

The following appeared as part of an article in the business section of a local newspaper:

“Ronnie’s Auto Repair Shop commenced business four months ago at the location formerly occupied by the Jenny’s Beauty Parlour. Ronnie’s Auto must be doing well at this location, because it intends to open a big shop in an adjacent town. Jenny’s, on the other hand, has seen a lower volume of business in its first year at its new location compared to the prior year at its former location. Jenny’s definitely erred in shifting to its new location; its former location is a better site.”

Discuss how well reasoned you find this argument. In your discussion be sure to analyse the line of reasoning and the use of evidence in the argument. For example, you may need to consider what questionable assumptions underlie the thinking and what alternative explanations or counterexamples might weaken the conclusion. You can also discuss what sort of evidence would strengthen or refute the argument, what changes in the argument would make it more logically sound, and what, if anything, would help you better evaluate its conclusion.

Argument:

The statement given by the author about Jenny erred in shifting her Beauty Parlour to its new location and its former location is a better site, is unsound. Without sufficient information about the economical growth of a place, the author claims his comparison of a contrary businesses and their locations. On the other hand, there are many possible reasons to explain Ronnie's intention on opening a big body shop in an adjacent town. Supporting his claim with Ronnie’s new large auto plans is not agreeable.

The major problem with the given passage is that the author compares an auto body shop to a beauty parlour. It is like comparing a food with an electronic good, totally different businesses compared. Ronnie’s Auto body shop is doing well because of the location where a lot of people might be interested in doing such businesses. And when compared to Jenny’s Beauty Parlor is not in a good fit, since the customer base of the location is not good. So Jenny’s idea to move to a new location might be a good one.

The author’s claim about Ronnie’s current location of business is going well can be acceptable. On the other hand assuming Ronnie’s intentions about opening a new big shop with current location’s goodness is obviously flawed. To our assumption we can also claim Ronnie might be shifting his location of some other branch of his shop to the new big opening or there might be some other shops that might be running out of business. So the assumption made to prove Ronnie’s current location is the only factor given him the good business is unsound.

Atlast, the author concludes the error totally on Jenny's shifting location and lower volume of business as a reason for Jenny's business drop. Moving a business to a new location with a low sourced business might be the reason for Jenny's drop in business. Instead, the author claims the old location might give her a good raise. Either way, a lower volume business leading to a lower profit is not implied. Considering the affordable price of lease and cost of living for Jenny provides her a better quality of life, which she might have prioritized than her profits from Beauty parlour. Maybe Jenny's lease and other costs are lower at the new location, resulting in the higher profits. Despite the factor of profits in the new place, obviously the move is not a mistake unless Jenny's ownership fails in the former place.