

5.1 Critically analyse a spoken claim and preserve its qualifications

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____

Total: 24 marks

KEY WORDS critical listening 批判性倾听 • qualification 限定 • comparison 比较

Objective

Critically analyse a spoken claim and preserve its qualifications. This is original GAC014-aligned practice, not an official assessment. All people, texts, records and instructions are fictional. This sheet's word ranges and analytic points are local teaching conventions, not official assessment specifications. Written scripts and plans support listening/speaking preparation; they do not replace reviewed audio or assess pronunciation, actual delivery or one-pass listening comprehension.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

■ **Key knowledge:** the task is to evaluate the argument rather than repeat its conclusion

Critical listening 批判性倾听 follows a claim, its support, its limits and the unanswered questions. A **qualification** 限定 such as in this class narrows what the speaker asserts. Preserve it when taking notes or summarising.

A **comparison** 比较 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.

■ **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."

■ 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.

■ 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.

2 Practice

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]

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

3 Exam-style questions

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

Solutions

2.1

Sixteen volunteers; twelve made at least one relevant revision.

2.2

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

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.

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

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.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: accurate twelve-of-sixteen result; combined checklist/comment 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.”