研究方法做出决定性的判断之前，观众应当被告知 Tertia 是否在过去的 20 年内发生了显著的变化。Field 博士是在 20 年前开展了他的观察性研究，而自那时起 Tertia 可能发生了显著的变化。例如，我们如果有证据证明后来外国人在岛上定居并引入了一种影响了 Tertia 的孩子抚养方式的新因素，Karp 博士的论证无疑会被削弱。在这种情形下，Field 博士原先的研究可能是准确的，Karp 博士的研究也可能是正确的。

Another piece of evidence that might help us evaluate this claim involves 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 interviewed a single Tertian child, it would significantly weaken the conclusion. It could turn out to be the case, for example, that children on Tertia are raised communally, whereas their biological parents raise children on other islands nearby.

【本段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 正文段结构，即：概括第二个逻辑错误的错误类型和其在原文中出现的位置，接下来给出合理的理由和他因来反驳原文。

【本段功能】

本段作为正文第二段，攻击原文中出现的第二个重要逻辑错误——调查类错误。根据原文，Karp 博士和他的研究生们对“居住于包括 Tertia 岛在内的一系列岛屿上的孩子们”开展了研

究。如果他们从未采访过一个 Tertia 的孩子，其结论将被显著地削弱。例如，事实有可能是 Tertia 岛上的孩子们被集体抚养，而附近其它岛屿上的孩子们均由他们的亲生父母抚养。

Further, in order to fully evaluate this claim the audience needs 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 their biological parents had a greater role than the community did in their rearing. It would significantly undermine Dr. Karp's argument if it turned out that the children said things like how much they missed their parents or how their parents had left them in a communal environment. Without knowing what the children said, one cannot accept the argument above without reservations.

【本段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 正文段结构，即：概括第三个逻辑错误的错误类型和其在原文中出现的位置，接下来给出合理的理由和他因来反驳原文。

【本段功能】

本段作为正文第三段，攻击原文中出现的第三个重要逻辑错误——调查类错误。为充分评价原文中的论断，观众需要就 Karp 博士所采用的面试问题获得更多的信息。我们既不知道他们所问问题的具体内容，也不知道孩子们的具体答案。仅仅是孩子们更经常谈到他们的亲生父母这一事实并不意味着他们的亲生父母在抚养他们的过程中比社区占有更主要的角色。如果事实证明孩子们经常说一些诸如他们多么想念父母或者他们的父母是如何把他们留在了一个集体环境中的事情的话，Karp 博士的论证将被显著地削弱。在不知道孩子们究竟说了些什么的情况下，我们不能无保留地接受原文的论证。

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 his extension of the results of his study to a conclusion that interview-centered methods are inherently more valid than observational-centered approaches in the case of study in the group of islands including Tertia. In order to fully evaluate this claim one would require 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 observational study, but other observational approaches could be effective. In order to make such grandiose claims, Dr. Karp really needs to provide a lot of additional evidence (ideally a meta-analysis of hundreds of anthropological studies).

【本段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 正文段结构，即：概括第四个逻辑错误的错误类型和其在原文中出现的位置，接下来给出合理的理由和他因来反驳原文。

【本段功能】

本段作为正文第四段，攻击原文中出现的第四个重要逻辑错误——外推类错误。在 Karp 博士的文章中，他将自己的研究结果推广到了以面试为中心的研究方法比以观察为中心的研究方法在研究包括 Tertia 在内的一组岛屿时本质上更有效这一结论。为充分评价这一论断，我们需要更多的以面试为中心的人类学研究和以观察为中心的人类学研究的例子，并且我们还需要考察不同的研究设计。或许 Field 博士并未开展一项有效的观察式研究，而其它的观察式研究均可能是有效的。为了做出如此宏大的论断，Karp 博士实在需要提供很多额外的证据。

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, and 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). Finally, we need an abundance of information if we want to extend the results of a study about one island culture to all anthropological fieldwork.

【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。段落首先再次重申原文站不住脚的 Conclusion，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信息等。

【本段功能】

本段作为 Argument 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 Argument 缺乏额外的证据支持，接下来给出合理的建议。我们需要对 Tertia 及其周围岛屿和它们在 20 年内是否发生了变化进行了解。我们还需要了解（Karp 博士和 Field 博士的）研究

设计。最后，如果我们想将对于一个岛屿文化的研究成果推广到全部人类学研究工作的话，我们还需要大量的信息。不难发现，结尾段总结提出的建议非常规整地与正文各段中依次攻击的错误遥相呼应，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。

It might seem logical, at first glance, to agree with the argument in Dr. Karp's article that (标志性的 Argument 开头段引出原文结论的语言表达形式。) However, in order to fully evaluate this argument, an audience should be provided with additional evidence. (标志性的指出文章错误的语言表达。)

The audience should know, before deciding conclusively about ..., if and it is possible that ... has changed significantly since then. For example, if we had evidence suggesting that, ..., 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. (标志性的(时间上的)错误类比的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

Another piece of evidence that might help us evaluate this claim involves According to this article, If we were to learn that ..., it would significantly weaken the conclusion. It could turn out to be the case, for example, that ..., whereas (标志性的调查类错误的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

Further, in order to fully evaluate this claim the audience needs to learn more about ...—...? We don't know, nor do we know The mere fact that ... does not mean that It would significantly undermine Dr. Karp's argument if it turned out that Without knowing ..., one cannot accept the argument above without reservations. (标志性的调查类错误的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

It is slightly more difficult to discuss the evidence we might need in order to evaluate the more interesting claims in In order to fully evaluate this claim one would require ... and we would also need to look into Perhaps ..., but In order to make such grandiose claims, Dr. Karp really needs

to provide a lot of additional evidence. (标志性的外推类错误的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

Clearly, then, we need to have additional evidence in order to get a more complete understanding of We need to know about We also need to know about Finally, we need an abundance of information if we want to (标志性的 Argument 结尾段的 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) It might seem logical, at first glance, to agree with the argument in Dr. Karp's article that

(正文段 1) The audience should know, before deciding conclusively about ..., if

(正文段 2) Another piece of evidence that might help us evaluate this claim involves

(正文段 3) Further, in order to fully evaluate this claim the audience needs to learn more about ...—...?

(正文段 4) It is slightly more difficult to discuss the evidence we might need in order to evaluate the more interesting claims in

(结尾段) Clearly, then, we need to have additional evidence in order to get a more complete understanding of

特别值得一提的是本文正文第三段的写作。该段首先通过 Further, in order to fully evaluate this claim the audience needs 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? 等一系列疑问句指出原文中出现的调查类错误，并紧接着通过 The mere fact that they speak more frequently about their biological parents than they do about other adults does not mean that their biological parents had a greater role than the community did in their rearing. It would significantly undermine Dr. Karp's argument if it turned out that the children said things like how much they missed their parents or how their parents had left them in a communal environment. 两句递进地对该逻辑错误进行有力的分析。

最后，该段通过 Without knowing what the children said, one cannot accept the argument above

without reservations.一句对全段讨论进行总结，充分展现出了正文段严密的逻辑思路。

老师好！教的才好



58位

出国考试首席
教学专家



108位

哈佛、耶鲁、剑桥等
世界名校教学研发讲师



120万

合计培训
出国考试考生



20万

世界名校
录取学子



92本

合计出版出国
考试畅销图书

TOEFL名师



魏少成
中国TOEFL口语第一人
托福人物“老魏”
公认的“托福口语王”
学生心目中的“男神级”老师



冷峰
中国TOEFL听力第一人
中国托福听力、SAT语法
教学权威，认证托福听力
美国本科留学指导专家



杨建辉
中国TOEFL阅读第一人
托福、SAT一机“杨姐儿”
中国托福阅读、SAT阅读
教学权威



高翔
中国TOEFL写作教学权威
美国ETS访问学者
拥有多年托福及雅思语言学
文教学及留学经历



孙嘉迪
中国TOEFL口语教学权威
托福口语专家，美国亚利桑
那大学高级访问学者，对托福
考试的前世今生有透彻的研究

IELTS名师



云唯真
新南威尔士大学
特许雅思培训师



梅皓
雅思阅读和听力课程帮助
超过10万人成功烤鸭



黄雅生
学生赞誉的“小美人”
自创美式happy教学法
曾获得美国总统学术卓越奖



乐峰
雅思阅读九段超高手
教学经历13年，培训学员
超过15万人



彭新松
数十万学子公认的
雅思听力教学大师

GRE名师



韦晓亮
中国GRE/GMAT写作第一人
“小室老师”
美国田纳西大学商学院教学系统搭建者
教育行业的拼命三郎



陈虎平
中国 GRE/GMAT阅读第一人
中国 GRE、GMAT阅读之王
出国考试培训领域的哲学博士



黄敏
中国GRE填空教学权威
GRE红宝书最畅销真正作者
号称“黄药师”，培训学员超过2



陈琦
中国GRE填空第一人
“要你命三千”的GRE教主
水木清华理工男，人称“琦叔”



陈鹏
中国GRE/GMAT数学教学权威
清华大学数学
GRE、GMAT数学名师

GMAT名师



曹卫东
中国GMAT培训第一人
神一般的传奇老师
GWD创始人



刘杰
中国人民大学博士
翻译管理学著作数本



康瑞
中国SAT语法教学权威
英国利兹大学社会学硕士
GMAT、SAT语法顶级大咖



严晨
美国宾夕法尼亚州立大学硕士
拥有扎实的工科背景
及严密的逻辑推理能力

SAT名师



杜坤
中国SAT写作第一人
SAT教学6年
帮助超过5万学生
获得写作高分



郭文君
中国SAT语法第一人
SAT语法大神
北大才女
中国SAT语法名师



魏晨
中国SAT阅读第一人
中国最美SAT女老师
她一手好琴，在《非常了得》
轻松拿得百万奖金



曲振
GRE/托福/SAT词汇教学权威
签约作家
“考神团队”创始人之一