

The following appeared in an article written by Dr. Karp, an anthropologist.

“Twenty years ago, Dr. Field, a noted anthropologist, visited the island of Tertia and concluded from his observations that children in Tertia were reared by an entire village rather than by their own biological parents. However, my recent interviews with children living in the group of islands that includes Tertia show that these children spend much more time talking about their biological parents than about other adults in the village. This research of mine proves that Dr. Field's conclusion about Tertian village culture is invalid and thus that the observation-centered approach to studying cultures is invalid as well. The interview-centered method that my team of graduate students is currently using in Tertia will establish a much more accurate understanding of child-rearing traditions there and in other island cultures.”

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

Dr. Krap claims that the observation of Dr. Field is not valid. To support his Idea, he pointed out some new evidence which is in contrast with the last evidence one. He believes that biological parents in Tertia island have an important rules-role in engendering their children, although twenty years ago the survey asserted differently. This argument is not based on credible information and has serious flaws.

First of all, Dr. Krap did not use any numbers in his assertion. For making a presumption to a theory, statistics and charts play an important rules. His group should categorize their results and observation in order to find out the percents of the results of two theories. Since comparing the results of two professors is not practical in this way, his claim is untenable.

The recent interview of adolescents of Tertia implies-cites other evidence due to based on Dr. Krap's argument. However, careful examination of them, reveals that it lends little credible support to the author's assumption. They believe, since the juveniles mentioned-spoke more about their biological parents, it can be concluded that the method of raising the children up in the mentioned area whether- has either changed or the last observation was wrong. Without establishing that all other factors affecting the upbringing of a child, the author cannot rely on this limited investigation to support his claim.

There are some other possibilities for talking more about the biological parents in this time. They can relate to the type of questions, which the students-researchers have asked the youths. Since we are not aware of the questionnaire, defending the new conclusion that based on it is not acceptable. On the other hand, the number of children which-who were questioned is not clear. It must be showed in related-relation to the whole population of the island and the more important factor, which is not considered in this argument, is the age of the ones who were interviewed. Youths in different ages depend differently on their biological parents. Perhaps they fantasy-fantasize about their relationship with their parents owing to their sentimental needs.

In sum, the argument is logically flawed and therefore unconvincing as it stands. It did not mention any statistics which can be compared with other information to evaluate correctly. There is no evidence about the age of children who were in the survey in order to consider the emotional factors. The questions are not accessible to examine the range of information which they have gathered. To strengthen this claim, the author needs to pay more attention to other possible factors and be clear in the evidence.