

Evaluation of article from the economist

Business



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

and number submitted Article Evaluation: “ Sooty skies” Overall the article “ Sooty skies” seems to be a one-off for an acclaimed magazine like The Economist as the article fails to conform to the standards of prose expected from writings in a publication of such repute. However one is able to get the main ideas expressed in the article after reading it completely. The following paragraphs evaluate some of the writing-related characteristics of the article.

Clarity and Flow

Firstly, while it is part of a contemporary fashion in the world of article writing, the title of the article offers no insight into the content in the article though it does manage to refer to the focal point of the essay. The abstract statement (“ Sooty skies”, 1) uses technical terms that make it difficult for a novice of the field of aviation to understand, without reading the article, what the article is about. Right at the very start of the article the writer addresses an aspect of de-icing an aeroplane in the first sentence and continues on with it in the third sentence with no regard for the change of perspective in the second sentence. Similarly in the second paragraph, the writer introduces a Dawid Janas with no reference to Dawid’s relevance to the discussion until later on in the article. Then the article moves on to describe the process of formation of a substance without describing the background of the substance and its relevance to the topic of the article, making it hard for the reader to maintain interest. The writer commits a similar mistake by describing the conductivity of the substance in detail without first stating that conductance of electricity through the substance is a process of the new de-icing technique. This application of the substance becomes clear only later on with an indirect reference to it by the writer as <https://assignbuster.com/evaluation-of-article-from-the-economist/>

he compares the two substances used in de-icing.

Information and Presentation

While a lot of information in the article is misleading and some is suspicious, the content does provide the necessary knowledge needed to understand the views expressed and the basics of the technology referred to by the writer. However the article contains engineering jargon that makes the aspect of de-icing techniques covered in the article irrelevant to business course students, though the price and viability comparisons of materials for de-icing in the later paragraphs can be considered relevant to the domain of business management education. The only image included in the article offers little help in understanding the gist of the article without having read a good part of the written content first. Amusingly enough the second sentence asks the reader to consider the experience of observers rather than the de-icing staff itself to understand the difficulty in de-icing. In the same paragraph the writer makes a reference to ‘ the chemicals’ garish colours’ which is not easy for the reader to understand. And in the next paragraph, the presumed connection between freezing of antifreeze chemical and the need for spraying it multiple times is almost impossible to understand without prior technical information of de-icing processes. While the implication from the use of the term ‘ old soot’ in the next paragraph is discernable, the term is not appropriate for how it is used in the article. And while the writer contends that nanotubes are ‘ famously’ better conductors than copper, the audience of a business magazine such as The Economist is inclined to disagree with him. In the same paragraph the writer makes a rather astonishing comparison between the thickness of one entity and the length of a similar entity. Also the writer makes all his comparisons and

<https://assignbuster.com/evaluation-of-article-from-the-economist/>

judgements based on the proposals of one university student whose invention has not even been tested. While most of the information provided is understandable, the writer provides no sources to verify it and the scientific jargon is not of much use or interest to readers of business magazines.

Language and Grammar

The writing misses the mark of acceptable grammar use at several locations in the article. The writer's abrupt departure in the third sentence of the article from the direction of the discourse provides a prime example of improper use of a preposition "It" and is easily identifiable as such. The writing neglects the target audience by including technical jargon which is not presented in easily understandable English either, to ease comprehension for novices of industrial processes' information. The style of writing too is neglectful of the reader's affiliation to the writer and employs informal terms such as 'a pop' to discuss sober facts in a business article. The writer makes it clear that the material proposed by Dawid is developed through rigorous mechanical processing; yet the writer keeps referring to the material as a type of soot, which is a by-product of the incomplete burning of carbon. Even if the material technically qualifies as soot, it is misleading to present it as such.

Though the article does seem to provide some value of information, especially if the information provided is correct, it seems to be misplaced with most of the discussion about feasibility relating to industrial processes rather than business matters.

References

<https://assignbuster.com/evaluation-of-article-from-the-economist/>

" Sooty Skies." The Economist 2013: n. pag. The Economist. 30 Nov. 2013.
Web. 9 Dec. 2013. .