









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 113

The following is a recommendation from the personnel director to the president of Acme Publishing Company:

"Many other companies have recently stated that having their employees take the Easy Read Speed-Reading Course has greatly improved productivity. One graduate of the course was able to read a five-hundred-page report in only two hours. Another graduate rose from an assistant manager to vice president of the company in under a year. Obviously, the faster you can read, the more information you can absorb in a single workday. Moreover, Easy Read costs only \$500 per employee, a small price to pay when you consider the benefit. Included in this fee is a three-week seminar in Spruce City and a lifelong subscription to the Easy Read newsletter. Clearly, Acme would benefit by requiring all of our employees to take the Easy Read course."

满分范文赏析

In this argument, the personnel director of Acme Publishing claims that Acme would stand to gain from improved employee productivity. The improvement would come at the cost of \$500 per employee for the enrollment in Easy-Read's 3-week seminar. To support this claim the director points out that many other companies have claimed to benefit from the seminar, that one student was able to read a long report very quickly, and that another student saw his career advance significantly during the year after the seminar. Scrutiny reveals that it accomplishes little toward supporting the director's claim.

【此段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 开头段结构,即:C – E - F 的开头结构,首句概括原文的 C(Conclusion)。接下来的一句话概括了原文为了支持他的结论所引用的 E(Evidence)。最后尾句中给出开头段到正文段的过渡句,指出原文在逻辑上存在 F(Flaw)。

【此段功能】

本段作为 Argument 开头段,具体功能就在发起攻击。首先,概括原文的结论: Acme 的 personnel director 认为接下来分别列举了原文为了支持这个结论引用的证据:对小城镇 Leeville 和大城市 Mason City 的对比,论据的归纳用于铺垫出正文段的具体攻击。最后点出原



文存在逻辑错误,引出后面的分析。

First of all, just because other companies benefited greatly from the course does not necessarily mean that Acme will benefit in identical ways. Perhaps the type of reading on which the course focuses is not the type in which Acme Publishing employees often engage in at work. Moreover, since Acme is a publishing company its employees are likely to be excellent readers already and may not have the capacity for much more improvement. In this case, the overall improvements would be far less dramatic and if follows that the productive rate would also be a little underwhelming.

【此段结构】

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原文犯错位置,接下来给出合理的理由和他因来反驳原文。

【此段功能】

本段作为正文第一段,攻击文章犯的主要逻辑错误:错误类比。作者认为 "Acme 可能不会像其他公司一样从课程中受益"。为此,作者提出了两种可能性反驳原文:一是课程针对的阅读可能与 Acme 工作中的 type 不同;二是 Acme 的员工应该已经是 excellent reader,课程对他们的阅读帮助不大。

Secondly, two success stories are not statistically meaningful. How many companies used the service and found no improvement? Consider the case of the individual whose career advanced after taking the course—any one of a myriad of other factors might explain that advancement.

【此段结构】

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原文犯错位置,接下来给出合理的理由和他因来反驳原文。

【此段功能】

本段作为正文第二段,攻击文章犯的主要逻辑错误:调查类错误。作者认为原文中提到的"两家公司成功的经历"不能说明问题。该调查没有充足的样本,同时也没有说明成功公司和失败公司的比例,而且成功案例也不能排除其他因素的影响。



Thirdly, the director assumes without warrant that the benefits of the course will outweigh its costs. While all of Acme's employees take the 3-week course, Acme's productivity would decline. This decline, along with the substantial fee for the course, could conceivably outweigh the course's long-terms benefits. Without a complete cost-benefit analysis it doesn't make sense to draw a conclusion.

【此段结构】

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原文犯错位置,接下来给出合理的理由和他因来反驳原文。

【此段功能】

本段作为正文第三段,攻击文章犯的主要逻辑错误:profit 类。作者认为原文不能保证课程的 benefits outweigh its costs。接下来。作者列举了课程会带来利润下降的一些原因,包括 productivity would decline(员工上课期间生产力下降),substantial fee for the course(课程的巨额支出)。最后说明没有 cost-benefit analysis,结论不合理。

In sum, the director's evidence does not warrant his conclusion. To support his recommendation he must first provide evidence that employees with similar reading skills as those that Acme employees possess have benefited significantly from the course (a survey of other publishing companies might be useful for this purpose). To better assess the argument an audience would need to be presented with more information about the extent to which the course would disrupt Acme's operations—a cost benefit analysis.

【此段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 结尾段结构,即:C – S 的结尾结构,首先再次重申原文的站不住脚的 Conclusion,接下来给出给合理建议 Suggestion。

【此段功能】

本段作为 Argument 结尾段,具体功能就总结归纳+建议措施,首先再次重申 director 的的观点不合理。接下来作者给出合理的建议:必须要有例子说明"与 Acme 公司员工阅读水平相似的人也会课程中收益",同时说明课程影响 Acme's operations 的程度。结尾段的两个条建议非常规整的隐射前面的两个主要错误,前后呼应,文章有力结尾,浑然一体。



【满分因素剖析】

【语言表达】

- 1. First of all, just because other companies benefited greatly from the course does not necessarily mean that Acme will benefit in identical ways. (标准的论证段开头,点出错误的结论和错误的论据。In identical way 表明此处的错误为——错误类比) Perhaps... Moreover, since ... Its ... (标志性的 GRE argument 论证语句,用于提出其他可能性)In this case, ...would ...(标志性的 GRE argument 论证语句, in this case 引出在其他可能性下得到的与原文结论相反的结果,从而反驳原文结论)
- 2. Thirdly, the director assumes without warrant that the benefits of the course will outweigh its costs. While ... Acme's productivity would decline. This decline, ..., could conceivably outweigh benefits. Without a complete cost-benefit analysis it doesn't make sense to draw a conclusion. 标志性的 profit 类错误分析,可以只要文中提到 the profit will increase 之类的语句,就可以攻击这种错误。3. In sum, the director's evidence does not warrant his conclusion.(标志性的结尾段开头,再次重申文章结论存在错误) To support his recommendation he must first provide evidence that ... To better assess the argument an audience would need to be presented with more information about ...(标志性的结尾中的两种表达方法,用于提出是文章更具有说服力的合理化建议)

【逻辑结构】

本文是非常严谨的开头段-正文段 1-正文段 2--正文段 3-结尾段的的五段论逻辑体系。开头段按照 C-E-F 的逻辑结构,顺利引出后文的分析。论证段中,从提出错误,到分析错误,到给出可能性,最后总结错误,层次清晰,衔接自然。结尾段总结全文,重申错误,给出合理化建议。这样一篇文章从开头到结尾逻辑严谨,内容清晰,圆满的完成了论证的作用。

正文段第三段值得借鉴

Thirdly, the director assumes without warrant that the benefits of the course will outweigh its costs.



(出现标志性词汇 benefit, outweigh, cost, 表示此段攻击的是 profit 类型的错误) While all of Acme's employees take the 3-week course, Acme's productivity would decline. This decline, along with the substantial fee for the course, could conceivably outweigh the course's long-terms benefits. (作者提出 cost 高于 benefit 的两种原因和可能性) Without a complete cost-benefit analysis it doesn't make sense to draw a conclusion. (最后提出 cost-benefit analysis 的必要性已经重申原文结论的错误)



