

9.1 How claims are qualified

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 12 marks**

KEY WORDS sustained argument 持续论证

Objective

Build the skills to analyse qualification in a **sustained argument** 持续论证.

You must be able to:

- trace how a claim’s scope changes across a whole text
- distinguish a narrowing argument from an inconsistent one
- state a writer’s final position including all its limits
- explain the rhetorical effect of visible narrowing

1 Worked examples

Study these first. Each one shows the method for a task used later.

■ Scope across a text

A claim stated broadly in the introduction may be narrowed twice before the conclusion. Track it: broad claim, first limit, second limit, final position. That sequence is the argument.

■ Narrowing against inconsistency

Narrowing is principled: each limit is introduced with a reason. **Inconsistency** is a claim that changes without acknowledgment. The presence or absence of a stated reason distinguishes them.

■ The effect of visible narrowing

A reader who watches a writer surrender ground for stated reasons trusts what is left. Narrowing performed openly buys credibility that an unqualified claim cannot.

2 Practice

2.1 State the four stages of tracking a claim’s scope. [2]

2.2 State what distinguishes narrowing from inconsistency. [2]

2.3 A writer’s conclusion claims less than the introduction, each step given a reason.

(a) State whether this is a weakness. [1]

(b) Justify your answer. [1]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 A claim that changes without acknowledgment is [1]

- **A** narrowing
- **B** inconsistency
- **C** qualification
- **D** concession

3.2 Visible narrowing buys the writer [1]

- **A** length
- **B** credibility
- **C** a thesis
- **D** coherence

3.3 State a writer’s final position in one sentence, given: an opening claim that a policy works, a limit to large cities, and a further limit to those with existing transport.

(a) Write the sentence. [2]

(b) State what the narrowing shows about the evidence. [2]

Solutions

2.1 broad claim; first limit; second limit; final position.

2.2 narrowing introduces each limit with a reason; inconsistency changes the claim without acknowledgment.

2.3 (a) no. (b) each surrender is principled, so the remaining claim is better supported and the reader trusts it.

3.1 B. unacknowledged change is inconsistency.

3.2 B. surrendering ground for reasons earns trust in what remains.

3.3 (a) one sentence including both limits, e.g. “The policy works in large cities that already have frequent transport”. (b) that the evidence supports the claim only under those conditions, and the writer has followed it rather than the original claim.