

# GMAT

上海前进进修学院  
英语教学系列丛书



## 智谋教程

### ——写作指导

英语教学系列丛书编委会

华东理工大学出版社

**图书在版编目(CIP)数据**

GMAT 智谋教程. 写作指导/上海前进进修学院英语教  
学系列丛书编委会编. —上海: 华东理工大学出版社,  
1999. 12

(上海前进进修学院英语教学系列丛书)

ISBN 7-5628-0991-7

I. G... II. 上... III. 英语-写作-教材  
IV. H315

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(1999)第 52462 号

**(沪)新登字 208 号**

上海前进进修学院英语教学系列丛书

**GMAT 智谋教程**

——写作指导

英语教学系列丛书编委会

华东理工大学出版社出版发行

上海市梅陇路 130 号

邮政编码 200237 电话 64253429

新华书店上海发行所发行经销

上海展望印刷厂印刷

开本 850×1168 1/32 印张 5 字数 129 千字

1999 年 12 月第 1 版 1999 年 12 月第 1 次印刷

印数 1—5000 册

---

ISBN 7-5628-0991-7/H·171 定价 10.00 元

## 英语教学系列丛书编委会

主 任 蔡光天

副主任 严诚忠

委 员 沈 炎 李蒙恩 罗国梁 黄振勋

邵慧毅 蔡裕中 归兰修

## 内 容 简 介

本书讨论了 GMAT 写作部分的试题类型、评分标准、解题思路及策略,并附有范文供考生参考。书末还附有大量考题。本书对具有较强英语学习基础者的深造与学习可提供有效的参考和帮助。

## 前 言

上海前进进修学院在蔡光天院长的领导下,以务实开拓的精神从事教学工作,取得了世所瞩目的成绩。以 TOEFL、GMAT、GRE 此类国际标准考试而言,每次考试前进学院都有一大批取得高分的学生。这些学生或留学海外,日后报效祖国;或留在国内,发挥各自专长。一批又一批的学生通过在前进学院的进修,提高了语言水平,扩展了知识视野,取得了心所向往的成绩。

为了进一步提高前进进修学院的教学质量,更有效地展开教学工作,在前进进修学院院长、全国政协委员、世界名人蔡光天先生的领导下,前进成立了由常务副院长、上海市政协常委、原华东理工大学经贸英语系主任严诚忠、副院长蔡裕中、邵慧毅、教务长归兰修等组成的英语系列教材编审委员会,负责组织具有丰富教学经验和研究心得的资深教师投入新一轮的前进英语教学系列教材的编写工作。前不久率先完成的《托福教程》颇受学生欢迎。GMAT、GRE 的系列教材也已推出。

《GMAT 智谋教程》分为两大部分:语言部分和数学部分。语言部分在考试实践中又分为句子改错

(Sentence Correction), 阅读理解(Reading Comprehension), 逻辑推理(Critical Reasoning)和写作(Analytical Writing and Assessment)四个部分。本书属语言部分的第四分册《写作指导》,其选择和编辑的题型难度同美国的正式试题相类似。由于“分析性写作”是GMAT考试中的一个新增内容,而非英语国家学生的英语写作水平往往存在差距,因此,在参与GMAT考试辅导以提高英语综合水平的过程中,不仅需要较强的应用语言基础,而且需要具有敏锐的分析判断和归纳。中国学生的常规英语学习,在这方面甚显不足,而本书的宗旨就是要帮助读者迅速掌握其原理和诀窍。本书由沈炎先生主编。书中如有疏漏之处,热忱欢迎诸位专家与读者不吝指正。对为本书编审、出版和发行作出贡献的各方面人士谨致谢意。

上海前进进修学院  
英语教学系列丛书编委会

## 目 录

一、GMAT 写作部分简介 .....	(1)
二、英语写作简介 .....	(15)
三、Analysis of An Issue .....	(19)
四、Analysis of An Argument .....	(36)
五、A Reasonable Use of the English Language .....	(51)
六、参考试题选编 .....	(57)
(一) Analysis of Issue Questions .....	(58)
(二) Analysis of Argument Questions .....	(95)

## 一、GMAT 写作部分简介



GMAT 写作部分 (Analytical Writing Assessment) 要求考生在一个小时之内写两篇文章 (各半小时)。增设写作部分是为了全面测试考生语言运用能力, 并杜绝某些考生申请材料请人代笔, 使得有关学校无法准确地判断该考生的实际语言运用能力的现象。写作部分通常是 GMAT 的第一项, 考生须用电脑键盘输入两篇文章。

两篇文章分别为 Analysis of an Issue 和 Analysis of an Argument。前者要求考生根据所给题目, 阐述自己对某一观点的态度, 或者支持, 或者反对。后者要求考生找出所给观点的逻辑错误。

GMAT 写作部分单独评分, 目前尚不计入总分。写作部分共 6 分 (1—6), 以 0.5 分作为递增或递减的最小分值。每篇文章将由两位阅卷人批改, 他们所给的分数经平均后作为最后分数。如果两个分数之差大于一分, 该篇文章将由第三位阅卷人再一次批改, 通常该考生所得到的分数是三个分数的平均数。

具体评分标准如下:

## GMAT SCORING GUIDE: ANALYSIS OF AN ISSUE

### SCORE

#### 6 OUTSTANDING

A 6 paper presents a cogent, well-articulated analysis of the complexities of the issue and demonstrates mastery of the elements of effective writing.

A typical paper in this category

- explores ideas and develops a position on the issue with insightful reasons and/or persuasive examples
- is clearly well organized
- demonstrates superior control of language, including diction and syntactic variety
- demonstrates superior facility with the conventions (grammar,

usage, and mechanics) of standard written English but may have minor flaws

## 5 STRONG

A 5 paper presents a well-developed analysis of the complexities of the issue and demonstrates a strong control of the elements of effective writing.

A typical paper in this category

- develops a position on the issue with well-chosen reasons and/or examples
- is generally well organized
- demonstrates clear control of language, including diction and syntactic variety
- demonstrates facility with the conventions of standard written English but may have minor flaws

## 4 ADEQUATE

A 4 paper presents a competent analysis of the issue and demonstrates adequate control of the elements of writing.

A typical paper in this category

- develops a position on the issue with relevant reasons and/or examples
- is adequately organized
- demonstrates adequate control of language, including diction and syntax, but may lack syntactic variety
- displays control of the conventions of standard written English but may have some flaws

### 3 LIMITED

A 3 paper demonstrates some competence in its analysis of the issue and in its control of the elements of writing but is clearly flawed.

A typical paper in this category exhibits *one or more* of the following characteristics:

- is vague or limited in developing a position on the issue
- is poorly organized
- is weak in the use of relevant reasons or examples
- uses language imprecisely and/or lacks sentence variety
- contains occasional major errors or frequent minor errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics

### 2 SERIOUSLY FLAWED

A 2 paper demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical writing skills.

A typical paper in this category exhibits *one or more* of the following characteristics:

- is unclear or seriously limited in presenting or developing a position on the issue
- is disorganized
- provides few, if any, relevant reasons or examples
- has serious and frequent problems in the use of language and sentence structure
- contains numerous errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics which interfere with meaning

### 1 FUNDAMENTALLY DEFICIENT

A 1 paper demonstrates fundamental deficiencies in analytical writing skills.

A typical paper in this category exhibits *one or more* of the following characteristics:

- provides little evidence of the ability to develop or organize a coherent response to the topic
  - has severe and persistent errors in language and sentence structure
  - contains a pervasive pattern of errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics which severely interfere with meaning
- 0 Any paper that is totally illegible or obviously not written on the assigned topic receives a score of zero.

## **GMAT SCORING GUIDE: ANALYSIS OF AN ARGUMENT**

### **SCORE**

#### **6 OUTSTANDING**

A 6 paper presents a cogent, well-articulated critique of the argument and demonstrates mastery of the elements of effective writing.

A typical paper in this category

- clearly identifies and insightfully analyzes important features of the argument
- develops ideas cogently, organizes them logically, and connects them smoothly with clear transitions
- effectively supports the main points of the critique
- demonstrates superior control of language, including diction and syntactic variety
- demonstrates superior facility with the conventions (grammar, usage, and mechanics) of standard written English but may have minor flaws

## 5 STRONG

A 5 paper presents a well-developed critique of the argument and demonstrates good control of the elements of effective writing.

A typical paper in this category

- clearly identifies important features of the argument and analyzes them in a generally thoughtful way
- develops ideas clearly, organizes them logically, and connects them with appropriate transitions
- sensibly supports the main points of the critique
- demonstrates clear control of language, including diction and syntactic variety
- demonstrates facility with the conventions of standard written English but may have minor flaws

## 4 ADEQUATE

A 4 paper presents a competent critique of the argument and demonstrates adequate control of the elements of writing.

A typical paper in this category

- identifies and capably analyzes important features of the argument
- develops and organizes ideas satisfactorily but may not always connect them with transitions
- supports the main points of the critique
- demonstrates adequate control of language, including diction and syntax, but may lack syntactic variety
- displays control of the conventions of standard written English but may have some flaws

## 3 LIMITED

A 3 paper demonstrates some competence in its critique of the argu-

ment and in its control of the elements of writing but is clearly flawed. A typical paper in this category exhibits *one or more* of the following characteristics:

- does not identify or analyze most of the important features of the argument, although some analysis is present
- is limited in the logical development and organization of ideas
- offers support of little relevance and value for points of the critique
- uses language imprecisely and/or lacks sentence variety
- contains occasional major errors or frequent minor errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics

## 2 SERIOUSLY FLAWED

A2 paper demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical writing skills. A typical paper in this category exhibits *one or more* of the following characteristics:

- does not understand, identify, or analyze main features of the argument
- does not develop ideas or is disorganized
- provides little, if any, relevant or reasonable support
- has serious and frequent problems in the use of language and sentence structure
- contains numerous errors in grammar, usage and mechanics which interfere with meaning

## 1 FUNDAMENTALLY DEFICIENT

A 1 paper demonstrates fundamental deficiencies in analytical writing skills.

A typical paper in this category exhibits *one or more* of the following characteristics:

- provides little evidence of the ability to understand and analyze the argument or to develop an organized response to it
  - has severe and persistent errors in language and sentence structure
  - contains a pervasive pattern of errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics, thus resulting in incoherence
- 0 Any paper that is totally illegible or obviously not written on the assigned topic receives a score of zero.

以下为两篇得 6 分的文章,考生可以此作为衡量自己写作能力的标准。

## ANALYSIS OF AN ISSUE

**Directions:** In this section, you will need to analyze and explain your views on the issue presented below. The question has no “correct” answer. Instead, you should consider various perspectives as you develop your own position on the issue.

Read the statement and directions, and then make any notes in your test booklet that will help you plan a response. Begin writing your response on the separate answer document. Make sure that you use the answer document that goes with this writing task.

“People often complain that products are not made to last. They feel that making products that wear out fairly quickly wastes both natural and human resources. What they fail to see, however, is that such manufacturing practices keep costs down for the consumer and stimulate demand.”

Which do you find more compelling, the complaint about the products that do not last or the response to it? Explain your position using relevant reasons and/or examples drawn from your own experience, observations, or reading.

*Many people feel that products are not made to last , and correspondingly, many natural and human resources are wasted . On the other hand , it can be noted that such manufacturing practices keep costs down and hence stimulate demand . In this discussion . I shall present arguments favoring the former statement and refuting the latter statement .*

*Products that are not made to last waste a great deal of natural and human resources . The exact amount of wasted natural resources depends on the specific product . For example in the automobile industry , the Yugo is the classic example of an underpriced vehicle that was not made to last . Considering that the average Yugo had ( not " has " since they are no longer produced ! ) a life expectancy of two years and 25,000 miles , it was a terrible waste .*

*Automobile industry standards today create vehicles that are warranted for about five years and 50,000 miles . By producing cheap Yugos that last less than half as long as most cars are warranted , the Yugo producer is wasting valuable natural resources . These same resources could be used by Ford or Toyota to produce an Escort or Tercel that will last twice as long , thereby reducing the usage of natural resources by a factor of two .*

*Human resources in this example are also wasteful . On the production side , manufacturers of a poor quality automobile , like the Yugo , get no personal or profession satisfaction from the fact that their product is the worst automobile in the United States . This knowledge adversely affects the productivity of the Yugo workers .*



*Conversely, the workers at the Saturn plants constantly receive positive feedback on their successful products. Saturn prides itself with its reputation for quality and innovation — as is seen in its recent massive recall to fix a defect. This recall was handled so well that Saturn's image was actually bolstered. Had a recall occurred at a Yugo plant, the bad situation would have become even worse.*

*Another factor in the human resources area is the reaction by the consumer. A great deal of human resources have been wasted by Yugo owners waiting for the dreaded tow truck to show up to hand away the Yugo carcass. Any vehicle owner who is uncertain of his/her vehicle's performance at 7 AM as he/she is about to drive to work, senses a great deal of despair. This is a great waste of human resources for the consumer.*

*While the consumer senses the waste of natural and human resources in a poor quality product, so does the manufacturer. People who argue that low quality manufacturing processes keep costs low for the consumer and hence stimulate demand should look at the Yugo example. In the mid-1980's the Yugo was by far the cheapest car in the United States at \$ 3995. By 1991, the Yugo was no longer sold here and was synonymous with the word "lemon."*

## **EXPLANATION OF SCORE — 6**

The response above is ambitious and somewhat unusual in its focusing on just one example, the lesson of the now defunct Yugo Responses, especially outstanding ones, typically discuss several different examples that build support for the writer's position on the issue. This sample response, then, should not be taken as necessarily endorsing a one-example writing strategy. What it *does* serve to underscore is how much is to be gained by *developing*, not just *listing*, examples. The strength of the response lies in the organized and thorough way in which it explores the re-