



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 5

The following appeared in a letter to the editor of the Ballmer Island Gazette:

“On Balmer Island, where mopeds serve as a popular form of transportation, the population increases to 100,000 during the summer months. To reduce the number of accidents involving mopeds and pedestrians, the town council of Balmer Island should limit the number of mopeds rented by the island’s moped rental companies from 50 per day to 25 per day during the summer season. By limiting the number of rentals, the town council will attain the 50 percent annual reduction in moped accidents that was achieved last year on the neighboring island of Seaville, when Seaville’s town council enforced similar limits on moped rentals.”

Write a response in which you discuss what questions would need to be answered in order to decide whether the recommendation is likely to have the predicted result. Be sure to explain how the answers to these questions would help to evaluate the recommendation.

【满分范文赏析】

The author of this editorial recommends that, to reduce accidents involving mopeds and pedestrians, Balmer Island’s city council should restrict moped rentals from 50 to 25 per day, at each of the island’s six rental outlets. To support this recommendation the author cites the fact that last year, when nearby Seaville Island’s town council enforced similar measures, Seaville’s rate of moped accidents decreased by 50%. There are several reasons why this evidence fails to substantiate the claim.

【本段结构】

本段采用了标准的 Argument 开头段结构，即 C—E—F 的开头结构。段落首先概括原文的 Conclusion，接下来概括原文为支持其结论所引用的 Evidence，最后给出开头段到正文段的过渡句，指出原文的 Flaw，即其 Evidence 不能证实其结论。

【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：为减少涉及摩托车与行人的事故的发生，Balmer 岛市议会应在该岛六个租车点将摩托自行车的日租借量限制由 50 辆下调至 25 辆。本段接下来列举了原文为支持其结论所引用的证据——在去年，

当附近的 Seaville 岛的镇议会实行了类似的措施后，其摩托车自行车事故率降低了 50%。这些信息的归纳为正文段中即将进行的具体攻击作铺垫。

To begin with, the author assumes that all other conditions in Balmer that might affect the rate of moped-pedestrian accidents will remain unchanged after the restrictions are enacted. People often find ways to circumvent restrictions. For example, with a restricted supply of rental mopeds, people in Balmer who currently rent in the summer might purchase mopeds instead. Also, the number of pedestrians might increase in the future. With more pedestrians, especially tourists, the risk of moped-pedestrian accidents would probably increase. For that matter, the number of rental outlets might increase to make up for the artificial supply restriction per outlet, a likely scenario in consideration of the fact that moped rental demand will not likely decrease. Without considering and ruling out these and other possible changes that might contribute to a high incidence of moped-pedestrian accidents, the author cannot convince me that the proposed restrictions will necessarily have the desired effect.

【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——忽略他因。原文作者假设在制定限制措施后，Balmer 岛上所有其它可能影响摩托车自行车事故率的条件将保持不变。然而，人们经常会发现避开限制的方法。例如，当摩托自行车的租借量受限制时，目前在夏季租用摩托自行车的 Balmer 岛人们可能会改为购买摩托自行车。另外，行人的数目在未来可能会增加。行人（尤其是游客）数目的增加可能会导致摩托自行车和行人之间发生事故的增多。鉴于对摩托自行车出租的需求量不太可能会下降，摩托自行车租借点的数目很可能会增加，以弥补每个租车点的租借量所受到的人为限制。本段最后指出：作者在没有考虑和排除这些可能会提高摩托自行车和行人纸质件事故的发生率的其它改变之前，是不能说服读者其所提出的措施一定会获得期望的效果的。

Next, the author fails to consider other possible explanations for the 50% decline in Seaville's

moped accident rate last year. Perhaps last year Seaville experienced unusually fair weather, during which moped accidents are less likely. Perhaps fewer tourists visited Seaville last year than during most years, thereby reducing demand for rental mopeds to levels even below the allowed limits. Perhaps last year some of Seaville's moped rental outlets purchased new mopeds that are safer to drive. Or perhaps the restrictions were already in effect but were not enforced until last year. In any event, a decline in Seaville's moped accident rate during only one year is scarcely sufficient to draw any reliable conclusions about what might have caused the decline, or about what the accident rate will be in years ahead.

【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——忽略他因。原文作者没有考虑到可能使得 Seaville 岛去年摩托车自行车事故率降低 50% 的其它解释。Seaville 岛去年可能经历了不同寻常的好天气、去年参观 Seaville 岛的游客数目可能少于往年、镇上的摩托车自行车租借点可能在去年购买了驾驶起来更安全的新摩托车自行车、该镇对摩托车自行车租借量的限制也可能其实早在起作用，只是直到去年才被加强。本段最后指出：无论如何，Seaville 岛上摩托车自行车的事故率在仅仅一年之内的下降均不足以推出任何有关这一下降的原因或未来几年的事故率的可靠的结论。

To further explore the link between the two locations and a reduction in number of accidents, the author relies on what could be an unfair comparison. Perhaps Balmer's ability to enforce moped-rental restrictions does not meet Seaville's ability. In that case, the mere enactment of similar restrictions in Balmer is no guarantee of a similar result. Or perhaps the demand for mopeds in Seaville is always greater than in Balmer. Specifically, if fewer than all available mopeds are currently rented per day from the average Balmer outlet, while in Seaville every available moped is rented each day, then the proposed restriction is likely to have less impact on the accident rate in Balmer than in Seaville.

【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——错误类比。或许 Balmer 岛在加强摩托自行车租借限制时的执行力不及 Seaville 岛的执行力。在这种情形下，仅仅在 Balmer 岛上制定与 Seaville 岛相似的限制并不能保证获得相似的效果。抑或是 Seaville 岛对摩托自行车的需求量始终比 Balmer 岛上的大。特别地，如果通常的 Balmer 岛租借点每天租出的摩托自行车数量比其可供租借的摩托自行车总量少，而 Seaville 岛租借点的每辆摩托自行车每天均被租出，那么被提议的限制对 Balmer 岛事故率的影响很可能会小于其对 Seaville 岛的影响。

Finally, the author provides no evidence that the same restrictions that served to reduce the incidence of all “moped accidents” by 50% would also serve to reduce the incidence of “accidents involving mopeds and pedestrians” by 50%. Lacking such evidence, it is entirely possible that the number of moped accidents not involving pedestrians decreased by a greater percentage, while the number of moped-pedestrian accidents decreased by a smaller percentage, or even increased. Since the author has not accounted for these possibilities, the recommendation requires further substantiation.

【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——错误假设。作者没有提供证据证明使得“摩托自行车事故”的发生减少 50% 的那些限制同样也将使得“涉及摩托自行车和行人的事故”的发生减少 50%。如果缺乏如此证据，完全可能是摩托自行车事故的数目降低了更大的百分比，而摩托自行车和行人之间的事故降低了较小的百分比，甚至可能上升了。本段最后指出：既然作者没有对这些可能性进行说明，其建议需要被进一步证实。

In conclusion, the recommendation is not well-supported. To convince an audience that the proposed restriction would achieve the desired outcome the author needs to establish that no changes serving to increase Balmer's moped-pedestrian accident rate will occur in the foreseeable future. The author must also provide clear evidence that last year's decline in moped accidents in Seaville was attributable primarily to its moped rental restrictions rather than to one or more other factors. In order to better evaluate the recommendation, an audience would need more information comparing the supply of and demand for moped rentals on the two islands. An audience would also need to know the rates of moped-pedestrian accidents in Seaville, both prior to and after the restrictions were enforced in Seaville.

【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 作者的论证不合理，接下来给出合理的建议。为说服观众其所提出的措施一定会获得期望的效果，原文作者需要确定可能导致 Balmer 岛摩托车与行人之间事故的发生率上升的改变不会在可预见的未来发生。作者还需提供清晰的证据证明 Seaville 岛去年摩托车事故率的下降主要归因于其摩托车租借量的限制而不是其它的因素。为了更好地评价原文的建议，观众需要更多比较两岛摩托车租借的供求量以及有关 Seaville 岛在加强限制措施之前和之后其岛上摩托车与行人之间事故的发生率的信息。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。

The author of 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 cites the fact that (引出原文为支持其结论所引用的荒谬论据。) There are several reasons why this evidence fails to substantiate the claim. (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。)

To begin with, the author assumes that For example, Also, For that matter, ..., a likely scenario in consideration of the fact that Without considering and ruling out these and other possible changes that might ..., the author cannot convince me that the proposed ... will necessarily have the desired effect. (标志性的忽略他因错误的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

Next, the author fails to consider other possible explanations for Perhaps Perhaps ..., thereby Perhaps Or perhaps In any event, ... is scarcely sufficient to draw any reliable conclusions about (标志性的忽略他因错误的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

To further explore the link between ..., the author relies on what could be an unfair comparison. Perhaps In that case, Or perhaps Specifically, if ..., while ..., then the proposed ... is likely to ... than (标志性的错误类比的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

Finally, the author provides no evidence that Lacking such evidence, it is entirely possible that Since the author has not accounted for these possibilities, the recommendation requires further substantiation. (标志性的错误假设的语言和逻辑模版体系。)

In conclusion, the recommendation is not well-supported. To convince an audience that ... the author needs to establish that The author must also provide clear evidence that ... was attributable primarily to ... rather than to one or more other factors. In order to better evaluate the recommendation, an audience would need more information comparing An audience would also need to know (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) The author of this editorial recommends that,

(正文段 1) To begin with, the author assumes that

(正文段 2) Next, the author fails to consider other possible explanations for

(正文段 3) To further explore the link between ..., the author relies on what could be an unfair comparison.

(正文段 4) Finally, the author provides no evidence that

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

特别值得一提的是本文正文第一段的写作。该段首先通过 To begin with, the author assumes that all other conditions in Balmer that might affect the rate of moped-pedestrian accidents will remain unchanged after the restrictions are enacted.一句说明原文中出现的忽略他因错误。接下来，该段使用 People often find ways to circumvent restrictions.一句简短有力地过渡，然后通过 For example, Also, For that matter, ..., a likely scenario in consideration of the fact that....等句递进地提出其它的可能解释。最后，该段 Without considering and ruling out these and other possible changes that might contribute to a high incidence of moped-pedestrian accidents, the author cannot convince me that the proposed restrictions will necessarily have the desired effect.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。



中国最强英语 / 出国考试专家团队

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



杨建群
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
拥有多年托福写作教学经验
文学双硕士学位



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
教学经验丰富，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”
中国出国留学留学教学体系搭建者
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红宝书系列助考作者
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》
轻松拿得百万高薪



曲振
GRE/托福/SAT阅读教学权威
签约作家
“考神团队”创始人之一



百度战略投资的在线学习领导品牌

听这些老师的课，才是一种享受！