

Argumentative Writing: Analytic Comparisons of Students' Refutation

Analytic Comparison: Refutation – Responsiveness

Refutation 'responsiveness' refers to how directly an argument or counter-argument is addressed by the writer's refutation. Is the counter-argument responded to closely, directly, and specifically? Or is the effort at refutation broad, approximate, somewhat evasive, or only marginally responsive? The closer and more direct the refutation, the more stringent is the critical thinking required and the more effective the refutation.

A) Argumentative claim: Undocumented residents improve the U.S. economy.

Of course, it is possible to disagree with the view that undocumented residents

improve the economy, and instead argue that they cost taxpayers money. However, the

weight of the evidence is on the other side. What must be remembered is that it costs a larger

amount of money to deport them, than letting them stay here, while they work and support an

economy that's not even their own. This shows that they want to have a better life here in

America to support them and their families, all the while supporting the economy.

B) Argumentative claim: The U.S. is a country of immigrants, so it should always protect and try to expand its diversity.

Of course, it is possible to disagree with the view that this

country is made up of immigrants and instead argue that this is a country of legal immigrants

who waited their turn. However, the weight of the evidence is on the other side. What matters is

that these immigrants can help the economy and we can learn to make our country more diverse

by accepting these new ideas and different cultures. This is why their argument is false and mine

is correct. Undocumented residents should in fact get a pathway to citizenship.

Argumentative Writing: Analytic Comparisons

Analytic Comparisons of Students' Refutation

Analytic Comparison: Refutation – Comprehensiveness

Refutation 'comprehensiveness' refers to the fullness and completeness of the refutation of the counter-argument. Does the effort at refutation leave a meaningful portion of the counter-argument standing, undermining the writer's argumentative position? Or does the writer refute the competing argument or counter-argument fully and comprehensively, so that there is nothing left that materially contradicts or conflates the writer's argumentative position?

A) Argumentative claim: Undocumented residents improve the economy because they are industrious and hard-working.

Now, some might argue that

there are American citizens who need these jobs which are being taken by the 8 million non-

citizens. However, the argument that legal immigrants provide for the economy therefore should

have a pathway to citizenship is still valid. What must be remembered is that these immigrants

are providing for the economy, so getting rid of them would be an ignorant choice. All that

would do is get rid of our entrepreneurs and inventors.

B) Argumentative claim: Deporting undocumented residents would tear apart millions of American families.

. Of course it is possible

to disagree with the view that immigrants will continue to be afraid of their families falling apart

and instead argue that these undocumented immigrants are breaking the law and are justified to

have their families split. However, the weight of the evidence is on the other side. What ought to

be remembered is that this argument is discriminatory. These immigrants are still people. No

humane person wants to be disconnected from their families, therefore it should not be wished

upon others. All of these people are trying to be permissible people and live with their families,

but the immigration laws are turning their heads to this fact.

Argumentative Writing: Analytic Comparisons Analytic Comparisons of Students' Refutation

Analytic Comparison: Refutation – Depth of Thinking

Refutation 'depth of thinking' refers to how thoughtful, acute, intellectually penetrating, and analytically reflective the refutation is. Does the writer's refutation reflect serious, deliberate thoughtfulness and reflection? Or is it dismissive, superficial, surface-level, and too easy?

A) Argumentative claim: Deporting undocumented residents would tear apart millions of American families.

Now, some might argue that these families are at fault for coming to the U.S. illegally, so the suffering shouldn't drive American government policy. But the argument that American immigration policy should avoid breaking these families' is still true. The key point in all of this is all of the children were not responsible for their parents' decision. American policy cannot punish children for their parents actions.

B) Argumentative claim: The U.S. is a country of immigrants.

Now some might argue that they came here illegally so the U.S. is justified in punishing them. That argument does not work in reality. The U.S.A is a melting pot, so when people say stuff like that, they are being hypocritical.

Argumentative Writing: Analytic Comparisons Analytic Comparisons of Students' Refutation

Analytic Comparison: Refutation – Strength of Counter-Argument

The 'strength of the counter-argument' refers to whether the writer engages with a credible, formidable counter-argument against the argument being made, or whether the writer sets up a 'straw man' to easily refute. In a sense, this is a question of the 'degree of difficulty' of the student's refutation: the stronger the counter-argument, the more credit is given to its refutation. A factor in determining a counter-argument's strength is its specificity to the argumentative claim, as opposed to its addressing the overall position in the essay and not directly addressing the argument for that position.

A) Argumentative claim: Undocumented residents improve the U.S. economy.

Of course, it is possible to disagree with the view that more

immigrants should be allowed to become American citizens, and argue that undocumented

immigrants don't use the opportunities that America has to offer them. However, the weight of

that evidence is on the other side. What must be remembered is that most people do use the U.S.

for new opportunities, such as getting a job, and attending college. Eight Million undocumented

residents are in the U.S workforce.

B) Argumentative claim: Undocumented residents improve the U.S. economy.

Of course, it is possible to disagree

with the view that undocumented immigrants can help improve our economy and instead argue

that the 8 million undocumented immigrants who are employed in the U.S. are taking jobs away

from American citizens. However, the weight of the evidence is on the other side. What must be

remembered is that immigrants come to the US to get a better life, so they boost our economy on

the way. This is fundamentally why undocumented immigrants are improving our economy.