

5. AW · Analytical Writing: Analyze an Issue

Starter Quiz ·

GRE General Test Name: _____ Score: _____

1. Practice task on “Governments should place few, if any, restrictions on scientific research”: choose the thesis that states a general preference for few restrictions and identifies a risk-based exception.

☐ Governments should rarely restrict research, but they must regulate studies that endanger human subjects or the public.

☐ Governments should never restrict research under any circumstances.

☐ Research is a big topic with many sides.

☐ I like science.
2. One unchanged essay can be assumed to fulfil every different GRE Issue instruction.

☐ True

☐ False
3. A serious opposing reason challenges your proposed policy. Which response best develops your analysis?

☐ Mention it only in the conclusion without comment.

☐ State it fairly, evaluate its force, and explain whether your position holds or needs revision.

☐ Ignore it.

☐ Agree completely without examining its reasoning.
4. A condition or limit clarifying the scope of a thesis is a _____.
5. A qualified position automatically receives a higher score than an unqualified position.

☐ True

☐ False
6. An instruction asks you to consider a policy’s possible consequences and explain how they shape your position. What must you do beyond listing benefits and costs?

☐ Replace the effects with a longer introduction.

☐ Avoid taking a position.

☐ Explain how the effects lead to your policy judgment.

☐ State that every possible effect is certain.
7. No empirical source has been supplied. Which sentence honestly presents an illustrative case?

☐ Official data show that almost no project needs review.

- ☐ This invented case proves how often delays occur nationwide.

☐ A national study proved that 97% of projects face pointless delays.

☐ Suppose a harmless comparison waits in the same full-review queue as a project with identified hazards.
8. A hypothetical case shows harmless routine work waiting in the same full-review queue as work with identified hazards. Which sentence best links that case to proportionate review?

☐ The case supplies national delay statistics.

☐ The different risks give a reason to vary review depth while keeping an initial assessment.

☐ Research is a large topic.

☐ The case proves that no review can ever help.
9. Select all revisions that directly repair substantive problems in an Issue response.

☐ Add the missing explanation of how consequences shape the position.

☐ Replace ordinary words with difficult synonyms regardless of meaning.

☐ Resolve a contradiction between the thesis and the conclusion.

☐ Add an unrelated story to increase length.

Tick every correct option.

10. A draft says, “Review is pointless because it delays 97% of studies,” but gives no source. Which revision best repairs the reasoning?

☐ Keep the number and add more complex vocabulary.

☐ Replace 97% with 99% for emphasis.

☐ Claim that no research can create any risk.

☐ Use a clearly labelled low-risk example and explain why review depth should match credible hazards.

GRE General Test

1. **Governments should rarely restrict research, but they must regulate studies that endanger human subjects or the public.**

This option fulfils both requested parts: a general preference and a risk-based exception. A qualified position is not automatically superior for every Issue task; a different position can also be well defended.

2. **False**

Different instructions can ask for consequences, strong challenges, or evaluation of a claim and its reason. A reusable plan must be adapted to the actual requirements.

3. **State it fairly, evaluate its force, and explain whether your position holds or needs revision.**

Fair evaluation can support a reply, a narrower claim or a changed recommendation. Automatic dismissal and automatic agreement both avoid the reasoning.

4. **qualification**

A qualification states where a claim applies or how a recommendation changes. Its value depends on the reasoning, not simply on making a thesis less absolute.

5. **False**

The task evaluates the response to its instructions, development, organisation and expression. Adding a condition does not by itself establish stronger reasoning or guarantee a score.

6. **Explain how the effects lead to your policy judgment.**

The instruction requires a decision link: explain why those effects lead to your recommendation or to a limit on it.

7. **Suppose a harmless comparison waits in the same full-review queue as a project with identified hazards.**

Suppose clearly signals an invented case. The other choices claim unsupported real data or use an invented case as a measured population result.

8. **The different risks give a reason to vary review depth while keeping an initial assessment.**

It identifies the relevant difference and explains how it bears on the proposed policy, without turning the case into a universal ban on review.

9. **Add the missing explanation of how consequences shape the position.; Resolve a contradiction between the thesis and the conclusion.**

A missing required move and an internal contradiction directly affect the argument. Extra length or difficult vocabulary does not repair those problems.

10. **Use a clearly labelled low-risk example and explain why review depth should match credible hazards.**

Remove the invented precision, analyse a limited mechanism and address review’s possible purpose. Another invented number or stronger wording does not fix the gap.