**Homework 6**

The author of the issue recommends that Quiot Manufacturing should decrease their work hours in order to reduce the percentage of on-the-job accidents among their workers. To support this recommendation the author points out that Panoply Industries factory had 30 percent less on-the-job accidents than Quiot Manufacturing, due to the fact that Panoply Industries plant had shorter time shift. This argument rests on a series of unsubstantiated assumptions, and is therefore unpersuasive as it stands.

A threshold assumption upon which the recommendation relies is that the percentage of on-the-job accidents in the Panoply Industries factory is absolutely accurate. The writer fails to substantiate this crucial assumption. Maybe the Panoply Industries factory underestimates the prevalence of on-the-job accidents among their workers. There is no firm evidence to prove this assumption. Besides, the author assumes that shorter work shifts are responsible for lower percentage of on-the-job accidents in the Panoply Industries factory. However, it is entirely possible that one or more other factors were instead responsible for this low percentage. Maybe the Panoply Industries factory has high- tech equipment that prevents accidents. Or maybe, the Panoply Industries plant teaches their workers about workplace safety. Either scenario would provide an alternative explanation for lower percentage of on-the-job accidents in the Panoply Industries factory.

Even assuming that the shorter work shifts are attributable to lower percentage of on-the-job accidents, the author fails to consider possible differences between the Panoply Industry factory and Quiot Manufacturing that might help to bring different results for Quiot Manufacturing. For instance, maybe Quiot’s worker have less salary than the Panoply Industries factory and have to work after finishing their work shifts in the factory. The other problem is that the writer assumes that what experts declare about the relationship between on-the-job accidents and the prevalence of fatigue and sleep deprivation among workers is completely correct, but maybe it is not true. Besides, what experts say is so general and there is no evidence to definitely prove that this is the case.

The other problem is that the writer assumes that if the Quiot Manufacturing shortens their work shifts by one hour, their employees will get adequate amount of sleep and will increase their productivity. But maybe their workers do other activities rather than sleeping in their extra hour. Besides, there is no evidence that by sleeping one hour more, the prevalence of fatigue will decrease among workers and maybe they need more than one hour. Even assuming that this extra hour will solve the sleep deprivation problem among workers, the writer fail to substantiate that decreasing sleep deprivation is responsible for increasing productivity. The writer must supply clear evidence that decreasing sleep deprivation among workers, and not some other factor, is responsible for high productivity.

In final analysis, the author recommendation cannot be taken to be correct because, as it was shown in the body paragraphs above, it depends on a number of assumptions each of which is questionable. The recommendation can only be accepted if the weaknesses already referred to are all removed.
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