

## 新 GRE Argument 官方范文集

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 examine the stated and/or unstated assumptions of the argument. Be sure to explain how the argument depends on the assumptions and what the implications are if the assumptions prove unwarranted.

### **Score 6 Response\***

While it may be true that the Mason City government ought to devote more money to riverside recreational facilities, this author's argument does not make a cogent case for increased resources based on river use. 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.

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 river sports. The sample may not have been representative of city residents, asking only those residents who live upon the river. The survey may have been 10 pages long, with 2 questions dedicated to river sports. We just do not know. Unless the survey is fully representative, valid, and reliable, it can not be used to effectively back the author's argument.

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 smelly. While a polluted, smelly 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 his/her argument, the author would benefit from implementing a normed survey asking a wide range of residents why they do not currently use the river.

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 clean up will result in increased river usage. If the river's water quality and smell result from problems which can be cleaned, this may be true. For example, if the decreased water quality and aroma is caused by pollution by factories along the river, this conceivably 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 which emit a strong smell of sulphur due to the geography of the area. This is not something likely to be affected by a clean-up. Consequently, a river clean up may have no impact upon river usage. Regardless of whether the river's quality is able to be improved or not, the author does not effectively show a connection between water quality and river usage.

A clean, beautiful, safe river often adds to a city's property values, leads to increased tourism and revenue from those 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, this author's argument is not likely significantly persuade the city goverment to allocate increased funding.

### **Reader Commentary**

This insightful response identifies important assumptions and thoroughly examines their implications. The proposal to spend more on riverside recreational facilities rests on three questionable assumptions, namely:

---

\*All responses in this publication are reproduced exactly as written, including errors, misspellings, etc., if any.

- that the survey provides a reliable basis for budget planning
- that the river's pollution and odor are the only reasons for its limited recreational use
- that efforts to clean the water and remove the odor will be successful

By showing that each assumption is highly suspect, this essay demonstrates the weakness of the entire argument. For example, paragraph 2 points out that the survey might not have used a representative sample, might have offered limited choices, and might have contained very few questions on water sports.

Paragraph 3 examines the tenuous connection between complaints and limited use of the river for recreation. Complaints about water quality and odor may be coming from only a few people and, even if such complaints are numerous, other completely different factors may be much more significant in reducing river usage. Finally, paragraph 4 explains that certain geologic features may prevent effective river clean-up. Details such as these provide compelling support.

In addition, careful organization ensures that each new point builds upon the previous ones. For example, note the clear transitions at the beginning of paragraphs 3 and 4, as well as the logical sequence of sentences within paragraphs (specifically paragraph 4).

Although this essay does contain minor errors, it still conveys ideas fluently. Note the effective word choices (e.g., "rife with . . . assumptions" and "may have swayed residents"). In addition, sentences are not merely varied; they also display skillful embedding of subordinate elements. For example, note the sustained parallelism in the first sentence of the concluding paragraph.

Since this response offers cogent examination of the argument and conveys meaning skillfully, it earns a score of 6.

### **Score 5 Response**

The author of this proposal to increase the budget for Mason City riverside recreational facilities offers an interesting argument but to move forward on the proposal would definitely require more information and thought. While the correlations stated are logical and probable, there may be hidden factors that prevent the City from diverting resources to this project.

For example, consider the survey rankings among Mason City residents. The thought is that such high regard for water sports will translate into usage. But, survey responses can hardly be used as indicators of actual behavior. Many surveys conducted after the winter holidays reveal people who list exercise and weight loss as a top priority. Yet every profession does not equal a new gym membership. Even the wording of the survey results remain ambiguous and vague. While water sports may be among the residents' favorite activities, this allows for many other favorites. What remains unknown is the priorities of the general public. Do they favor these water sports above a softball field or soccer field? Are they willing to sacrifice the municipal golf course for better riverside facilities? Indeed the survey hardly provides enough information to discern future use of improved facilities.

Closely linked to the surveys is the bold assumption that a cleaner river will result in increased usage. While it is not illogical to expect some increase, at what level will people begin to use the river? The answer to this question requires a survey to find out the reasons our residents use or do not use the river. Is river water quality the primary limiting factor to usage or the lack of docks and piers? Are people more interested in water sports than the recreational activities that they are already engaged in? These questions will help the city government forecast how much river usage will increase and to assign a proportional increase to the budget.

Likewise, the author is optimistic regarding the state promise to clean the river. We need to hear the source of the voices and consider any ulterior motives. Is this a campaign year and the plans a campaign promise from the state representative? What is the timeline for the clean-up effort? Will the state fully fund this project? We can imagine the misuse of funds in renovating the riverside facilities only to watch the new buildings fall into dilapidation while the state drags the river clean-up.

Last, the author does not consider where these additional funds will be diverted from. The current budget situation must be assessed to determine if this increase can be afforded. In a sense, the City may not be willing to draw money away from other key projects from road improvements to schools and education. The author naively assumes that the money can simply appear without forethought on where it will come from.

Examining all the various angles and factors involved with improving riverside recreational facilities, the argument does not justify increasing the budget. While the proposal does highlight a possibility, more information is required to warrant any action.

### **Reader Commentary**

Each paragraph in the body of this perceptive essay identifies and examines an unstated assumption that is crucial to the argument. The major assumptions discussed are:

- that a survey can accurately predict behavior
- that cleaning the river will, in itself, increase recreational usage
- that state plans to clean the river will actually be realized
- that Mason City can afford to spend more on riverside recreational facilities

Support within each paragraph is both thoughtful and thorough. For example, paragraph 2 points out vagueness in the wording of the survey: Even if water sports rank among the favorite recreational activities of Mason City residents, other sports may still be much more popular. Thus, if the first assumption proves unwarranted, the argument to fund riverside facilities — rather than soccer fields or golf courses — becomes much weaker. Paragraph 4 considers several reasons why river clean-up plans may not be successful (the plans may be nothing more than campaign promises or funding may not be adequate). Thus, the weakness of the third assumption undermines the argument that river recreation will increase and riverside improvements will be needed at all.

Instead of dismissing each assumption in isolation, this response places them in a logical order and considers their connections. Note the appropriate transitions between and within paragraphs, clarifying the links among the assumptions (e.g., "Closely linked to the surveys ..." or "The answer to this question requires...").

Along with strong development, this response also displays facility with language. Minor errors in punctuation are present, but word choices are apt and sentences suitably varied in pattern and length. The response uses a number of rhetorical questions, but the implied answers are always clear enough to support the points being made.

Thus, the response satisfies all requirements for a score of 5, but its development is not thorough or compelling enough for a 6.

### **Score 4 Response**

The problem with the argument is the assumption that if the Mason River were cleaned up, that people would use it for water sports and recreation. This is not necessarily true, as people may rank water sports among their favorite recreational activities, but that does not mean that those same people have the financial ability, time or equipment to pursue those interests.

However, even if the writer of the argument is correct in assuming that the Mason River will be used more by the city's residents, the argument does not say why the recreational facilities need more money. If recreational facilities already exist along the Mason River, why should the city allot more money to fund them? If the recreational facilities already in existence will be used more in the coming years, then they will be making more money for themselves, eliminating the need for the city government to devote more money to them.

According to the argument, the reason people are not using the Mason River for water sports is because of the smell and the quality of water, not because the recreational facilities are unacceptable.

If the city government allotted more money to the recreational facilities, then the budget is being cut from some other important city project. Also, if the assumptions proved unwarranted, and more people did not use the river for recreation, then much money has been wasted, not only the money for the recreational facilities, but also the money that was used to clean up the river to attract more people in the first place.

### **Reader Commentary**

This competent response identifies two unstated assumptions:

- that cleaning up the Mason River will lead to increased recreational use
- that existing facilities along the river need more funding

Paragraph 1 offers reasons why the first assumption is questionable (e.g., residents may not have the necessary time or money for water sports). Similarly, paragraphs 2 and 3 explain that riverside recreational facilities may already be adequate and may, in fact, produce additional income if usage increases. Thus, the response is adequately developed and satisfactorily organized to show how the argument depends on questionable assumptions.

However, this essay does not rise to a score of 5 because it fails to consider several other unstated assumptions (e.g., that the survey is reliable or that the efforts to clean the river will be successful). Furthermore, the final paragraph makes some extraneous, unsupported assertions of its own. Mason City may actually have a budget surplus so that cuts to other projects will not be necessary, and cleaning the river may provide other real benefits even if it is not used more for water sports. This response is generally free of errors in grammar and usage and displays sufficient control of language to support a score of 4.

### **Score 3 Response**

Surveys are created to speak for the people; however, surveys do not always speak for the whole community. A survey completed by Mason City residents concluded that the residents enjoy water sports as a form of recreation. If that is so evident, why has the river not been used? The blame can not be solely placed on the city park department. The city park department can only do as much as they observe. The real issue is not the residents use of the river, but their desire for a more pleasant smell and a more pleasant sight. If the city government cleans the river, it might take years for the smell to go away. If the budget is changed to accommodate the clean up of the Mason River, other problems will arise. The residents will then begin to complain about other issues in their city that will be ignored because of the great emphasis being placed on Mason River. If more money is taken out of the budget to clean the river an assumption can be made. This assumption is that the budget for another part of city maintenance or building will be tapped into to. In addition, to the budget being used to clean up Mason River, it will also be allocated in increasing riverside recreational facilities. The government is trying to appease its residents, and one can warrant that the role of the government is to please the people. There are many assumptions being made; however, the government can not make the assumption that people want the river to be cleaned so that they can use it for recreational water activities. The government has to realize the long term effects that their decision will have on the monetary value of their budget.

### **Reader Commentary**

Even though much of this essay is tangential, it offers some relevant examination of the argument's assumptions. The early sentences mention a questionable assumption (that the survey results are reliable) but do not explain how the survey might have been flawed. Then the response drifts to irrelevant matters — a defense of the city park department, a prediction of budget problems and the problem of pleasing city residents. Some statements even introduce unwarranted assumptions that are not part of the original argument (e.g., "The residents will then begin to complain about other issues" and "This assumption is that the budget for another part of city maintenance or building will be tapped into"). Near the end, the response does correctly note that city government should not assume that residents want to use the river for recreation. Hence, the proposal to increase funding for riverside recreational facilities may not be justified.

In summary, the language in this response is reasonably clear, but its examination of unstated assumptions remains limited and therefore earns a score of 3.

### **Score 2 Response**

This statement looks like logical, but there are some wrong sentences in it which is not logical.

First, this statement mentions raking water sports as their favorite recreational activities at the first sentence. However, it seems to have a relation between the first sentence and the sentence which mentions that increase the quality of the river's water and the river's smell. This is a wrong cause and result to solve the problem.

Second, as a response to the complaints from residents, the state plan to clean up the river. As a result, the state expects that water sports will increase. When you look at two sentences, the result is not appropriate for the cause.

Third, the last statement is the conclusion. However, even though residents rank water sports, the city government might devote the budget to another issue. This statement is also a wrong cause and result.

In summary, the statement is not logical because there are some errors in it. The supporting sentences are not strong enough to support this issue.

#### ***Reader Commentary***

Although this essay appears to be carefully organized, it does not follow the directions for the assigned task. In his/her vague references to causal fallacies, the writer attempts logical analysis but never refers to any unstated assumptions. Furthermore, several errors in grammar and sentence structure interfere with meaning (e.g., "This statement looks like logical, but there are some wrong sentences in it which is not logical").

Because this response "does not follow the directions for the assigned task" and contains errors in sentence structure and logical development, it earns a score of 2.

#### ***Score 1 Response***

The statement assumes that everyone in Mason City enjoys some sort of recreational activity, which may not be necessarily true. They statement also assumes that if the state cleans up the river, the use of the river for water sports will definitely increase.

#### ***Reader Commentary***

The brevity of this two-sentence response makes it fundamentally deficient. Sentence 1 states an assumption that is actually not present in the argument, and sentence 2 correctly states an assumption but provides no discussion of its implications. Although the response may begin to address the assigned task, it offers no development. As such, it is clearly "extremely brief ... providing little evidence of an organized response" and should earn a score of 1.

The following appeared in an article written by Dr. Karp, an anthropologist.

“Twenty years ago, Dr. Field, a noted anthropologist, visited the island of Tertia and concluded from his observations that children in Tertia were reared by an entire village rather than by their own biological parents. However, my recent interviews with children living in the group of islands that includes Tertia show that these children spend much more time talking about their biological parents than about other adults in the village. This research of mine proves that Dr. Field's conclusion about Tertian village culture is invalid and thus that the observation-centered approach to studying cultures is invalid as well. The interview-centered method that my team of graduate students is currently using in Tertia will establish a much more accurate understanding of child-rearing traditions there and in other island cultures.”

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.

### **Score 6 Response**

It might seem logical, at first glance, to agree with the argument in Dr. Karp's article that children in Tertia actually are raised by their biological parents (and perhaps even, by implication, that an observation-centered approach to anthropological study is not as valid as an interview-centered one). However, in order to fully evaluate this argument, we need to have a significant amount of additional evidence. The argument could end up being much weaker than it seems, or it might actually be quite valid. In order to make that determination, we need to know more then analyze what we learn.

The first piece of evidence that we would need in order to evaluate Dr. Karp's claims is information about whether or not Tertia and the surrounding island group have 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 that in teh intervening years Westerners had settled on the island and they introduced a more typical Western-style family structure, 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, as well, though his conclusion that Dr. Field's method is ineffective would be seriously weakened.

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 children on other islands nearby are raised by their biological parents.

In order to fully evaluate this article, we would also need 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 meant hat they are raised by their biological parents. 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, it is hard to accept Dr. Karp's conclusion.

It is slightly more difficult to discuss teh 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 order to fully evaluate this claim, in fact, we would need to look at many 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 a lot of additional evidence (ideally a metaanalysis of hundreds of anthropological studies).

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, 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). And we really need a lot more information if we want to extend the results of a study about one island culture to all anthropological fieldwork.

### **Reader Commentary**

This outstanding response clearly addresses the specific task directions and presents a cogent, insightful analysis by specifically detailing the impact that different pieces of evidence would have on the argument. The introductory paragraph sets up the organization of the response, and each body paragraph provides the sort of compelling development typical in responses that receive a score of 6. For example, after the writer discusses possible evidence that Tertian child rearing practices have changed over the past 20 years, he or she clearly explains the impact information about those changes might have on the argument, saying, "In that case, the original study could have been accurate, and Dr. Karp's study could be correct, as well, though his conclusion that Dr. Field's method is ineffective would be seriously weakened." Not only is this argument compelling, but it also demonstrates sophisticated syntax and facility with language. There is more insightful development in the fifth paragraph, in which the writer examines Dr. Karp's claims about interview-based studies. Although there are a few typos and minor errors here, nothing in the response distracts from the overall fluency of the writing. Sentences like this one demonstrate the fluent and precise diction and varied syntax that are evident throughout the response: "It could turn out to be the case, for example, that children on Tertia are raised communally, whereas children on other islands nearby are raised by their biological parents." Because of its compelling and insightful development and fluent and precise language, this response fits all of the bullet points for a 6.

### **Score 5 Response**

There seems to be an abundance of evidence that, if we were to examine it closely, might make us reconsider Dr. Karp's argument here. If we look first at the evidence that might weaken this argument, we can see a lot of the problems with Dr. Karp's article. It would certainly weaken the argument if we were to discover that Dr. Karp and his students did not actually conduct any of their interviews on the island of Tertia itself. Looking closely at the article, we see that Dr. Karp claims the interviews were conducted with children from the island group that includes Tertia. There is no evidence that they interviewed Tertian children. It would definitely weaken the argument if we were to learn that they interviewed children only on islands close to Tertia. Those islands may or may not have similar child-rearing traditions, and geographic proximity does not guarantee societal similarity.

Another piece of evidence that would weaken the argument could come from transcripts of the interviews themselves. Dr. Karp's article makes the claim that the children "spend much more time talking about their biological parents than about other adults," but he gives no indication of what exactly they say about their biological parents. After all, the children may be talking about how they never see their parents.

One more important piece of evidence that might undermine the argument Dr. Karp is making in this article. He admits that twenty years have passed since Dr. Field's study was conducted, but he does not provide evidence that proves child-rearing techniques have not changed significantly in that time. Any number of factors could have led to a significant shift in how children are raised. Influences from other cultures, significant catastrophic events, or a change in government structures could have led to a change in family dynamics. Any evidence of such changes would clearly undermine Dr. Karp's argument.

If we went looking for evidence that could strengthen the argument, we might also find something interesting. Obviously, some of the evidence above might strengthen the argument if they were NOT as discussed above (e.g., if there were evidence that the Tertian islands have NOT changed since Dr. Field's study or if there were transcripts that showed the children spoke about how much they loved living with their biological parents). However, if we discovered that there are numerous interview-based studies that confirm Dr. Karp's findings, it would go a long way toward bolstering his claim about Tertian child-rearing AND his claim about interview-centered studies being more effective. Another piece of evidence that would strengthen Dr. Karp's argument is undermining Dr. Field's original study. Maybe Dr. Field was sloppy, for example.

Dr. Karp's article, then, ends up looking like something of an empty shell. Depending on the evidence we find to fill it out, we may discover that it is quite convincing, or we could determine that he is full of hot air.



### **Reader Commentary**

This strong response presents a generally thoughtful and well-developed analysis of the argument, and it follows the specific task directions quite clearly. This writer approaches the task by first discussing the evidence that might weaken Dr. Karp's argument and then, in somewhat less depth, considering the evidence that could strengthen it. In both cases the writer analyzes the ways in which the evidence would bear on the argument. For example, the writer notes, "Influences from other cultures, significant catastrophic events, or a change in government structures could have led to a change in family dynamics. Any evidence of such changes would clearly undermine Dr. Karp's argument." Although the development presented here is strong, the response does not present the compelling development required for a 6. For instance, in the first paragraph there is some repetition, and in the third paragraph the reader must fill in the implications of potential "changes" in Tertia, which are not fully fleshed out. How could a catastrophic event or a change in governmental structure have led to changes in child rearing traditions? The development, then, is strong but not outstanding. Also, the response demonstrates some facility with language, though it does not convey meaning skillfully enough to merit a score of 6. In general, the response demonstrates strong writing skills, in spite of some minor errors like the sentence fragment that begins paragraph three. Sentences like this one demonstrate the quality of the writing seen throughout the response: "Those islands may or may not have similar childrearing traditions, and geographic proximity does not guarantee societal similarity." In terms of writing skill and analysis, then, this response earns a score of 5.

### **Score 4 Response**

Dr. Karp's arguments that his research proves that observation-centered research is invalid and that his interview-centered method "will establish a much more accurate understanding of child-rearing traditions there and in other island cultures" need more support. While the findings from Dr. Karp's interviews do challenge Dr. Field's results, one then cannot make the assumption that Dr. Field's research is invalid. This essay will attempt to explain three ways in which Dr. Karp can strengthen his argument.

First, Dr. Karp should provide more information about the content of the interviews. Misinterpretation from observation can be as likely as misinterpretation in interviews. It is possible that while children may spend more time talking about their own biological parents, other people from the village are still assisting in most of the rearing of the child. Perhaps asking the children how much time they spend with their parents, who disciplines them, and other specific questions about rearing would provide a more complete answer about who exactly is raising the children.

Second, Dr. Karp could provide some information about societal changes in the past twenty years. If there have been significant changes on the island of Tertia, it is possible that both anthropologists are correct. Twenty years ago, the entire village raised children, and now, biological parents raise their own children. Recent events could explain the change such as introduction of Western mass media or changes in government (monarchy to democracy). Perhaps even interviewing adults to get a better understanding on child rearing. Not to mention, interpreting information from children and using that information to generalize about an entire island is not the most effective means.

Thirdly, Dr. Karp needs more proof that the observation-centered approach to studying cultures is invalid. A potential mistake in one article can hardly invalidate an entire method of research. Other anthropologists who employ the interview-centered method need to dispute the work of anthropologists who use the observation-centered approach. Only when a significant amount of research can be disproved can an entire method of research be invalidated.

To conclude, Dr. Karp needs to do more research and provide more evidence before his large claims can be fully supported. In fact, it will take more than Dr. Karp alone to prove observation-centered method of research is invalid and further, that the interview-centered method is better. In terms of his own research, Dr. Karp needs to conduct more interviews on the Tertia islands and scientifically prove Dr. Field's research wrong.

### **Reader Commentary**

This adequate response manages to identify some important features of the argument, presenting a competent examination and generally following the task directions. The response does not merit a score of 5 or 6, however, because it does not present compelling or insightful development. The response identifies basic points about the content of the interviews, possible changes in Tertia, and observation-centered studies, but these points are developed only



adequately. Development in paragraph four (“Thirdly . . .”) is generic and thin, and the final paragraph just recapitulates the assertions made earlier. The response does follow the specific task instructions, but it does not develop its discussion of specific evidence fully. For example, there is a claim that “specific questions about rearing would provide a more complete answer about who exactly is raising the children,” but the response does not explain what sorts of questions would give which answers or how those answers would strengthen or weaken the argument. Also, language control in this response is merely adequate, not strong. There are some typos and other errors (e.g., a sentence fragment in paragraph 3: “Perhaps even interviewing adults to get a better understanding on child rearing”), but the response generally demonstrates control of the conventions of standard written English, and main points are made with reasonable clarity. Because of its adequate control of language and competent analysis, this response earns a score of 4.

### **Score 3 Response**

It will be very inappropriate to condemn Dr. Field’s observations and findings. A critical look and analyses of the argument shows that details of Dr. Field’s work was not given out. In fact, it is sad on the side of the writer to think that Dr.Fields work is invalid.

First, the fact that the children of Tertia spend much time talking about their biological parents than about other adults in the village can be interpreted in a different way. The writer did not give any clue on what exactly the children were saying about their biological parents. It could be that they were talking about their parents irresponsibility of rearing them by themselves than leaving them in the hands of the whole community to bring them up. In fact, the argument could have been strengthened if the writer gave what exactly the children were talking about.

On the other hand, the writer failed on his or her part as a researcher to look at the time frame from the time Dr. Field did his analyses to the the time writer also conducted His or Her research. This would have given him the insight as what new developments has taken place within the twenty years gap that Dr. Field did His analyses. The writer’s argument would have given a lot of meaning if the writer had research into the cultural developments that has taken place since the time Dr. fields last visited and didcompleted His work at Tertia.

Also, as a reader, the tone this writing is not very convincing. It almost seems like Dr. Karp is making Dr. Fields look bad, instead of supporting his own research with information. He really only says one sentence about his own research, the rest of it is about how Fields work is not as good and saying things about Fields work. He needs to have more details about his own work to really sell the reader on it. He needs to write more about what the interview-centered method is, since he does not even say what it is. This will be more convincing if it is less of an attack on Dr. Field and more about the researches.

On the whole the writer’s work is incomplete and His or Her criticisms are unfounded. The writer needs to change the qualitative way of His or Her research into a more quatitative approach. If done in this way the impact of His or Her findings will be very strong and convincing.

### **Reader Commentary**

Although this response analyzes some important features of the argument, it is limited in development and often lacks acceptable clarity in expressing its ideas. In particular, this response contains occasional major errors and frequent minor errors that can interfere with meaning. Misused words, subject/verb agreement problems, and other lapses occur throughout the response. In addition to the problems with language control, the response demonstrates limited relevant development. It is true that the response makes an attempt to follow the specific task instructions, identifying the fact that the argument might be strengthened by evidence that the children were talking in a positive manner about their parents. However, the response does not explain exactly how this evidence would strengthen the argument. Similarly, there is discussion of the elapsed time between the two studies, but the response does not clarify how information about the “cultural developments” over the past 20 years would strengthen the argument Dr. Karp is making. Additionally, some of the points the response is making are not actually relevant to an analysis of the logic of the argument. The discussion of Dr. Karp’s tone in the fourth paragraph, for example, is a rhetorical critique, not a logical one. There is an attempt to talk about evidence (“He needs to have more details . . .”), but the focus in this paragraph is on “selling” the reader, not creating a persuasive argument. Because of its limited development and language control, this response earns a score of 3.

## **Score 2 Response**

The argument is on the article written by Dr. Karp , an anthropologist and his study and the new plan to study the same in the tertia region. Dr. Karp has written an article on Children in Tertia and about the culture.

The argument is that they have not mention the type of interview and the type of questions of the interviewees. They haven't indicate the education level in the children and the background of the children. What are all the things the team is going to observe and study on the child rearing tradition is not clearly mention.

The team is going to study and correlate the tradition with the other island culture but there is a possibility of different environment of other island or different biological parents. The resource availability on one island is different than the other is also a possibility . In that situation it is not possible to correlate the culture between to island.

There is a possibility , Dr. Field's interview time , lacking of infrastructure in the tertia. There was no development of schools and other refreshment activity or the parents may not spent enough time with the children due to various reasons and that effect to the children , so they might have spend more time talking about their biological parent.

To support the argument more information about the nature, cultural background and also the type of infrastructure presence in the area is require, the kind of study carrying out in the study area is require. Which would help to give more support the argument.

## **Reader Commentary**

This response demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical writing. There seem to be some attempts at logical analysis, though none that specifically and clearly examine the evidence that might weaken or strengthen the argument. Additionally, there is little or no relevant or reasonable support for the writer's points. In large part, the lack of logical development seems to be due to the serious and frequent problems with language control seen throughout the response. There are basic errors in just about every sentence of the response, and these errors frequently interfere with meaning. This sentence exemplifies the problems seen throughout the response: "There was no development of schools and other refreshment activity or the parents may not spent enough time with the children due to various reasons and that effect to the children , so they might have spend more time talking about their biological parent." The writer is attempting to discuss some points that are relevant to an analysis of this argument, but meaning is obscured by all of the errors present. However, some meaning can be discerned, and these errors are not severe enough to drop the score to a 1.

## **Score 1 Response**

Twenty years ago Dr field an anthropologist found result after reserch that in small village of tertia children reared by entire village but according to dr karp he talked most of the children that they talk about there boiological parents. so it conclude that the reserch of dr field is unvalid now and what type of methods dr field used may be not cover all aspects of there culture and also other cultures of other islands. reared the children by entire village is not logical but in some cultures there are some surprizing customs . so may be dr field did not anlysed the culture of that island on various parameters , which we are using now a days. intrveiw with children and observing their behaviour is important because some time the person talk one thing and behave in different way look like either he not telling correct or he is showing his altitude in misguiding way. i think the behaviour of the children shows proper report of reserch and you can observe their altitude to the other adult peoples of the village and to their own biological parents. The expert reserch scholer can easily feel their emotions and behaviour during some time stay with their culture. dr field maybe more research time, maybe, for longer.

## **Reader Commentary**

This fundamentally deficient response mainly consists of a summary of the prompt, and although there is some evidence of understanding, the response provides little evidence of the ability to develop and organize an analysis of the argument. Also, severe problems in language persistently interfere with meaning. In fact, the material that does not come directly from the prompt is more or less incomprehensible.

The following appeared in a memorandum from the owner of Movies Galore, a chain of video rental stores.

“In order to reverse the recent decline in our profits, we must reduce operating expenses at Movies Galore’s ten video rental stores. Since we are famous for our special bargains, raising our rental prices is not a viable way to improve profits. Last month our store in downtown Marston significantly decreased its operating expenses by closing at 6:00 P.M. rather than 9:00 P.M. and by reducing its stock by eliminating all movies released more than five years ago. Therefore, in order to increase profits without jeopardizing our reputation for offering great movies at low prices, we recommend implementing similar changes in our other nine Movies Galore stores.”

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.

### **Score 6 Response**

One question which needs to be addressed before implementing the recommendation is whether there are not other ways to improve profits besides cutting operating expenses. Without proof, the author decides, first, that there are only two viable options for increasing the profits of Movies Galore: raising rental prices, and cutting costs. He rules out the first course, and hence claims the second option must be chosen. But it seems there may be alternative methods of increasing profits, such as initiating advertising campaigns or closing unprofitable Movies Galore locations.

Even if it is granted that there are only two options for increasing profitability — cutting costs, and raising rental prices — one might wonder why raising rental prices is so unthinkable. The author implies that because Movies Galore is famous for special bargains, raising the rental prices would eliminate this competitive advantage and decrease profitability. However, in making this conclusion, he makes several assumptions without considering questions that need to be addressed. First, he assumes that there is no room to raise current prices and yet maintain lower prices than competitors. One would need to ask if prices could be increased slightly, while keeping them cheap. Even if there is no room for such a strategy, the author assumes that Movies Galore’s reputation for bargain pricing would evaporate if they increased their prices slightly. Perhaps such a reputation would be widespread enough to persist despite a slight increase in prices. And thirdly, even if the reputation for bargains would be eliminated by an increase in prices, the author assumes that Movies Galore cannot change course and be successful in some other way. Perhaps it could instead become known as the store with the friendliest employees. Perhaps it already is, and the author is wrong to believe that a causal relationship between bargain prices and success exists, when the real cause of Movies Galore’s good reputation is entirely independent of its prices. The author needs to answer these questions to convince us that profits are caused by bargains, and not by the other factors that may be involved.

Another question that needs to be raised is whether or not the downtown Marston store is truly analogous to the other nine Movies Galore stores. The author seems to assume that because the cost-cutting measures worked at the Marston location, it will work at the others, but this is far from clear. Perhaps the patrons of the other Movies Galore locations would resent such changes in the hours and stock of their local stores.

Perhaps the most important question that needs to be asked is whether the Marston location’s changes truly increased profitability. The author writes that the Marston store decreased operating expenses by closing earlier and cutting its stock, but he makes no mention of increased profitability. It is quite possible that the Marston location’s profits decreased as a result of their cost cutting, and this is a question that needs to be addressed. The author then jumps to the conclusion that taking similar measures would increase profitability at other locations, though such a connection has not even been established at the Marston store.

Even if the cost-cutting measures increased profitability at the Marston store last month (and a causal relationship, though presumably assumed, is still far from evident), there is no guarantee that such measures would continue to increase profitability over time. One would need to ask: Why not observe how the Marston location’s action affect profitability over several months, before implementing such sweeping changes at every store? A single month is a very short time span, and the habits of customers may change slowly. As word gets around that the Marston store has cut their hours and their selection, they may in fact jeopardize their reputation for offering “great movies at low prices.” After all, the name of the franchise is Movies Galore,

and by drastically reducing the available selection, they may alienate their customer base. If, as mentioned above, Movies Galore is famous for more than its great bargains—if customers prefer Movies Galore because of its selections, as well—then such a move may drastically reduce profits over time. It seems extremely rash to implement such a new and relatively untried strategy at every Movies Galore location, before the effects can be fully observed and interpreted.

### **Reader Commentary**

This outstanding response clearly addresses the specific task directions and presents a cogent, insightful analysis by discussing specific questions that need to be addressed in order to analyze the argument presented. It is worth noting that although the directions ask for questions, it is not necessary that these be phrased in question form. The response articulately discusses the information needed to evaluate whether the recommendation is likely to have the predicted result and demonstrates how this information would help to evaluate the recommendation. There are many examples of ways in which the writer addresses questions without putting them in question form (e.g., “he assumes that there is no room to raise current prices and yet maintain lower prices than competitors. One would need to ask...” or “it seems there may be alternative methods of increasing profits”). Throughout this response, the writer provides the cogent development typical of a 6 response. For example, the discussion of Movies Galore’s reputation gets at a number of flaws in the argument’s reasoning, making nuanced points (e.g., “Perhaps it could instead become known as the store with the friendliest employees. Perhaps it already is...”) that create a compelling case for the writer’s objections. Transitions are natural, and the paragraphs build on one another, succinctly and completely developing the writer’s points. Because of its compelling and insightful development and fluent and precise language, this response fits all of the bullet points for a score of 6.

### **Score 5 Response**

Management’s prediction that declining profits could be reversed by reducing operating hours and reducing stock seems to be rash since there is little evidence that proper research has been conducted. It may be true that profits could be restored by cutting operating costs, but management needs to ask whether making these changes would have a negative impact on its best sources of revenue.

The management states that the downtown Marston store “significantly decreased its operating expenses by closing at 6:00pm rather than 9:00pm.” It is reasonable to think that closing at 6:00pm rather than 9:00pm would decrease operating expenses, but the business is concerned with renting movies and these may be the busiest and most profitable hours of operation. Could it be that most people renting movies have normal working hours and have leisure time at night and to fill that time they turn to renting movies? If management researches its daily rental history, it may discover that its peak rental hours are between 6:00pm and 9:00pm. If this is the case, the store could lose significant income or even go out of business altogether. If management wants to reverse a decline in profits by cutting hours of operation and thereby reducing expenses, it would be advantageous to determine through research which block of time during the day is the least profitable and then cut those hours of operation. For instance, if it is found that profits are lowest during the morning hours or around noon, it would be better to close the store during those hours rather than during the hours that bring in the greatest profits.

The management then states that operating expenses will also be cut “by eliminating all movies released ore than five years ago.” Again, more research is needed in order to determine if this would indeed help reverse the decline in profits that Movies Galore is experiencing. Is it possible that the success of a movie rental business is based on its ability to provide customers with a wide array of movie selections, both new and old? It could be dangerous for this business to eliminate its stock of older movies without first determining the percentages of income that come from each product. Management should research its history of movie rentals in order to determine if a significant percentage of its profits come from the rental of older movies. Even if little profit does come from older movies, it may still be unwise to eliminate the stock of older movies. If Movies Galore maintains a variety of movies, a person searching for a current movie may decide to rent an older movie as well. This may be especially relevent in the case of a new movie that is a sequel to an older movie or part of a trilogy. Reducing movie variety may also damage the reputation of the stores. The management states that Movie Galore already has a “reputation for offering great movies.” If movie variety is suddenly reduced, the stores may gain a negative reputation.

Overall, the management makes a prediction that is untrustworthy and potentially damaging. More research should be conducted to see if indeed such changes to cut operation costs will be effective, and if not, what

should be done instead. If the proper investigation is implemented by the management, Movies Galore stores may reverse the recent decline of profits.

### **Reader Commentary**

This strong response presents a generally thoughtful and well-developed analysis of the argument, and it follows the specific task directions clearly. The response approaches the task by asking questions that seek to understand whether the management of Movies Galore truly understands where its greatest profits are generated. It first questions whether closing the stores between 6:00 and 9:00 pm would be optimal since that is when people with “normal working hours” might have the leisure to rent movies, and, then, it questions whether eliminating movies released more than five years ago would be prudent since it is possible that profits rely on carrying “a wide array of movie selections, both new and old.” In both cases, the writer indicates the specific kinds of information that management would need to gather (e.g., “If management researches its daily rental history, it may discover that its peak rental hours are between 6:00pm and 9:00pm”) in order to determine whether its prediction is valid. Likewise, in both cases, the writer also analyzes the ways that this specific information would impact the predicted result (e.g., “If this is the case, the store could lose significant income or even go out of business altogether”). In general, then, development of the points the writer makes is thorough, but it is not as compelling as that required for a 6. Also, the response, on the whole, demonstrates facility with written English; however, it lacks the fluency necessary to merit a score of 6. In general, writing skills, in spite of a few spelling errors and some repetitious sentence structuring (several sentences in both the second and third paragraphs depend upon an “if...then” construction) are strong, as evidenced by the following characteristic sentence: “It is reasonable to think that closing at 6:00pm rather than 9:00pm would decrease operating expenses, but the business is concerned with renting movies and these may be the busiest and most profitable hours of operation.” In terms of writing skill and analysis, then, this response earns a score of 5.

### **Score 4 Response**

The owner of Movies Galore is proposing a reduction in operating expenses in all of its chain stores. This reduction would consist of closing the stores 3 hours early and reducing its stock to include movies released only within the last 5 years. To determine if this proposition would be effective in increasing profits across the chain, several pieces of additional information would be needed.

First, it is necessary to ask if the Marston store is similar to the other Movies Galore stores. If this is not the case, the proposition might have quite the opposite of the intended effect. The performance of the other stores would be a critical piece to this proposition since what works for one store, may not work for another.

Second, what effect did the reduction in operating expenses had on store profits in Marston? Because the declines in profit are termed to be “recent” and that the reduction of operating expenses happened within the last month, this is unclear. It is possible that only a brief period of low profits, consistent with variability in the market, spurred the reduction and this actually caused a greater decrease in profits. It is also possible that no improvements have been seen in profits since the reduction, rendering it ineffective. Data regarding profits from several months before and several months after the reduction in operating expenses would be necessary to determine if this reduction was at all helpful. Finally, to what degree did each of the two changes made, closing early and getting rid of older movies, affect profits? To determine if such a change would be helpful, it is important to understand how each variable contributed to the end result, assuming that it was effective. Perhaps closing early resulted in such a decline in the operating costs as employees did not have to be paid, that the reduction in their stock was unnecessary. It could be the the stock reduction actually decreased profits but this was masked by the increased profits caused by closing early. A more in depth analysis of the variables involved is necessary.

To accept such an extreme change in the practices of these stores, the preceeding recommendations should be followed. Specifically, the necessity of the reduction in other stores should be determined, data regarding the effectiveness of the reduction in operating expenses in the Marston store should be analyzed, and an analysis of the components of this reduction should be completed.

### **Reader Commentary**

This adequate response presents a competent examination of the argument and conveys meaning with acceptable clarity. In accordance with the task directions, the response raises appropriate questions that could help to evaluate the recommendation and its predicted result. Unlike the thoughtful development of a 5-level response, however, this response develops its ideas (i.e., answers to the questions it raises) unevenly, sometimes underdeveloping key claims.

For example, the relatively brief second paragraph supports the assertion that the downtown Marston store may not be comparable to the chain's other stores, but it does so with minimal reasoning. Other body paragraphs more satisfactorily develop questions about the timing of the recommendation and the profits that have actually been generated, while the conclusion merely recapitulates the assertions made earlier. A basic organizational structure, aided by the use of simple transitions between paragraphs and sufficient sentence variety within paragraphs, are other qualities of this response that underscore its adequacy. The language control is also adequate, demonstrating control, but not facility, with the conventions of standard written English. There are some minor grammatical errors and typos (e.g., there is a tense error in paragraph 3: "what effect did the reduction in operating expenses had on store profits in Marston?"; there is also vague diction in the same paragraph: "Because the declines in profit are termed to be 'recent' and that the reduction of operating expenses happened within the last month, this is unclear"), but the response manages to convey ideas with acceptable clarity overall. Because of its adequate analytical development and language control, this response earns a score of 4.

### **Score 3 Response**

It is imperative that "Movies Galore" must find a way to reduce operating expenses without jeopardizing its popularity with the customer. The option of reducing operating hours and reducing its stock of available movies is a good start, however these two ideas need some revising in order for them to be successful in turning the company's profits around.

The reduction of hours needs to be reversed. Instead of closing earlier they should open later. People go to the video store to rent movies more frequently in the evening hours than in the morning. In the morning is when most customers return movies. The adjustment in hours can be structured so that the store opens later in the morning, and customers can simply return the movies in a drop box, allowing the store to remain open later in the evening for people who want to rent movies.

Reducing the stock by "eliminating all movies released more than five years ago" is a good way to reduce costs, but again it may hurt business. Unlike food movies don't go bad after a certain amount of time. In some cases it is quite the opposite, they become classics. It would be bad business to assume that people will not want to rent movies over five years old, and "Movies Galore" might actually lose customers if they do so. Instead of eliminating an entire group of movies of a certain age, spread the reduction of stock throughout the entire store, making it a more subtle reduction to the consumer, but an effective cost-saver to the store.

The basic ideas of cutting stock and reducing operating hours do indicate saving money, however only if it is done correctly with both the business and the consumer in mind. It is obvious that "Movies Galore" has the consumer in mind because of its refusal to jeopardize their reputation "for offering great movies at a low price." So they need to consider exactly how their proposals are going to impact the consumer and whether or not they will actually lose business by putting these policies in place.

If the management at "Movies Galore" uses good business sense then there is no reason that their declining profits cannot be turned around, with little to no affect on the consumer.

### **Reader Commentary**

While this response conveys ideas with acceptable clarity, despite an occasional error, it earns a score in the lower half because it mainly discusses tangential matters. The introductory paragraph, for example, suggests that instead of presenting an examination of the prompt's logic, the response will offer business advice to turn "the company's profits around." And that is what paragraphs 2 and 4 do: they avoid relevant analysis and instead engage in analyzing tangential matters and generally agreeing with the prompt. Paragraph 2, for example, implicitly agrees with the reduction in hours but suggests that a better business tactic would be to switch the early closing for a later closing and later opening. Paragraph 4 agrees with the overall recommendation and concludes that Movies Galore is generally going in the right business direction. What relevant analysis is present occurs in paragraph 3, which questions the wisdom of reducing the stock of older movies since this might hurt rather than help profitability. So, although the response exhibits competent control of the conventions of standard written English, it does not manage to exhibit adequate development of relevant analysis. The fact that its relevant analysis is greatly outweighed by tangential material and business advice indicates that the response is limited in addressing the specific task directions. Thus, it merits a score of 3.



## **Score 2 Response**

In order to reverse the decrease or decline in the profits it is very necessary to take some steps which are beneficial to both the customer and the seller. Thus to increase the profits, offering movies at low prices can be one of the ways. This will not only increase the purchasing ability of the customers but also bring about an increase in the sales and the profits made by the company. Raising the rental prices of the videos would not be a better option because this will not lead to an increase in the profits made by the company. If the customers will get videos in lower price in comparison to the rent, they will prefer to purchase more videos then taking them on the rent. The increase in the profits can also be brought about by giving various exciting offers at different occasions, for example buy three and get one free video at the time of Christmas , New Year etc can attract more and more customers towards the stores and also bring about an increase in the profits earned by the stores.

Increase in the video sales can also be brought about by offering several discount schemes when the hit and great movies are being released. Thus, in order to increase the profits without jeopardizing the reputation of the stores , it is recommended to implement the similar changes as mentioned above in all the other nine Movies Galore stores.

### **Reader Commentary**

This response clearly fits the second bulleted description of a 2 in the scoring guide. It does not follow the directions of the assigned task. Instead of discussing questions that need to be addressed in order to determine if the recommendation is likely to have the predicted result, the writer merely posits potential strategies to increase profits. The response also develops ideas poorly and contains serious errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics, such as in this sentence: “If the customers will get videos in lower price in comparison to the rent, they will prefer to purchase more videos then taking them on the rent.” However, it is the response’s overall disregard of the specific task directions that earns it a score of 2.

## **Score 1 Response**

Yes reducing the price of the movies would attract more coustmers.No one will be ready to purchase a movie for a high price rather than that they could see the movie in a theater.Watching a movie in the theater would be lesser than renting the movie.

It is stated that making special bargains and increasing the rental prices will not result in yeilding any profits.

They had to shut down their store at 6:00pm instead of 9:00pm

### **Reader Commentary**

This response is fundamentally deficient. Although the response arguably offers some evidence that the writer understands the basic subject matter, it provides little evidence of understanding the argument made in the prompt. The “Yes” that begins the first sentence makes it seem as if the writer is responding to a claim made in the prompt, but the fact that the remainder of the sentence makes a claim that never appears in the prompt (i.e., “reducing the price of the movies would attract more coustmers”) suggests, at best, a very limited understanding of the argument. Although the brief opening paragraph is somewhat relevant to the argument’s assertion that “raising our rental prices is not a viable way to improve profits,” it is not sufficient to demonstrate either that the writer understands the argument or that the writer is able to develop an organized response. The second paragraph consists almost entirely of verbatim or poorly paraphrased material from the prompt and, as such, provides no additional evidence either that the writer understands the argument or that the writer has the ability to develop an organized response. Thus, despite its relatively clear use of language, this response demonstrates fundamental deficiencies in analytical writing that warrant a score of 1.

The following is taken from a memo from the advertising director of the Super Screen Movie Production Company.

"According to a recent report from our marketing department, during the past year, fewer people attended Super Screen-produced movies than in any other year. And yet the percentage of positive reviews by movie reviewers about specific Super Screen movies actually increased during the past year. Clearly, the contents of these reviews are not reaching enough of our prospective viewers. Thus, the problem lies not with the quality of our movies but with the public's lack of awareness that movies of good quality are available. Super Screen should therefore allocate a greater share of its budget next year to reaching the public through advertising."

Write a response in which you discuss what questions would need to be answered in order to decide whether the recommendation and the argument on which it is based are reasonable. Be sure to explain how the answers to these questions would help to evaluate the recommendation.

### **Score 6 Response**

The advertising director of the Super Screen Movie production company believes that increasing the amount of advertising the company does will increase the amount of people attending Super Screen produced movies. He believes this because during the past year fewer people than ever before attended Super Screen produced movies, yet the percentage of positive reviews about specific Super Screen produced movies increased over the past year. Ostensibly the extra advertising would tout the good reviews written about Super Screen movies. Before this plan is implemented, however, Super Screen needs to address some questions about its possible flaws.

First of all, the company needs to ask what the actual number of people attending its movies as compared to the movies of other production companies is. The number of people going to movies may have been in universal decline. If this is the case and more people are going to see Super Screen Movies than the movies of any other production company, advertising about how fun it is to go to the movie theater may do more to boost Super Screen viewership than advertising promoting its own good reviews.

Secondly, the company needs to ask what the actual original number of positive reviews was. If Super Screen movies recieved 1% positive reviews last year and this year they recieved 2% positive reviews, getting that message to viewers is not going to increase Super Screen attendance. Making better movies would be much more likely to increase attendance rates.

Finally, Super Screen needs to ask what the relationship is between its viewers and the movie reviewers cited in the memo. Using a survey distributed to its target audience, Super Screen could determine if movie reviews have an effect on their audience's decision to go see a movie, whether movie reviewers tended to have the same taste as the target audience and exactly whether or not movie reviews are reaching the audience. Super Screen also needs to consider how its movie choices have affected the separate movie reviewer and audience populations. If the studio has switched from making mega-blockbuster action movies to more nuanced dramas, the general public may be less willing to go see their movies even though movie critics prefer the dramas to the action movies.

Finally the studio must ask whether the percentage of positive reviews is really a relevant way to measure the potential impact of movie reviews. There are dozens of movie reviewers but when deciding whether to not to go to a movie, the general public will usually pick from among the 10 most popular movie reviews. These are the reviews that will impress the public if they are included in advertising. If the most popular movie reviewers disliked Super Screen movies that a larger number of small time film bloggers reviewed positively, Super Screen needs to think of a new advertising strategy.

In conclusion, there are many questions Super Screen needs to answer before using this advertising director's plan. They need to look carefully at actual numbers, both of viewership and of positive reviews. They also need to identify the relationship that their target audience has with movie reviewers and determine how their target audience feels about their movies. Finally they need to take a nuanced look at the movie reviews that they use in their advertising.

### **Reader Commentary**

This response clearly identifies aspects of the argument relevant to the assigned task and provides insightful, thoroughly developed analysis. Thus, it earns a score of 6. The response is clearly on task, examining the questions that would need to be answered in order to determine if the recommendation is reasonable. In each case, the writer perceptively explores the nuances of the question, showing different ways in which the answers to those questions might have an impact on the recommendation. For example, the first body paragraph looks at the issue of overall movie attendance, exploring the possibility that Super Screen might actually be doing better than other production companies. If that is the case, perhaps Super Screen's advertising is already effective, and the proposed plan to increase advertising would not have the intended effect. Throughout the response, the analysis is detailed and cogent, and the organization of the response is logical both within paragraphs and between paragraphs. In addition, although there are a few misspelled words, the response demonstrates facility with language, conveying ideas fluently and precisely. Sentences like this one demonstrate the superior control of the conventions of standard written English seen throughout this response: "If this is the case and more people are going to see Super Screen Movies than the movies of any other production company, advertising about how fun it is to go to the movie theater may do more to boost Super Screen viewership than advertising promoting its own good reviews." Because of its fluent language and insightful analysis, this response earns a score of 6.

### **Score 5 Response**

While the advertising director clearly aims at relitalizing his production company and ensuring that the public is well informed about the movies which are available, there are several basic flaws to his argument . There remain some questions that need answering before any steps can be taken with regard to advertising strategies for the Super Screen Movie Production Company.

First among these questions is this; were ticket sales of the entire movie industry down? This is an essential question because it helps to pinpoint the cause of the writer's problem. If the industry as a whole is undergoing poor revenues, then perhaps the issue is not Super Screen's advertising company but rather the country's economy. In times of economic strife, it is only natural that people would be less willing to spend money on luxuries such as movie tickets. If this is the case, it might better suit the production company to cut costs rather than refunneling them into a different part of the company.

Second, the advertising director should ask himself this; what medium do the majority of his most generous movie reviewers utilize? The writer states that movie reviews were generally positive, but where were these reviews located? On television, newspapers, or the Internet? It is possible that the medium used by the most positive reviewers of Super Screen's movies is one that is not utilized by most of the company's target audiences. If Super Screen produces many family films, but most of the good reviews are found in late night television shows, then there is a good chance that the reviews are not going to be seen by the target audience. If this is the case, then the company would be better off conducting research as to what medium is most likely to reach their audiences.

One last question would be this; what advertising is currently being used by the Super Screen company? If the company advertises using only one medium, such as in newspapers, perhaps the solution is not to double the amount of newspaper space but to branch out and try other forms of advertising. The writer fails to mention exactly how the company currently advertises their movies, and this absence detracts from his argument.

In conclusion, the advertising director would be better served by first answering these questions and evaluating the resulting answers before pouring millions of dollars into his solution. It is possible that an alternative solution exists, perhaps one that will not be as expensive nor as risky.

### **Reader Commentary**

This response earns a score of 5 because it presents generally perceptive analysis and maintains facility with language in spite of a few minor errors. The writer clearly identifies aspects of the argument relevant to the assigned task, looking at how the various points raised might impact the marketing director's recommendation. However, the development of each point is not as insightful as the development seen in the sample 6 (see, for example, the somewhat rudimentary paragraph about Super Screen's advertising media). In general, however, the development is perceptive, as in the exploration of a potential disconnect between the target audience and the media used by the reviewers, so the response rises above the adequate level. Language control in this response is also at the 5 level, as seen in the effective use of

sentence variety and appropriate word choice. Take, for example, this sentence, which demonstrates effective control of subordination and complex syntax: "If Super Screen produces many family films, but most of the good reviews are found in late night television shows, then there is a good chance that the reviews are not going to be seen by the target audience." Because of its perceptive analysis and strong control of language, then, this response earns a score of 5.

#### **Score 4 Response**

In order to decide whether or not the advertising director's recommendation is reasonable there are a lot more questions that need to be addressed. First of all it is important to look at the bigger picture. Fundamentally, has anything changed about Super Screen? Has new leadership come into the company? If so, how has that changed business practices?

Leadership changes or other changes within the company might have led Super Screen to choose to make different types of movies this year than it has in the past. It is important to determine whether or not different movie subjects/topics have influenced audiences. Many times there are discrepancies between how a reviewer rates a movie and how an audience rates a movie. It is important to determine whether or not the audiences are pleased with the products coming out of Super Screen, not just the movie reviewers.

Another question to ask is whether or not advertising has significantly changed over the past year. Has there been any less advertising this year than years before? If not, then again, the problem probably does not lie in advertising alone. If there have been some differences in the way movies were advertised, it would be important to look at some of those decisions and determine how they affected movie audiences. Perhaps the right audiences were not targeted for the right movies. If a childrens movie was released and all the advertising went into adult magazines, this would present an obvious problem.

In conclusion, it would not be a good idea to only up the advertising budget next year in an attempt to reach audiences. It is important to look at differences, if any, throughout the whole company and then determine the best course of action.

#### **Reader Commentary**

This response does identify questions that need to be answered in order to determine if the recommendation is reasonable, and the development of each point of analysis is adequate. Take, for example, the discussion of how Super Screen might have started making different types of movies this year. The writer notes, "It is important to determine whether or not different movie subjects/topics have influenced audiences. Many times there are discrepancies between how a reviewer rates a movie and how an audience rates a movie." This discussion is certainly relevant, and it is developed enough to make the point that positive reviews might not lead to more viewers. But the response does not demonstrate the perceptive analysis or the thorough development required for a higher score. As with the analysis, language control in this response is adequate. There are some minor errors, but all the writer's points are presented with adequate clarity. Because of its adequate analysis and language control, this response earns a score of 4.

#### **Score 3 Response**

There are a battery of questions that should be asked when deciding whether or not the advertising director's recommendation is reasonable. One of the most prevalent being "How many people actually take into account movie reviews when they are deciding which movie to watch?" For, if no one reads movie reviews before making these decisions, then the proposed plan from the movie director may not guarantee anything.

The second question would be this: "who exactly is doing the movie reviews?" For instance, if there is but one or two reviewers who are doing such work, can we be sure that such a small sample would be representative of our target market?

The director's argument is not necessarily fallacious. However, there is certain evidence that would have to be put forward to consider his proposal further. First of all, we need to know how our target market takes movie reviews into account. And lastly, we need to know who, and how many people, are conducting the reviews. Only then, can we make a maximally informed decision regarding the reviews.

### **Reader Commentary**

This response earns a score of 3 because of the limited development of its critique. The points that the writer makes are certainly relevant, and there is some attempt made to analyze the impact on the recommendation of the questions the writer raises. However, the response provides little support for each point. For example,

the discussion of “who exactly is doing the movie reviews” is supported only by the fairly generic notion that the sample size might be too small to be meaningful. This response uses repetition instead of developing its analysis, as seen in the final paragraph, which simply repeats the points made earlier in the response. Language control in this response is adequate, but it earns a score of 3 for limited development.

### **Score 2 Response**

It seems like the Super Screen Movie Production Company has good quality movies. However, it did not have enough viewers to see the movies. It is probably because not many people are aware of their movies that being showed. Their problem is how to let people know that their movies are showing. The Super Screen Movie Production Company need to come up with different strategies to let people know about their movies and has more advertisements done. If the company does the following three ideas, I think they are able to reach the number of prospective viewers. One of them is advertise their movies on television, second is to talk about their new movies on radio, and third is to post poster of their new movies every where that can catch people attention. This will be able to bring their number of viewers higher.

Television is a very popular electronic that no one can live without. After a long working hours, everyone watches television to relax such as the News, movies, soap opera, and so on. If the Super Screen Movie Production Company has their movie's advertisement during this hour, people will be able to see and know that there is a good quality movie around the corner. They will come and see the movie.

Everyone has to go to work. They have to drive in a car where they listen to their radio. This is the best time for the Super Screen Movie Production Company to talk about their new released movie. This give people a chance to hear about their new movie and decide whether to go see it or not.

Seeing a poster is worth more than a thousand words. Many students do not like to look at a paper with a lot of words, but if they see a poster with picture, they will stop and look right away. This is also helping the Super Screen Movie Production to increase their viewers. Not only students, the adults are the same. There are some people do not know how to read, so seeing a poster of the new movie will help them out a lot.

After discussing three different ways for the Super Screen Movie Production Company to advertise their movie to reach enough number of prospective viewers, I believe that their movies will get many more viewers to come see their movies. What easy ways to let people know about their movies by advertise them on television, talk about the movies on radio, and put posters of their movies up everyone that people can see.

### **Reader Commentary**

This response earns a score of 2 because it does not present an examination based on logical analysis. Instead, it agrees with the marketing director's argument and provides advice for how Super Screen could best increase its advertising (“One of them is advertise their movies on television, second is to talk about their new movies on radio, and third is to post poster of their new movies every where that can catch people attention.”). There are some minor errors in this response, but it does not demonstrate the serious problems in language characteristic of a 2 (language control is more at the 3 level). Instead, this response earns a 2 because it presents agreement and advice instead of logical analysis.

### **Score 1 Response**

According to this memo, It seems to be wrong things are not exist about Super Screeb Movie Production Company. That's it.

There are advantage of both ways - by listening to advice through personal experience. But I prefer to learn about the thing. Yes sure. in my country monumentally yes or not for his or her. i couldn't understand about terrable things Why did you sent me a reply I can not imagine that oh no

### ***Reader Commentary***

This incoherent response earns a score of 1. There is some evidence of an attempt to respond to the assigned topic (“It seems to be wrong things are not exist about Super Screeb Movie Production Company.”), but there is little or no evidence of understanding the argument. There is also little or no evidence of the ability to develop an organized response. In addition, the response contains pervasive errors that result in incoherence. For all these reasons, then, the response earns a score of 1.



Hospital statistics regarding people who go to the emergency room after roller-skating accidents indicate the need for more protective equipment. Within that group of people, 75 percent of those who had accidents in streets or parking lots had not been wearing any protective clothing (helmets, knee pads, etc.) or any light-reflecting material (clip-on lights, glow-in-the-dark wrist pads, etc.). Clearly, the statistics indicate that by investing in high-quality protective gear and reflective equipment, roller skaters will greatly reduce their risk of being severely injured in an accident.

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.

### **Score 6 Response**

The argument above is well-presented and appears to be relatively sound at first glance: because of the hospital statistics regarding people who go to the emergency room after roller-skating accidents, the roller skaters should investing in high-quality protective gear and reflective equipment in order to reduce their risk of being severely injured in an accident. However, as more light is shed on the issue and more detailed facts are concerned, it is easy to see that the argument suffers from several grave fallacies in its assumptions as well as commits a false analogy.

To begin with, as mentioned in the argument, there are two distinct kinds of gear—preventative gear, such as light reflecting material, and protective gear, such as helmets. Preventative gear is intended to warn others, presumably for the most part motorists, of the presence of the roller skater. It works only if the “other” is a responsible and caring individual who will afford the skater the necessary space and attention. Protective gear is intended to reduce the effect of any accident, whether it is caused by another, the skater or some force of nature. Protective gear does little, if anything, to prevent accidents but is presumed to reduce the injuries that occur in an accident. The statistics on injuries suffered by skaters would be more interesting if the skaters were grouped into those wearing no gear at all, those wearing protective gear only, those wearing preventative gear only and those wearing both. These statistics could provide skaters with a clearer understanding of which kinds of gear are more beneficial.

In addition, the argument is much weakened by the fact that it does not take into account the inherent differences between skaters who wear gear and those who do not. It is at least likely that those who wear gear may be generally more responsible and/or safety conscious individuals. The skaters who wear gear may be less likely to cause accidents through careless or dangerous behavior. It may, in fact, be their natural caution and responsibility that keeps them out of the emergency room rather than the gear itself. Also, the statistic above is based entirely on those who are skating in streets and parking lots which are relatively dangerous places to skate in the first place. People who are generally more safety conscious may choose to skate in safer areas such as parks or back yards.

Moreover, the statistic also can not make sense when come to the conclusion that safety gear prevents severe injuries. The conclusion suggests that it is presumed that people come to the emergency room only with severe injuries. This is certainly not the case. Also, given that skating is a recreational activity that may be primarily engaged in during evenings and weekends when doctors' offices are closed, skater with less severe injuries may be especially likely to come to the emergency room for treatment.

Last but not least, there is absolutely no evidence provided that high quality gear is any more beneficial than other kinds of gear. For example, a simple white t-shirt may be easily caught by others' sight that provide the same or even more preventative benefit as a higher quality, more expensive, shirt designed only for skating. Before skaters are encouraged to invest heavily in gear, a more complete understanding of the benefit provided by individual pieces of gear would be helpful.

Overall, the argument is far from forceful enough to persuade the roller skaters should invest in high-quality protective gear and reflective equipment in order to reduce their risk. Before any final decisions are made about whether the roller skaters should invest in high-quality protective gear and reflective equipment, much work is left for the arguer to do to make his/her argument more logical and cogent.

### **Reader Commentary**

This outstanding response presents a comprehensive examination of the argument's root flaws. Specifically, the response exposes several points that undermine the argument:

- that preventative gear and protective gear are not the same
- that skaters who wear gear may be less prone to accidents because they are, by nature, more responsible and cautious
- that the statistics do not differentiate by the severity of the injuries that gear may not need to be high-quality to be beneficial

The discussion is smoothly and logically organized, and each point is thoroughly and cogently developed. In addition, the writing is succinct, economical, and contains few minor errors. Sentences are varied and complex, and the diction is expressive and precise.

In sum, this response exemplifies a score of 6 because it presents cogent, well-articulated critique and conveys meaning skillfully.

### **Score 5 Response**

This argument is too weak to be convincing, relying on the correlation of two incomplete statistics. Correlation does not always imply causation, though it might be tempting to believe it is. Here, the implication is that protective gear will reduce the risk of accident. It assumes that lack of protective gear is the main cause of severe injury in roller skates, which is not necessarily true under any circumstance.

First, it claims that 75 percent of roller-skaters who have had accidents in streets or parking lots were not wearing any protective gear. This says nothing about the cause or the degree of severity of injuries. Some may have been hit by vehicles in broad daylight, in which case neither padding nor reflective material would have saved a skater. Common sense dictates that padding will reduce your risk of being injured, but in extreme cases, padding may do very little.

The argument also ignores the fact that roller-skating is something of an "extreme sport." While the injured may have been injured with roller skates on the street or in a parking lot, the injuries may have resulted from the skater's predilection for performing dangerous tricks. Often, these tricks involve careful balancing on thin objects while moving at high speed, and it is questionable how much padding would protect a skater. One would need to compare this to the statistics of injuries occurring in skate parks.

Lastly, the last 25 percent of emergency room cases of this type are also ignored. What would be useful are the types of injuries incurred on these people as a basis of comparison. They may all have been injured so severely that they are forced into extended hospital stays. By the same argument as given above, 100% of all skaters wearing protective gear suffered extreme injuries, thus it is imperative that skaters not wear any such accessories at all.

The use of statistics is a shaky way of bolstering an already decent argument. There are too many implications derived from the data the way it is presented. As such, the numbers are an indirect method of supporting the need for more protective accessories in skating. The argument could be improved by providing more statistics detailing the nature of injuries and a better representative group with which to compare data. One simply cannot compare injuries caused by carelessness or recklessness as opposed to general accidents, at least not statistically, as carelessness will improve the chances of injury. As it stands, the argument has too many holes with which it can be torn apart.

### **Reader Commentary**

This strong response sets out to critique the argument's use of statistics and its assumption that lack of protective gear causes more severe injuries, and it does just that. The response identifies and critiques insufficiencies of the statistics that cause the argument to be less than compelling:

- that the statistics do not differentiate between the causes or severity of the injuries that the statistics only represent people who skate in parking lots and streets, and that these people may engage in more dangerous activities than those who skate in skate parks

- that no information is given about the extent of the injuries for the other 25 percent who were wearing protective gear, and that their injuries might have been comparable to or worse than those who did not wear gear

The respondent develops each of these points by offering alternative explanations and, in paragraphs 2 and 3, by calling for additional data that would be needed to confirm or refute the argument's assumptions. The response does not analyze the argument as insightfully or develop its critique as fully as required for a 6, but the clear organization, strong control of language, and substantial degree of development warrant more than a score of 4.

#### **Score 4 Response**

This argument is based on the claim that investing in high-quality protective gear and reflective equipment, roller skaters will reduce the risk of being severely injured in an accident. This is based on a statistic that states that 75 percent of the people who go to the emergency room after a roller-skating accident had not been wearing any protective clothing or light-reflecting material. However, this argument makes many assumptions which weaken the argument as a whole.

First, the argument assumes that the people who went to the emergency room after roller-skating injuries were skating properly. The accidents could have been avoided if the skaters were following skating rules, such as where to skate and obeying laws of traffic. Any violations to these skating rules could have been the reason the skaters were injured. However, the argument fails to address this issue, which makes it unsound.

Second, the argument assumes that the skaters who were injured did not take any abnormal risks. The accidents could have occurred because of the risks taken by the skaters. Readers do not know if the statistics were collected from a representative sample. The data could have been collected from a group of young males who tend to take risks greater than those of older women, but the argument does not address this issue. The argument assumes that the statistics sample the population accurately, which provides weakness to this argument.

Last, the argument assumes that protective equipment will solve the problem of severe roller-skating injuries. In actuality, the assumptions that the argument makes prior to this assumption creates a great deal of skepticism for readers. There are many external factors that were not addressed in this argument and that would alter the conclusion if they were considered. It weakens the argument to assume that the addition of protective gear would directly reduce the risk of being severely injured in an accident.

For all these reasons, the argument can be viewed as fundamentally unsound. The argument could be strengthened by addressing whether or not the skaters followed rules and laws effecting skating. It could be strengthened by identifying the risks taken by the skaters from which the data was collected. And the argument could be greatly strengthened by eliminating any external forces or addressing them in the argument. All of these adjustments would provide the argument with a solid foundation.

#### **Reader Commentary**

This response presents a competent critique of the argument and conveys meaning adequately.

After paraphrasing the argument in paragraph 1, the respondent analyzes some questionable assumptions:

- that skaters who went to the emergency room had been skating properly and obeying traffic laws that skaters who went to the emergency room did not take any abnormal risks
- that statistics were collected from a representative sample
- that protective equipment will solve the problem of severe roller-skating injuries

At first glance, the response appears well organized and each point seems equally developed. However, it is not clear that "skating properly" and "not tak[ing] any abnormal risks" are two separate issues as suggested by the organization of the response. Rather than organizing information logically, the respondent attempts to fit the critique into a formulaic package. In addition, the discussion in paragraph 4 offers little in the way of analysis, instead relying on empty generalities. Despite appearances, discussion of the points listed above is only adequately developed and competently presented. The response is not thorough or thoughtful enough to merit a score of 5.

The writer's general control of language also supports a score of 4. The paper is free of significant or persistent errors. Diction is apt and sentence construction is generally skillful.

### **Score 3 Response**

In many roller skating accidents the person injured is not wearing appropriate protective equipment. The statement assumes that the cause of the accident was the injured persons lack of high-quality protective gear and reflective equipment. The statment does not address the fact that accidents can occur and injuries may result even if a person does have the appropraite high-quality protective gear and reflective equipment.

The hospital statistics does show that 25% of those injured in roller-skating accidents in a street or parking lot were wearing some form of protective clothing although they were still injured. This shows that their is a 1 in 4 chance that someone wearing protective equipment will stil be injured if involved in an accident. The arguement depends purely on assumptions that the accidents that roller-skaters are involved in are minor and not life threatening. The their was a greater amount of life-threateing injuries such as roller-skater verses automobile, the fact that they wore protective equipment would be of little help to the injured person.

More analysis would need to be done before deciding if the high-quality protective gear and reflective equipment would greatly reduce the risk of being severely injured in an accident. One must consider what types of accidents roller-skaters are most likely to get into and weither they would be injured despite the fact that they wear protective equipment.

### **Reader Commentary**

This response demonstrates some competence in its critique of the argument and in conveying meaning but is obviously flawed.

This response suffers from poor reasoning, both in its interpretation and in its criticism of the argument. First, the response misstates the argument's conclusion in paragraph 1: "The statement assumes that the cause of the accident was the injured persons lack of high-quality protective gear and reflective equipment." From this faulty reading of the prompt, a slew of illogic progresses.

The response focuses its critique on the 25 percent of skaters who suffered injuries despite having worn some type of protective or reflective equipment. From this fact, the respondent draws a faulty conclusion that there is a 1 in 4 chance that someone wearing protective equipment will still be injured in an accident. Even if that followed from the original statistics, the respondent does not explain how such a fact weakens the argument.

In the end the response does offer two potentially relevant points of criticism:

- that the type of injuries is not addressed
- that the type of accidents is not addressed

However, these points are undeveloped; the response calls for more information about types of accidents and injuries but does not explain how such information would strengthen the argument.

There are a few minor errors in writing. However, it is lack of development and poor reasoning that force a score of 3.

### **Score 2 Response**

The judgement is questionable. First, the the statistics focus on the protective equipment of rollerskating, but it shows us that statistics in streets or parking lots. Isn't it strang? whether the equipment is useful or not should be test in the rollerskating field.

Second, the statistics only show the 75 percent of people who go to the emergency room without protective equipment, but how about the people who wear equipment. Maybe the people with protective equipment become careless and they are dead in accidents, so they are not counted in these statistics.

In order to make consumer believe the use of the protective equipments, the satistics should show the injure population with and without equipments and the noninjure pepulation with and without equipments. Moreover, it should divide the injure conditions. There is a large different from bone break and skin break.

Finally, without more detailed, I do not think the judgement is correct.

### ***Reader Commentary***

This response demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical writing. The response attempts critique based on logical analysis but fails to provide reasonable development.

The response offers three other points of critique:

- the statistics are “questionable” because they only represent skaters who skate in the street or parking lots (“it shows us that statistics in streets or parking lots. Isn’t it strang?”)
- the statistics are misleading because they do not include skaters who have died while wearing protective equipment
- the statistics should differentiate between type of injuries (“it should divide the injure conditions”)

While these are valid points of critique (that are often used in more successful responses), this response fails to provide relevant and reasonable support for them. In addition, this response has serious problems in the use of language and sentence structure that interfere with meaning (see examples above).

### ***Score 1 Response***

If the assumptions contained within this arguement are true then it could be correlated that not only would protective gear assist in reducing injury occurance amongst rollerbladers but could also initiate city code to enforce such gear to be worn. If the arguement is a falsehood and the injury could be conected more to the time of day injury occured or even the sport itself then there will no change in the injury occurance rate.

### ***Reader Commentary***

This fundamentally deficient response offers two hypothetical scenarios: what would happen if the argument were true; and what would happen if the argument were false. There is no evidence of an ability to understand or analyze the argument. In addition, each of the two sentences contains minor errors in grammar. However, it is primarily the lack of critique that forces a score of 1.

The following is a memorandum from the business manager of a television station.

“Over the past year, our late-night news program has devoted increased time to national news and less time to weather and local news. During this time period, most of the complaints received from viewers were concerned with our station’s coverage of weather and local news. In addition, local businesses that used to advertise during our late-night news program have just canceled their advertising contracts with us. Therefore, in order to attract more viewers to the program and to avoid losing any further advertising revenues, we should restore the time devoted to weather and local news to its former level.”

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.

### **Score 6 Response**

The decision to restore the time devoted to weather and local news to its former level is one that should be made with more careful consideration of evidence, data, and viewer/client feedback by the business manager of this television station. Many assumptions have been made on the business manager’s part about the exact cause of the problems with the program. He or she should approach the idea of making changes with more caution.

The memorandum stated that more complaints received from viewers were concerned with the station’s coverage of weather and local news, but it did not state the nature of the complaints. The viewers may have been complaining about the accuracy or quality of the weather and local news rather than the shortened length of the segments. More specific information about the complaints—including whether they were about the late-night edition or about other news programs during the day—would support the argument because it would show if there was a relationship between the shortened length of the segments in the late-night news program and the viewers’ dissatisfaction with these particular segments. Sometimes it is the personalities and the chemistry of the news anchors that govern people’s decisions about which station’s news they watch. The business manager will never know unless he asks the viewers exactly why they do or do not enjoy watching his news program.

Additionally, stated in the memorandum was the fact that local businesses had just canceled their advertising contracts with the station. An assumption being made is that the reason businesses were pulling their ads was directly related to the shortened segments of the weather and local news. Considering the fact that more than one business just pulled their ad, other factors could have been involved, such as any controversy that the station’s national news may have recently brought up. Janet Jackson’s notorious wardrobe malfunction comes to mind. Though that incident happened during a national sporting event, there are many controversial national news topics that have the potential to create such a stir with the local public. If the manager could establish that businesses discontinued advertising contracts specifically because they were displeased with the change in news coverage, and that the remaining advertisers are on the verge of leaving if coverage of weather and local news is not increased, that information would help eliminate other possible explanations.

Evidence that research had been conducted to find specific ways to attract viewers to a news program would also strengthen the argument. Moreover, findings from research about what viewers would like to see on the program may help. Assuming that they would like to see more weather and local news does not seem safe. Perhaps they are looking for something besides national news, local news, and weather all together. Or possibly they are tuning into another station that has something in their program that draws their attention. Data about which ratings are highest and what people are watching would assist the business manager in his or her decision about how to change the program.

The station cannot expect to go back to the programming it once had and be successful. Obviously, something about the previous programming must not have been working; otherwise they would not have changed their structure the last time. They cannot expect to see different results if they go back to the same structure. Careful analysis of all the factors I have presented is the best first step to making a change in the structure of their news program.



## **Reader Commentary**

This outstanding response clearly identifies specific evidence necessary to evaluate the argument, and explains lucidly why the evidence is necessary. This response does a particularly nice job of both identifying specific evidence that would strengthen the prompt's argument and identifying evidence that would undermine the argument. For example, the response notes that while the argument assumes that lost advertising contracts are the result of the station's decreased attention to weather and local news, myriad factors, this assumption is unsupported by specific evidence. The response then provides a cogent and thorough discussion of the kinds of evidence needed to examine this assumption and how the evidence might strengthen or weaken the prompt's argument.

Each paragraph here is fully and cogently developed, and the response as a whole is organized logically. Finally, the response consistently demonstrates fluency and skillful use of language. For these reasons, the response earns a score of 6.

## **Score 5 Response**

As the business manager of the television station, I would be concerned with two things; the fact that there are fewer advertisers during the late-night news, and the increased complaints received from viewers about weather and local news. To support the argument that the station should restore the time devoted to weather and local news, I would carefully analyze the reasons for these factors.

In regards to the complaints received, I would gather specific accounts that address both the issue of weather and local news. Several recorded phone calls, emails, or letters would suffice to show first-hand data that there is concern among some viewers. Next, I would do a thorough study into what percent of complaints are about news and weather, as opposed to other content of the program. If content complaints as well as specific weather and local-news related complaints are up, this would not support my argument.

If historical evidence about viewership and number of written grievances could be gathered, this would be even better. The station could look at the specific complaints, and number of comments from the previous year and compare them to this year's. Next, I would conduct surveys of viewers to understand the reasons why they watch the late-night news. I would also look at trends and variations among viewers of morning, evening, and late-night news. There is a chance that the demographics of individuals watching at these various times are completely different. A broad large-scale survey could be conducted to determine viewer interests. If other stations have taken such measures, perhaps this station could get a copy of results, to look at larger trends in the country. Before we assume that bringing back more local news and weather will increase our viewership, we need to understand why those individuals are not happy right now.

In terms of a station's success, funding from advertisers is very important. A station can run if they lack the audience, but have a financial backing; not the other way around. I would ask the advertisers who have dropped their contracts with the station why they did so. If the reasoning was because the receptionist was rude to them last time they called the station, then we could address that problem instead of rearranging our programming. We could also analyze what kinds of local advertisers are leaving. It could be that they have found more of an audience for their product advertising on another time-slot, or more specific special-interest cable channel that speaks more to their market. It would also be beneficial to speak with the advertisers as their marketing people may have better insight into the viewership of the late-night news than the station has. The previously mentioned viewer survey could have already been done by the local business advertisers, and this could help the station realign itself with the market. Though it might be difficult to coordinate, it would definitely be advantageous to contact other local station to inquire about their contract status with the local businesses. A general lackluster response from community business could be a result of a larger-scale economic downturn, rather than the change in programming of one station. If the station wants the support back from local business advertisers, it can't just make assumptions about what is driving contracts with television stations.

Lastly, if all evidence seemed to suggest that the decreased coverage of local news and weather was the reason for increased complaints from viewers and dropped contracts of local business advertisers, then there could be a test pilot week or month of heavier coverage of weather and local news during the late-night broadcasting. If complaints are still pouring in, it might be time to hire the news anchor at least to thoroughly analyze the possible consequences and reasons for doing so.

### **Reader Commentary**

This strong response offers a generally thoughtful and well-developed discussion of the specific evidence needed to evaluate the prompt's argument. In particular, the essay cites the need to obtain evidence detailing the nature and scope of the complaints, the preferences of the audience, and the reasons for the cancelled advertising contracts. Although this response sometimes lacks the full and cogent development of a 6, it does indicate how and why different types of evidence are necessary for a thorough evaluation of the argument. The response also occasionally digresses from its discussion of the evidence needed to evaluate the argument into specific strategies the television station might use to gather the needed evidence. On the whole, the essay conveys ideas clearly and demonstrates facility with standard written English but the response does lack the fluency and precision of language necessary for a 6. For these reasons, the response warrants a score of 5.

### **Score 4 Response**

In order for this argument to be strengthened, specific details about the viewers complaining and the businesses that pulled advertising need to be elucidated.

First, the station should be concerned about what the viewers are specifically complaining about in regards to the weather and local news coverage. It is possible that the viewers were complaining for various reasons, which may include the following: the anchorperson or weatherperson, and their physical appearance, or delivery of the news/weather, the quality of the graphics being used during these segments, or the quality or choice of the stories covered. The television station needs to determine the exact complaints, for it would strengthen the above argument if the complaints were specifically about the time spent on the local news and weather.

Along the lines of clarity, the station needs to determine the reasons why local businesses cancelled their advertising contracts. Alternative reasons for this may include another station offering cheaper air time during the same time slot, the local economy going bad, leading to these companies needing to cut costs in advertising, or consumer reports for the companies that detail better times to advertise to their customers. The television station may be losing these advertising contracts for other reasons than time devoted to local news and weather.

Finally, a closer look at viewer numbers might strengthen the argument that time spent on local news and weather is affecting this aspect. Support for this memorandum would come in the form of viewer percentages dropping the after the time devoted to national news increased. The business manager should make sure that the viewer numbers did not increase over the past year because of the increase in national news coverage. This would invalidate the argument in regards to attracting more viewers.

In conclusion, to strengthen or support the argument that restoring the time devoted to local news and weather would attract new viewers and avoid losing contracts, the business manager needs to outline that the complaints from viewers and cancelling of advertising contracts specifically occurred because of the shift to increased national news coverage.

### **Reader Commentary**

This response earns a score of 4 by demonstrating competence both in its analysis of the argument and in its control of language. The response opens by noting the need for "specific details about the viewers complaining and the businesses that pulled advertising." It goes on to discuss how evidence suggesting alternative explanations for the viewer complaints and loss of advertising would undermine the argument. Although the essay provides some satisfactory support for and development of its analysis, the analysis as a whole is competent rather than generally thoughtful. Similarly, the response conveys meaning with only acceptable clarity.

### **Score 3 Response**

The aforementioned argument is a quality assessment of a potentially costly situation. In order for the news agency to ensure its continued success at the level that they once were it is absolutely necessary that they return to the level of local news that they once had. The argument that has been presented to me seems to be logical one. There is a clear statement of the problem and there is a significant amount of detail that leads readers to see that the decline in the amount of business that the station does is directly related to the dereliction that it is given to the local news.

However, in order to make this argument stronger than it already is, I think that there are certain things that could be added to bolster the information that is already here. First of all, it may be necessary to include some sort of survey results from both the community and local businesses to ensure that the reason that they have withdrawn their business is because of the program's focus shift. It may be possible that this station is merely doing a bad job at delivering the news and that this is the reason for the decline. It is important to make sure the motivation for changing formats is the correct one.

Secondly, it should be noted that it is important to examine the complaints that were received during this time period. The information provided does not specify whether there was a spike in the amount of complaints that were coming in, or whether it was merely the same amount as usual. This would also be a point that needs to be examined closely before any definite decision could be made.

All in all, I think that the information that has been provided here is a sound and logical argument for returning the news back to the original format. However, I also feel that if the suggestions that I made were taken seriously, then it may be possible to make this argument even better than it originally was.

### ***Reader Commentary***

Although the response seems largely to accept the argument's claims, it demonstrates some competence in addressing the task by noting the need for information that could "bolster the information that is already there." The response goes on to question whether advertisers might have withdrawn for other reasons and whether the level of viewer complaints was any different from the usual, but the discussion does not go much beyond emphasizing the need for information. Moreover, though the discussion implies how particular pieces of evidence would strengthen the response, it does not articulate an explanation. Organization here is adequate, and control of language, though somewhat uneven, is sufficient to convey ideas with acceptable clarity. In short, although the response's organization and control of language might be sufficient to warrant an upper-half score, the response must receive a score of 3 due to its limited development of relevant analysis.

### ***Score 2 Response***

In this passage, it is evident that the problem began when the formation of the station time had changed. There is a need for local and weather news in the late-night news programs. What is being targeted here is that if the late-nightly news is for local viewers, then local viewers should get the local news and weather followed by the world news. As Americans were affected by what is happening in the world, but the most affected news is of what is happening in the 'back yard.'

There has to be a compromise in news watching. There may be news that affects us in a far instead of up close. Most Americans want to know what happened nearby, while others want to know what happened far away. Before the circulation had changed, the news station should have given a pole of all the late-night viewers to determine which program would be more beneficial to them, world news or local/weather news.

In late-night news, the only viewers who would view this are the viewers who would be up late, which means these people work through the after-noon and evenings and miss the news broadcast at this time. The early day viewers usually watch the news during the morning and evening news. Even though the late-night viewers are watching the news, they still want to see what tomorrow will bring as far as controversy in the neighborhood or rain. Advertisements should be played mostly during the evening and the nightly news for better response to the ads. Most Americans work morning to evening and watch the evening and nightly news.

With this news program playing in the late-night, most views are not affected by it. When the news is playing and there is crucial information that needs to be heard, there are some Americans who rarely want to look at local advertisement, especially since they may be sleeping or working during the regular business hours of the advertiser.

There are many points that can be argued on the late-night news mainly because it is late-night. It does not affect the majority of the American population because they are mostly sleeping. For a company who is advertising during this time frame, there should be an inclusion in the contract with the news company that states the advertisement that plays on late-night news should also play on the morning news or on the evening news. With this exposure, the contract would be satisfied.

### ***Reader Commentary***

Rather than identifying specific evidence needed to evaluate the prompt's argument, this response consists largely of a lengthy discussion of why and when people watch news programs. The essay's only acknowledgement of the assigned task appears in the second paragraph where the writer suggests that the station "should have given a pole" to determine what kind of information late-night viewers want. However, this call for additional evidence is not developed or supported in any way.

The response also suffers from errors in usage, grammar, and syntax that interfere with meaning (for example, in such sentences as "When the news is playing and there is crucial information that needs to be heard, there are some Americans who rarely want to look at local advertisement, especially since they may be sleeping or working during the regular business hours of the advertiser"). Although these errors are not frequent or serious enough to rule out a score of 3, the response must, nevertheless, receive a score of 2 because it largely disregards the specific task directions.

### ***Score 1 Response***

The viewers concern local news. The local businesses want advertising.

I think the business manager should decrease national news for a television station will increase weather and local news. The local Advertising will be come back. The programs should have national news, local news, weather and advertising. The manager must be look for the structure of the TV time.

In conclusion, I think the manager should restore the time to national news and talk with local business advertising for a television station.

### ***Reader Commentary***

Although this response suggests some slight understanding of the argument's content and provides some visual cues that suggest organization, it suffers from pervasive errors in grammar and sentence structure that result in near-incoherence. Thus, the appropriate score is a 1.