The following is a memorandum from the business manager of a television station.

"Over the past year, our late-night news program has devoted increased time to national news and less time to weather and local news. During this time period, most of the complaints received from viewers were concerned with our station's coverage of weather and local news. In addition, local businesses that used to advertise during our late-night news program have just canceled their advertising contracts with us. Therefore, avoid losing any further advertising revenues, we should restore the time devoted to weather and local news to its former level"

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

In this memo, the author concludes based on assumptions that seems convincing at first glance, however, with a closer look they are not compelling enough and wellsupported. The argument assumes that the reasons behind complaints are directly related to decreasing time to weather and local news while it is not based on sound grounds. Also, the writer justifies the cancelation of local businesses advertisements contracts due to less time given to local news, which is not compelling.

First of all, the author mentioned that these results occurred during a specific period of time. It can be inferred from the situation that probably the consequences that writer directly relates to less time to local news and weather coverage is-are merely related to that period of time. It is plausible that the same news timing in some other periods of time would not bring about the same results in complaints or advertising rates. The argument would have been more compelling had it provided the same results in diverse periods of time.

Secondly, the argument depends on <u>an</u> unsubstantiated premise that the high rate of complaints in that period of time was due to weather coverage news; however, it may refer to <u>the</u> quality of weather coverage in that specific time, not the duration of weather news. The argument would have to further prove that the root cause of the complaints was purely <u>the</u> timing of the weather coverage news. A

A major problem with the last part of <u>the</u> argument is that the writer assumes that canceling the advertising contracts by local businesses stem<u>s</u> in-purely from less local news or even less time to weather news_{τ}-however, it can refers to some financial and economic <u>crisis</u> <u>crises</u> in the local businesses or the changing strategies of the companies in their marketing plans. Even it is plausible that a new news program in other channels attracted businessmen and enterprises for their advertisements. In order to support this argument it would be more compelling had the writer support his claim with feedback survey from customer service when canceling their contract during that specific time with the same customers.

All in all, the argument was based on unsubstantiated reasons and evidently the author overlooked other possible impacting factors. The conclusion <u>can_could</u> be acceptable had the author mentioned the other lateral factors such as other periods of

time, constant quality of news or any possible change of marketing strategy of customers which may have <u>an</u> impact on the final results.