









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 16

In surveys, Mason City residents rank water sports (swimming, boating, and fishing) among their favorite recreational activities. The Mason River flowing through the city is rarely used for these pursuits, however, and the city park department devotes little of its budget to maintaining riverside recreational facilities. For years there have been complaints from residents about the quality of the river's water and the river's smell. In response, the state has recently announced plans to clean up Mason River. Use of the river for water sports is, therefore, sure to increase. The city government should, for that reason, devote more money in this year's budget to riverside recreational facilities.

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】

While it may be true that the Mason City government ought to devote more money to riverside recreational facilities, the author fails to make an argument for the justification of increased monetary resources based on the potential of increased recreational patronage of the river. It is easy to understand why city residents would want a cleaner river, but this argument is rife with holes and assumptions, and thus, not strong enough to lead to increased funding.

【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 无法让原文的结论具有说服力。

【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 Mason 政府应当为沿河游乐设施投入更多的金钱。本段接下来提到了原文中为支持之前的 Conclusion 所提供的证据,包括人们潜在的水上娱乐以及更干净的河水质量的需求。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。



Citing surveys of city residents, the author reports city resident's love of water sports. It is not clear, however, the scope and validity of that survey. For example, the survey could have asked residents if they prefer using the river for water sports or would like to see a hydroelectric dam built, which may have swayed residents toward ranking river sports over a less attractive option. The sample may not have been representative of city residents, asking only those residents who live in the vicinity of the river. The survey may have been 10 pages long, with 2 questions dedicated to river sports. Unless the survey is provided, analyzed, and found to be of use for the case presented above, it cannot be accepted as fully representative, valid, and reliable.

【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。对于原文当中提到的 Survey,本文并不认为这样的调查是有说服力的。比如,调查的样本数量,调查的问题内容,调查的方式等等,都可能对这个调查的公正性产生消极的作用。所以,原文的关于调查具有说服力的 Assumption 是不合理的。

Additionally, the author implies that residents do not use the river for swimming, boating, and fishing, despite their professed interest, because the water is polluted and smells bad. While a polluted, stinking river would likely cut down on river sports, a concrete connection between the resident's lack of river use and the river's current state is not effectively made. Though there have been complaints, we do not know if there have been numerous complaints from a wide range of people, or perhaps from one or two individuals who made numerous complaints. To strengthen the argument, a full and complete survey should be performed for the explicit purpose of gather opinions regarding the matter at hand.

【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。原文提到,居民们抱怨由于河水质量问题而很少下水去做娱乐。但是,这样的观点在没有客观证据的支持下是不足让人信服的。有可能是因为其他原因,而非河水质量,导致了居民们不愿意下水娱乐的现象。所以,原文的关于河水质量和人们下水娱乐的因果关系的 Assumption 是不合理的。

Building upon the implication that residents do not use the river due to the quality of the river's water and the smell, the author suggests that a river cleanup will result in increased river usage. If the river's water quality and smell result from problems that can be cleaned, this may be true. For example, if the decreased water quality and smell is caused by pollution, this could be remedied. But if the quality and aroma results from the natural mineral deposits in the water or surrounding rock, this may not be true. There are some bodies of water that emit a strong smell of sulfur due to the geography of the area. This is not something likely to be affected by a cleanup. Consequently, a river clean up may have no impact upon the quality of water or river usage. Regardless of whether or not the river's quality can be improved, the author does not effectively demonstrate that there is a connection between water quality and river usage.

【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。原文提到,如果河水质量问题得到了解决,人们就能够进行更多的水上娱乐。但是,这样的观点是建立在"河水质量问题能够得到解决"的 Assumption 上的。而如果因为种种原因这个问题得不到或者很难得到解决,那么人们并不能进行更多的水上娱乐。所以,原文的河水质量能够得到解决的 Assumption 是不合理的。

A clean, beautiful, safe river often adds to a city's property values, increased revenue from tourists who come to take advantage of the river, and a better overall quality of life for residents. For these reasons, city government may decide to invest in improving riverside recreational facilities. However, the author's argument, as it stands, is not likely to persuade the city



government to allocate increased funding.

【本段结构】

本段采用的并非标准的 Argument 结尾段结构 (即 C-S 的结尾结构),而先是在铺垫了文章背景后,表明原文 Conclusion 是站不住脚的,但接下来并没有给出可以增强原文说服力的合理的 Suggestion。

【本段功能】

本段作为文章结尾段,具体功能即为总结归纳,即概括原文作者的论证不合理。很明显,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因 果类错误,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。

While it may be true that... the author fails to make an argument for the justification of... (标志性的 Argument 开头段引出原文结论的语言表达形式。) this argument is rife with holes and assumptions, and thus, not strong enough to lead to increased funding...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—E—F 的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

Citing surveys of city residents, the author reports... It is not clear, however, the scope and validity of that survey. For example, the survey could have... The sample may not have been representative of city residents, asking only those... Unless the survey is provided, analyzed, and found to be of use for the case presented above, it cannot be accepted as fully representative, valid, and reliable. (标志性的样本不具有代表性导致样本类错误的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

Additionally, the author implies that... While... a concrete connection between... To strengthen the argument, a full and complete survey should be performed for the explicit purpose of gather



opinions regarding the matter at hand. (标志性的包含他因的导致因果类错误的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

Building upon the implication that... the author suggests that... For example... Regardless of... the author does not effectively demonstrate that there is a connection between water quality and river usage. (标志性的主观臆断导致因果类错误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) While it may be true that... the author fails to make an argument for the justification of...

(正文段 1) Citing surveys of city residents, the author reports... It is not clear, however...

(正文段 2) Additionally, the author implies that...

(正文段 3) Building upon the implication that... the author suggests that...

(结尾段) ... However, the author's argument, as it stands, is not likely to persuade the city government to allocate increased funding.



