

GRE写作argument全部官方范文分析(3) PDF转换可能丢失图片或格式，建议阅读原文

https://www.100test.com/kao_ti2020/644/2021_2022_GRE_E5_86_99_E4_BD_9Ca_c86_644809.htm

GRE 写作argument全部官方范文分析：第二部分范文分析第一篇文章。范文分析第一篇文章

Hospital statistics regarding people who go to the emergency room after rollerskating accidents indicate the need for more protective equipment. Within this group of people, 75 percent of those who had accidents in streets or parking lots were not wearing any protective clothing (helmets, knee pads, etc.) or any light-reflecting material (clip-on lights, glow-in-the-dark wrist pads, etc.). Clearly, these statistics indicate that by investing in high-quality protective gear and reflective equipment, rollerskaters will greatly reduce their risk of being severely injured in an accident. 原题逻辑顺序为：数据显示了对保护装备的需求== 展开说明这个数据是怎样显示这样的需求的(即用这个装备有什么效果)== 结论：为了达到这个效果我们应该重金买这保护设备。

Benchmark 6 The notion that protective gear reduces the injuries suffered in accidents seems at first glance to be an obvious conclusion. After all, it is the intent of these products to either prevent accidents from occurring in the first place or to reduce the injuries suffered by the wearer should an accident occur. 前两句首先肯定了原命题中值得肯定的地方。这是求同存异的表现。注意这里第一句作者同意原命题的同时，在第二句紧接着就给出了展开的证明。而没有光是罗列观点。 However, the conclusion that investing in high quality protective gear greatly

reduces the risk of being severely injured in an accident may mask other (and potentially more significant) causes of injuries and may inspire people to over invest financially and psychologically in protective gear. 再说原命题是存在逻辑漏洞的，即它因。这里并没有展开论证，因为这是全文的中心句，整个文章都在后面给予论证。同时，最后半句给出了论据中的潜在后果。

First of all, 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). body打头第一段是属于攻击总前提假设的，作者认为这个(即保护性设备和防护性设备的差别)是有必要在讨论一切之前弄清楚的。论证方法为质疑假设，加条件后讨论，提出建议。实际上，这个前提对应的就是开头段的前两句话。深层的含义就是，尽管我在开头对你的某一个部分作了让步似的同意，但是这个同意也是建立在一定的假设基础上的，要是这个假设搞不清楚，哼哼我让不让步还不一定呢!本段就来讨论这个假设基础。

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 an other, 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. 这两句分别从两个方面进行了论述，为本段第一句话的论证进行服务，每一方面的具体方法是先定义，再比较。论证方法为加上不同的条件后进行讨论，比如前一句话

假定只有防护性装备会怎样，后一句话假定只有保护性装备会怎么样。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. 这里提出了作者的 建议，即如何通过进一步的完善使原命题更加的有力。These statistics could provide skaters with a clearer understanding of which kinds of gear are more beneficial. 如果这个问题(保护防护设备的差别)解决了后面的讨论才能继续。所以说，总的来说这一段是讨论了原文一个核心的前提。转载自:百考试题 -

[100test.Com] The argument above is weakened by the fact that it does not take into account the inherent differences between skaters who wear gear and those who do not.从本段起，连着的三个自然段就是按照原文逻辑链的顺序进行攻击和质疑。实际上，这三段对应的就是开头段的however之后的话。本段先质疑了人的本质的差异。论证方法是加条件后讨论。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.以上三句话展开证明第一个分支观点，论证方法就是大名鼎鼎的三段论。加入常识性条件。即本身很注意安全的人配戴保护装置== 配戴装置后就能少出事故== 故本身注意安全才使得少出事故。 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 (and therefore more likely to wear gear) may choose to skate in safer areas such as parks or back yards. 以上两句展开证明第二个分支观点，论证方法同样为大名鼎鼎的三段论，加上常识性条件。即街道公园本身不太安全== 本身注意安全的人会选择安全的地方== 来这里的人都是本身不太注意安全的。这里最后一点是我给补充上的，原文没有论证完全，但是基本的框架还是有的。 The statistic also goes not differentiate between severity of injuries.攻击逻辑链的第二步，受伤的程度没有说清。这里的论证方法核心是质疑隐含假设，加条件后讨论。 The conclusion that safety gear prevents severe injuries suggests that it is presumed that people come to the emergency room only with severe injuries. 指出原隐含假设。 This is certainly not the case.指出它错了。 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. 加上人们晚上去滑的人多这个条件后讨论，最终削弱原命题。 Finally, there is absolutely no evidence provided that high quality (and presumably more expensive) gear is any more beneficial than other kinds of gear.攻击逻辑链的第三步，质量好的不一定有用。核心论证方法为列举它因和提出建议。 For example, a simple white t-shirt may provide the same preventative benefit as a higher quality, more expensive, shirt designed only for skating.简单的t-shirt也能很有用。 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. 建议我们对器材考虑得更加全面些。 The argument for safety gear based on emergency room statistics could provide important information and potentially saves lives. 强调原文的初衷还是很好的，就好像两个人在那里辩论，范文把原文给说急了，范文怕原文不高兴了，就再哄哄他：别看我骂了这么多，你的初衷还是好的嘛！值得肯定。 Before conclusions about the amount and kinds of investments that should be made in gear are reached, however, a more complete understanding of the benefits are needed. 范文看原文也不怎么哭了，于是最终还是委婉的表达自己的建议。 After all, a false confidence in ineffective gear could be just as dangerous as no gear at all. 最后补充论证自己的建议：论证方法为反证法。同时范文在最后吓唬一下原文，告诉他这样做的可怕后果。 Reader Comment on 6 This outstanding response demonstrates the writer's insightful analytical skills. The introduction, which notes that adopting the prompts fallacious reasoning could "...inspire people to over invest financially and psychologically in protective gear," is followed by a comprehensive examination of each of the arguments' root flaws. Specifically, the writer exposes several points that undermine the argument: *that preventive 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 error-free. Sentences are varied and complex, and diction is expressive and precise. In sum, this essay exemplifies the very top of the "6" range described in the scoring guide. If the writer had been less eloquent or provided fewer reasons to refute the argument, the essay could still have been scored "6."

小总结：(1)分析原题目中可取之处.指出原文中不足之处.推出论据中的潜在后果。(这里的第一点展开证明，这样虽然没有直接复述题目，但是这三点说完后整个框架就很清楚了)(2)正文中第一段质疑我认为的核心假设错误(从原题目中的可取之处中寻找，要把它唯一一点正确的东西也给质疑了)，后三段按原文逻辑顺序攻击三点，如本文中人的本质== 人受的伤的差别== 为防受伤，买质量好的就有用?可以看出，这三点是与原文中三段论式论证环环相扣的。这就是前面第一部分讲解awintro中提到的analytical writing的具体应用。(3)逻辑方面的论证方法为：寻找并质疑隐含假设，列举它因，加条件(常识性条件，或者限定性条件)后讨论，提出建议。(4)在语言方面的论证手法有：分情况讨论，举反例推繹。(5)最后的时候还是要首先肯定原文的可取之处如初衷好啊，然后指出需要思考的更加完善才行。要是思考的不完善会有什么后果。(范文最后一段基本属于扯淡) 相关推荐：[GRE写作之旅：先扩大词汇再狠抓作文](#) [2011年GRE考试写作经典背诵句式整理](#) 为了能及时获取2011年gre考试相关信息，建议大家收藏[百考试题#333333>gre考试频道#ff0000>点击收藏](#)，我们会第一时间发布相关信息。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