

Exercise walk-through

5.1

Education

GAC Academic English

Method — Key knowledge: the task is to evaluate the argument rather than repeat its conclusion

Critical listening follows a claim, its support, its limits and the unanswered questions. A **qualification** such as in this class narrows what the speaker asserts. Preserve it when taking notes or summarising. A **comparison** helps address an explanation only when its design is suitable. A result after an activity does not by itself show that the activity caused the result. Identify what was measured and what other influences remain. Written-script analysis prepares a rehearsal; it is not a recorded listening assessment.

Method — Source A: text or task brief

Original written education-seminar script: “Sixteen volunteers used a teacher checklist and then exchanged comments on their paragraphs. Twelve made at least one relevant revision afterwards. For this local task, a relevant revision clarifies a claim or adds support required by the checklist; a spelling-only change does not count. However, there was no group using the checklist without peer comments. The records also give no earlier revision rate. We can report revisions after the combined activity, but we cannot isolate the effect of comments alone. A future comparison could give both groups the same checklist and state the revision criteria before review.”

Method — Source B: response or review record

Summary draft: “Peer comments alone caused twelve students to improve, and the other four changed no words. The teacher checklist cannot have helped. The trial proves that all classes should use peer comments.”

Discussion question: “Does the limited evidence mean the activity was completely useless?”

No actual audio, assigned comparison group or later classroom result is supplied.

Method — Worked example: separate the counted revision from an unmeasured explanation

Known: twelve of sixteen volunteers met the stated relevant-revision criterion after a combined activity. Why preserve combined? Every volunteer had a checklist and peer comments; their separate effects were not measured.

The remaining four did not meet that criterion. They may have made spelling-only changes or no changes; the record does not distinguish these. A critical summary can acknowledge the observed revisions without either asserting an isolated cause or declaring the activity useless.



Exercises 2.1-2.3

2.1 State the number of volunteers and the number making a relevant revision. [2]

2.2 Give the local revision criterion and say whether a spelling-only change qualifies. [2]

2.3 Explain THREE unsupported statements in the summary draft. [3]

Exercises 2.1-2.3

2.1 State the number of volunteers and the number making a relevant revision. [2]

2.1

Sixteen volunteers; twelve made at least one relevant revision.

2.2 Give the local revision criterion and say whether a spelling-only change qualifies. [2]

2.2

Clarifies a claim or adds checklist-required support; spelling-only change does not qualify.

2.3 Explain THREE unsupported statements in the summary draft. [3]

2.3

Any three distinct points, B1 each: comments alone were not isolated; the remaining four may have made changes outside the criterion; checklist influence is unknown rather than excluded; one volunteer class does not prove a rule for all classes.

Exercises 2.4·3.1

2.4 Identify THREE missing or limited aspects of the evidence relevant to the argument. [3]

3.1 Write a claim-support-limit summary and propose one useful comparison. Explain why it is useful. [6]

Exercises 2.4·3.1

2.4 Identify THREE missing or limited aspects of the evidence relevant to the argument. [3]

2.4

Any three, B1 each: no checklist-only group; no earlier revision rate; voluntary participation/one class limits wider representation; no later result or suitable assigned comparison.

3.1 Write a claim-support-limit summary and propose one useful comparison. Explain why it is useful. [6]

3.1

Reports revisions after the combined activity; twelve of sixteen and criterion retained; no checklist-only comparison; no isolated comment effect or universal conclusion; proposes a suitable comparison with both groups using the same checklist and pre-stated revision criteria; explains how holding the checklist/criteria consistent addresses the separate-effect question without guaranteeing proof.

Exercise 3.2

3.2 Write an 80–110 word critical summary for a seminar partner, keeping the observed result, its limits and a useful next check. [8]

Exercise 3.2

3.2 Write an 80–110 word critical summary for a seminar partner, keeping the observed result, its limits and a useful next check. [8]

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: accurate twelve-of-sixteen result; combined checklist/comme activity; relevant-revision criterion and spelling distinction; no invented absence of all changes in remaining four; absent baseline/comparison and no isolated causation; suitable proposed comparison; limited scope without universal benefit or unsupported dismissal; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “The seminar reports relevant revisions in twelve of sixteen volunteers after a checklist-and-peer-comment activity. A relevant revision clarified a claim or added required support, so a spelling-only change did not count. The other four did not meet this criterion, but the record does not say they changed nothing. Because everyone received both the checklist and comments, and no earlier revision rate or checklist-only group was recorded, comments alone cannot be identified as the cause. A future comparison could keep the checklist and revision criteria consistent. The evidence is useful but limited; it neither proves a universal benefit nor shows the activity was useless.”