

GMAT作文6篇Argument 范文下载 PDF转换可能丢失图片或格式，建议阅读原文

https://www.100test.com/kao_ti2020/217/2021_2022_GMAT_E4_BD_9C_E6_96_87_c89_217286.htm GMATAWA1 : Argument

Writing Samples 写作题目见权威辅导 (PP2) 第258页，共89篇

：这些文章的价值不在于它们的语言表达（尚有不少不当之处，有待改进），而在于它们提出的观点具有启发作用。请

不要背样文，应背写作模式及每篇的理由。1. Citing facts

drawn from the color-film processing industry that indicate a downward trend in the costs of film processing over a 24-year period, the author argues that Olympic Foods will likewise be able to minimize costs and thus maximize profits in the future. In support of

this conclusion the author cites the general principle that "as organizations learn how to do things better, they become more efficient."

This principle, coupled with the fact that Olympic Foods has had 25 years of experience in the food processing industry leads to the authors rosy prediction. This argument is unconvincing

because it suffers from two critical flaws. First, the authors forecast of

minimal costs and maximum profits rests on the gratuitous assumption that Olympic Foods "long experience" has taught it how

to do things better. There is, however, no guarantee that this is the case. Nor does the author cite any evidence to support this

assumption. Just as likely, Olympic Foods has learned nothing from

its 25 years in the food-processing business. Lacking this assumption, the expectation of increased efficiency is entirely unfounded.

Second, it is highly doubtful that the facts drawn from the color-film

processing industry are applicable to the food processing industry. Differences between the two industries clearly outweigh the similarities, thus making the analogy highly less than valid. For example, problems of spoilage, contamination, and timely transportation all affect the food industry but are virtually absent in the film-processing industry. Problems such as these might present insurmountable obstacles that prevent lowering food-processing costs in the future. As it stands the authors argument is not compelling. To strengthen the conclusion that Olympic Foods will enjoy minimal costs and maximum profits in the future, the author would have to provide evidence that the company has learned how to do things better as a result of its 25 years of experience. Supporting examples drawn from industries more similar to the food-processing industry would further substantiate the authors view.² In this argument the author concludes that the Apogee Company should close down field offices and conduct all its operations from a single, centralized location because the company had been more profitable in the past when all its operations were in one location. For a couple of reasons, this argument is not very convincing. First, the author assumes that centralization would improve profitability by cutting costs and streamlining supervision of employees. This assumption is never supported with any data or projections. Moreover, the assumption fails to take into account cost increases and inefficiency that could result from centralization. For instance, company representatives would have to travel to do business in areas formerly served by a field office, creating travel costs and loss of critical time.

In short, this assumption must be supported with a thorough cost-benefit analysis of centralization versus other possible cost-cutting and/or profit-enhancing strategies. Second, the only reason offered by the author is the claim that Apogee was more profitable when it had operated from a single, centralized location. But is centralization the only difference relevant to greater past profitability? It is entirely possible that management has become lax regarding any number of factors that can affect the bottom line such as inferior products, careless product pricing, inefficient production, poor employee expense account monitoring, ineffective advertising, sloppy buying policies and other wasteful spending. Unless the author can rule out other factors relevant to diminishing profits, this argument commits the fallacy of assuming that just because one event (decreasing profits) follows another (decentralization), the second event has been caused by the first. In conclusion, this is a weak argument. To strengthen the conclusion that Apogee should close field offices and centralize. This author must provide a thorough cost-benefit analysis of available alternatives and rule out factors other than decentralization that might be affecting current profits negatively.³ In this argument the author concludes that the city should allocate some of its arts funding to public television. The conclusion is based on two facts: (1) attendance at the city's art museum has increased proportionally with the increases in visual-arts program viewing on public television, and (2) public television is being threatened by severe cuts in corporate funding. While this argument is somewhat convincing, a few concerns need to

be addressed. To begin with, the argument depends on the assumption that increased exposure to the visual arts on television, mainly public television, has caused a similar increase in local art-museum attendance. However, just because increased art-museum attendance can be statistically correlated with similar increases in television viewing of visual-arts programs, this does not necessarily mean that the increased television viewing of arts is the cause of the rise in museum attendance. Moreover, perhaps there are other factors relevant to increased interest in the local art museum. for instance, maybe a new director had procured more interesting, exciting acquisitions and exhibits during the period when museum attendance increased, in addition, the author could be overlooking a common cause of both increases. It is possible that some larger social or cultural phenomenon is responsible for greater public interest in both television arts programming and municipal art museums. To be fair, however, we must recognize that the authors assumption is a special case of a more general one that television viewing affects peoples attitudes and behavior. Common sense and observation tells me that this is indeed the case. After all, advertisers spend billions of dollars on television ad time because they trust this assumption as well. In conclusion, I am somewhat persuaded by this authors line of reasoning. The argument would be strengthened if the author were to consider and rule out other significant factors that might have caused the increase in visits to the local art museum.[1] [2] 下一页

100Test 下载频道开通 , 各类考试题目直接下载。详细请访问 www.100test.com