

Submitted Response

Governments should focus on solving the immediate problems of today rather than on trying to solve the anticipated problems of the future.

Should the ~~government~~government put forces on immediate problems or should it focus on future matters more? Solving problems of present moment of a society seems to be the important duty of every ~~government~~government. However, considering the future problems seems to be ~~more wisely~~wiser. Future problems ~~migh~~might be bigger and cost more. ~~Moreover~~Moreover, ~~fighting~~fighting with future problems is an easier task to do and we can ~~have~~plan for ~~#them~~. And it should not be ~~forgeten~~forgotten that nowadays problems were the future problems of the past.

The introduction paragraph is NOT effective. You don't state your point of view and the reasons behind it clearly. In addition, you seem to have focused on "the future problems" rather than taking the broader and more logical point of view that "it is indeed very important for any government to tackle the problems at hand as well as plan ahead for decades to come". Therefore, the point of view that you have presented here is basically flawed.

Typically, in an introduction paragraph for the GRE Issue Task, you need to clearly mention your point of view and provide a brief explanation of the reasons that have led you to that conclusion. These reasons need to be logically sound. In the body paragraphs you will provide in depth analysis of those reasons along with examples and other kinds of supporting information.

The problems at the present time may seem to be difficult to solve. However, ~~Who may know?~~who knows? There ~~migh~~might be a serious problem in the future. For ~~example~~example, natural disasters are really huge crises rather than other problems of a society. An earthquake can cause a lot of ~~damge~~damage to people and cities. So it is wise to be well prepare for such problems.

Look at these two statements:

"The problems at the present time may seem to be difficult to solve. However, ... there might be a serious problem in the future."

The connection between these two ideas is vague. Do you mean the government should focus on the future problems because they are more "serious"? Or, do you mean, we cannot do anything about current problems so let's focus on the future problems and forget about present problems? I don't get it!

Also, is "earthquake" really a good example for future problems that governments need to plan for? Earthquakes occur naturally and the best a government can do is to establish guidelines for the construction of buildings, bridges, airports, etc. to minimize the impact of the tragedy. This is a very good point and you could've used it as an example for a paragraph that discussed the necessity of contingency plans in case of natural disasters.

There are, however, hundreds of other problems that you can think of which happen as a result of lack of planning or mismanagement on the part of the governments. These problems could be easily avoided with solid planning and would serve as great examples for a body paragraph such as this one.

Some good examples of this sort of problems:

- Unemployment
- Healthcare
- Over-population

Second, ~~figthing~~fighting with future problems is a pretty easier task to accomplish. ~~Eventhough~~Even though those problems might be huge. There is plenty of time to make plans for what we anticipate to occur. For ~~instance~~instance, if we consider earthquake as a problem that someday may happen to our city, it is much easier for get ready for it, rather ~~that~~than encounter with it suddenly. As an example ~~construction and building~~buildings can be built ~~more strong~~stronger and resistant to ~~shaking~~earthquakes. Teaching people ~~to how to how to react in crisis moment~~at the times of crisis can be mentioned as ~~an other~~another example for getting ready for earthquake as a future problem.

First of all, if you have planned ahead and anticipated something like an “earthquake” to happen. It doesn’t mean it’s easier to deal with it. In case of your example, it is never easy to get over countless deaths and a huge financial loss. As I said in the previous comment, you can only minimize the impact in such cases.

The topic of this paragraph, and for that matter even the example, is essentially an extension of the previous paragraph and you have not presented any new ideas here.

I would’ve followed something similar to the following logic to develop this paragraph:

- Planning to prevent future problems (unemployment, education, healthcare, etc)
- You can’t always expect to be able to anticipate every aspect of a problem
- If/when any unforeseen issue arises (e.g. refugee crisis in Europe) you will have a solid basis to work out a solution to an immediate problem

Some people might say that at this moment we suffering ~~form~~from present problems. Why we should concentrate on the future problems. However, ~~Hit~~it should be noted that what we face today as problems were future problems ~~at in~~the past. So if we were able to prognosticate these problem and make ourselves ready, we would not ~~encounter~~have to deal with them today or at least we would ~~be sufferings~~suffering less from them. As an illustration if a country ~~get~~gets ready for future attack from some enemy, it definitely ~~cause~~causes less damage to the people and country rather than having no protection for the people.

While this is not necessarily true in all cases, you can argue that even when an effective government is in place, at least in some cases, the problems that we are facing at the present could’ve been avoided with sufficient planning. This is a good idea that unfortunately you have failed to develop, especially with an example that borders on warmongering!

In your example of an attack by a foreign power, one can argue that there’s always someone who is, or considers themselves to be, more powerful than you are. While taking deterrent measures, such as maintaining a reasonably powerful military is a good idea, it will NOT prevent attacks; some good examples are most of the countries that were attacked by the axis powers in WWII some of them were pretty powerful but the attacker invaded them anyways! You may be able to repel the attack when it comes or you may not be able to do so. In any case, that will end in a humanitarian and economical disaster such as what came to pass in WWII. Therefore, this line of reasoning is fundamentally flawed. The safest way to maintain the sovereignty of a nation is for a government to foster a peaceful and friendly relationship with other nations and build upon it. A good example is the Switzerland. While the Swiss maintain a huge and well trained reserve army, and are one of the world leaders in economy, technology and social welfare, they have never been invaded in recent history exactly because of their strategic planning to develop and nurture their ties with most nations in the world. Now, this is good planning and an excellent example.

~~In conclusion~~In conclusion, although trying to solve presents problem surely is right to do, it is ~~more wise~~wiser to put enough forces for the problems in the way. No one ~~can not~~can estimate-predict the future precisely; there might be a huge problem in future ~~rather than presents one~~. FightingFightng with them ~~wiht~~with a plan is ~~more easie~~easier than ~~encoutering~~encountering them suddenly. And if we prognosticate our future problem, ~~who may know? There~~there might be no problems in the future which will become present someday.

This concluding paragraph is seriously ineffective. Here, you’ve even repeated some of the ideas from the other paragraphs word for word. A good concluding paragraph summarizes the ideas from the essay, clearly mentions the author’s point of view and as a concluding remark may offer a suggestion that encourages deeper thoughts.

Rater's Comments

Other Remarks:

Study the correct organization of essays, topic development and analytical writing essential techniques using the following resources (internet links are clickable):

- TOEFL Independent Writing eTutor ([Download Link](#))
- GRE Analytical Writing eTutor ([Download Link](#))

Your response largely disregards the specific task directions and/or demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical writing.

A typical response in this category exhibits ONE OR MORE of the following characteristics:

- is unclear or seriously limited in addressing the specific task directions and in presenting or developing a position on the issue or both
- provides few, if any, relevant reasons or examples in support of its claims
- is poorly focused and/or poorly organized
- has serious problems in language and sentence structure that frequently interfere with meaning
- contains serious errors in grammar, usage or mechanics that frequently obscure meaning

Submitted Response

In an attempt to improve highway safety, Prunty County last year lowered its speed limit from 55 to 45 miles per hour on all county highways. But this effort has failed: the number of accidents has not decreased, and, based on reports by the highway patrol, many drivers are exceeding the speed limit. Prunty County should instead undertake the same kind of road improvement project that Butler County completed five years ago: increasing lane widths, resurfacing rough highways, and improving visibility at dangerous intersections. Today, major Butler County roads still have a 55 mph speed limit, yet there were 25 percent fewer reported accidents in Butler County this past year than there were five years ago.

Write a response in which you discuss what specific evidence is needed to evaluate the argument and explain how the evidence would weaken or strengthen the argument.

Author concludes that to decrease ~~accident number~~ the number of accidents in Prunty County ~~highway-highways~~ some improvement needs to be done. His evidence is that previous action which was reducing speed limit did not yield appropriate results, and ~~other-another~~ County has done some improvements and obtained ~~suitable result~~ desirable results. While at first glance the argument seems to be logical, there are some other ~~aspect of the evidences~~ pieces of evidence which need to be evaluated ~~more represented~~ and an assumption which needs s to be more clarified.

First, the author concludes that lowering speed limit did not reduce accident number in Prunty County. He explains that Butler County instead of reducing speed limit has done some improvements s and has gain-gained better results, and he jumps into the conclusion that Prunty County should do the same ~~implement~~. However, before that, situation of Prunty County should be evaluated. ~~Dose its situation is~~ Is the situation in Prunty County worse ~~that than that in~~ Butler County or even it is better ~~than that~~. If the improvements have been done in Prunty County before and even with better standard rather than what has been done on Butler County, it does not seem logical to improve its situation more.

Second, author states that in Prunty County there are some drivers who exceed speed limit. Therefore, there might be some other factor such as cultural background which ~~needed-needs~~ to be evaluated in order to solve the problem. People in Bulter County may ~~are more respectful to the law rather that people of Prunty County~~ be more inclined to follow the law. Thus cultural aspects of Butler and Prunty people ~~needed~~ to be evaluated and considered too. If that is the case, to decrease ~~accident number~~ the number of accidents some cultural task needed to be done in Prunty County.

Third, the author compares the accidents rate in two County which is increase in Prunty and decrease in Butler. However, it should be answered that what is the volume of traffic and its change at these two County. Maybe traffic at Butler has decreased d over the last years and increased in Prunty. If that is true reason of increasing accident number in Prunty. Thus comparison of the traffic rate between these two Counties ~~needed-needs~~ to be evaluated too.

The argument would be considerably strong if the author provided more evidence and evaluated them better. There is possibility that improving Prunty County highway situation would ~~make accident rate less~~ lower the number of the accidents. ~~However~~ However, this accident rate could be based on other factors that author needs to evaluate them more.

Rater's Comments

In your response, items from the list below that

- you have mentioned and discussed effectively with solid reasoning and examples:
- you have mentioned and somewhat explained but not effectively: **4**
- you have mentioned but not explained: **7**
- you have mentioned but provided flawed reasoning for: **6**

Logical problems with the assumption:

Prunty County lowered speed limit to increase highway safety → lower the number of accidents + lower the rate of casualties

1. The report focuses only on number of accidents not the rate of casualties. Maybe they have a lot of accidents that does not cause serious injuries.
2. The report does not mention why Prunty County officials decided their highways were unsafe to begin with and they planned to make them "safer".

The plan to increase the highway safety in Prunty County has failed:

3. The number of accidents has increased: Compared to what statistics from what time period? → The report mentions a change in the number of accidents in Butler County over 5 years, Prunty County passed this law last year, maybe they need more time
4. No benchmark is provided by the report to discern that the number of accidents in Prunty County Highways were high to begin with (e.g. national or international standards)
5. "Many drivers exceed the speed limit": Not accurate. Should be presented in terms of percentages in comparison to a benchmark.
6. If a lot of people break the law → may need to reinforce the law more effectively (e.g. speed cams, more patrols, etc), offer compulsory training sessions for law breakers.

Logical problems with the solution:

Prunty County should do the same as Butler County:

7. Increasing highway lane widths: no statistics/studies for the volume of traffic and otherwise are provided to show that this will indeed be helpful in solving the problem. Might be just a waste of resources.
8. resurfacing rough highways: while it's always a good idea to maintain the roads, no data is provided that damaged road surfaces have been the cause of accidents in either area.
9. improving visibility at dangerous intersections: this is of course prudent but it is also highly dependent on the geography of the region. For example, in mountainous areas this is very important but in flat landscapes it is not needed as much. No information on the comparative geography of the two areas is provided.
10. yet there were 25 percent fewer reported accidents in Butler County this past year than there were five years ago: no data on the population dynamics of Butler County and that of Prunty County is provided. Younger drivers tend to have more accidents. If population decreases (as a result of emigration) naturally fewer people use the roads.

Extra ideas:

11. Advances in technology might have lowered the number of accidents over a period of 5 years in Butler County → e.g. more efficient braking systems and Advanced Driver Assistance Systems
12. The report does not mention that the 3 items mentioned as the improvements made by Butler County were the only improvements made and there were no other factors involved

Your response largely disregards the specific task directions and/or demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical writing.

A typical response in this category exhibits ONE OR MORE of the following characteristics:

- does not present an examination based on logical analysis, but may instead present the writer's own views on the subject
- does not follow the directions for the assigned task
- does not develop ideas, or is poorly organized and illogical
- provides little, if any, relevant or reasonable support for its main points
- has serious problems in language and sentence structure that frequently interfere with meaning
- contains serious errors in grammar, usage or mechanics that frequently obscure meaning