

INITIAL WRITING SKILL LEVEL UPON ENROLLMENT: AS OF 7/28/20

The arguments presented provide different points of view on the gold standard. The proponents' argument is stronger because their evidence is more specific and convincing.

The proponents' argument is based on the fact that the gold standard establish stable market prices. They provide information while the country used the gold standard, the yearly inflation rate was only 0.1%. However, after the gold standard was changed and cancelled, the inflation rate was increased to 4.1%. This specific data helps to convince the readers that the gold standard creates stable economy, and it benefits the general public.

On the other hand, the opponents claim that the gold standard produce only temporary stability. They give two historical events, the California Gold Rush and the Civil War, to back up their claim that price changes more while the country used gold standard. However, the opponents do not specify how much were the price changes. This suggests that their evidence is based on estimation and speculation and therefore is weak.

In summary, the proponents provide more specific and compelling evidence. Therefore, their argument is better supported. It is better for the U.S. to use the gold standard since it helps to maintain the stability of our economy.

WRITING SKILL LEVEL: AS OF 8/6/20

Should More Gun Control Laws Be Enacted?

At 8 A.M., you send your children to school. At 10 A.M., you learn that there is a mass shooting at your children's school. How do these parents bear the pain? Over the past few years, mass shootings have frequently happened in the U.S., and the issue of gun control laws has generated a lot of debate. Both the proponents and the opponents of gun control laws provide evidence to support their positions. However, the proponents' argument is better supported because their evidence shows that gun control laws reduce gun deaths and economic costs.

Firstly, the proponents' argument is stronger than the opponents because they provide convincing empirical data to support their ideas that gun control laws help to lower gun deaths. For example, the proponents state, "According to a Mar. 10, 2016 Lancet study, implementing federal universal background checks could reduce firearm deaths by a projected 56.9%; background checks for ammunition purchases could reduce deaths by a projected 80.7%, and gun identification requirements could reduce deaths by a projected 82.5%." (ProCon.org, Pro 2) These statistical data show that a background check, one of the gun control laws, is effective to prevent gun violence and save a myriad of precious lives.

Secondly, the proponents present a stronger argument than the opponents because they cite evidence that shows gun control laws are needed to reduce the economic costs related to gun violence. For instance, the proponents mention, "A study in the American Journal of Public Health estimated that hospitalizations for firearm-related injuries cost Medicaid and Medicare \$2.7 billion over nine years. 84% of those injured by firearms are uninsured, leaving taxpayers responsible for most of those bills through programs like Medicaid." (ProCon.org, Pro 7) This means that gun control laws are vital as it could save enormous taxpayers' money due to gun violence and therefore, reduce the negative impact on the U.S economy.

On the contrary, the opponents of gun control laws argue that gun control laws would cause the government to gain too much power and take away all guns from people. The opponents say, "57% of people surveyed by Pew Research in Feb. 2013 said that gun control laws would "give too much power to the government over the people." (ProCon.org, Con 6) However, the opponents' evidence is vague because there is no indication of which group of people participated in the survey. Although Pew Research is well known, it is necessary to be concise in presenting information to the public.

In summary, the proponents' argument that more gun control laws should be enacted is better supported than the opponents' argument. The proponents provide statistical data and cite evidence to prove that gun laws save lives and taxpayers' money. The opponents' argument is ambiguous as they do not specify how the researcher selected the sample for the study. Thus, the government should enforce gun laws to create a safer environment.