**Argument task:**

**The following is a recommendation from the personnel director to the president of Acme Publishing Company.**

**"Many other companies have recently stated that having their employees take the Easy Read Speed-Reading Course has greatly improved productivity. One graduate of the course was able to read a 500-page report in only two hours; another graduate rose from an assistant manager to vice president of the company in under a year. Obviously, the faster you can read, the more information you can absorb in a single workday. Moreover, Easy Read would cost Acme only $500 per employee—a small price to pay when you consider the benefits. Included in this fee is a three-week seminar in Spruce City and a lifelong subscription to the Easy Read newsletter. Clearly, Acme would benefit greatly by requiring all of our employees to take the Easy Read course."**

**Write a response in which you examine the stated and/or unstated assumptions of the argument. Be sure to explain how the argument depends on these assumptions and what the implications are for the argument if the assumptions prove unwarranted.**

In the argument, the author argues that, the productivity of the corporation has improved as its employees attend Speed-reading class. He gives some information to support his claim. However, his argument is flawed. The author not only, draws a strong conclusion on basis of weak evidence, but uses unwarranted assumptions to support his conclusion.

Firstly, the author makes the point that there are many corporations which has (have) their productivity increased since its (their) employees attend Speed-reading classes. This assumption is flawed since there may be many different reasons that the productivity increase (must come at the end of the sentence) of those corporations. For example, the working environment of those corporations are maybe (*probably* is a better choice; *maybe* comes at the beginning) more quiet and comfortable. As a result, employee’s productivity has increased.

Secondly, the author argues that one of the graduates of the class is able to read a 500-page report in 2hours. As a result his efficiency has improved. This is flawed. Due to the fact that, the productivity increases when one is able to do more efficient work in a time limit (better to say *a limited time*), reading a 500-page report in 2hours without understanding it does not mean improving the efficiency. Also reading at this speed never guarantees that the employee has completely understood the essence of the report. Actually, in order to conclude such a thing, the author should provide sufficient information about whether reading with this speed reduces the quality of learning or not.

Thirdly, the author says that, the improvement of a graduate of these classes from assistant to vice president in a year shows that, these classes are really beneficial. This claim is also flawed. The assistant may have been improved for different reasons such as his job background or his performance in his job that can be for any reason other than his reading speed. In this assumption, there is no enough evidence showing that the real reason of improvement of the assistant.

Moreover, the author argues that, since as we read faster, we get more information, speed reading would benefit in improving the productivity. This is also flawed. There is no proof that fast reading means learning more things in a time limit. We may acquire more information as we read faster but this never guarantees that we learn more things. The author should provide scientific proof and evidence that as one reads faster, he or she absorbs more information. Therefore his productivity will increase.

Finally, the author argues that the price of this class is 500$ which is very low price for the benefits of it. This is flawed since this price may be low for the personnel director and not for the employees. The author needs to consider the opinions of the employees about this price and then conclude such a thing.

In sum, the argument would be strengthened if the author provided some information about the reason of the improvement of the assistant. It also would be more strengthened if he would give more evidence about the relationship between speed of writing and quality of learning and the relativity of these two to the productivity. As it stands, however, the argument is flawed due to the stated reasons.
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