

6.1 Read an argument critically and write a bounded analytical response

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____

Total: 24 marks

KEY WORDS critical reading 批判性阅读 • assumption 假设 • counterargument 反驳论点

Objective

Read an argument critically and write a bounded analytical response. This is original GAC015-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. Sources supplied here are original fictional classroom material. Actual research coursework requires genuine retrieved sources, verified methods and references in the required style.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

■ **Key knowledge: a result, a causal explanation and a policy prediction are different claims**

Critical reading 批判性阅读 identifies a conclusion and tests the evidence and reasoning offered for it. An **assumption** 假设 is a premise the argument relies on, whether stated or unstated. A result after an activity is not automatically an effect caused by it.

Address a fair **counterargument** 反驳论点 rather than replacing it with a weaker position. A useful response acknowledges what the source shows, explains a specific limit and develops a conclusion no stronger than its support. Do not infer dishonesty merely because an argument overreaches.

■ **Source A: text or task brief**

Original fictional class report E, §1: Thirty students chose an optional revision workshop. Their average later quiz score was seven out of ten, compared with six among thirty students who did not attend. Earlier quiz scores were not compared. Workshop attendees also reported more revision time.

Report E, §2: "Since workshop attendees scored higher, compulsory attendance will raise every student's score." The report gives no individual before-and-after scores and no suitable assigned comparison. The workshop's cost and compulsory-attendance access effects are not recorded.

Local writing task: evaluate the recommendation, citing Report E by label and section. These source labels locate this supplied fictional material, not real educational research.


■ Source B: response or review record

Response draft: “All thirty attendees improved by one point, so the workshop definitely caused the difference. Anyone who questions compulsory attendance thinks revision is useless. The author must have invented the scores.”

Fair alternative view: “The workshop may still be useful, but the comparison should be evaluated before making a universal prediction.”

No later study, budget or attendance policy decision is supplied.

■ Worked example: a difference between groups is not a change in every person



Known: the two later group means are seven and six on the same ten-point scale. Why avoid all improved by one? Individual earlier scores are missing, and the means compare different groups.

The compulsory-attendance prediction assumes a causal contribution and benefit for every student. Voluntary participation, missing earlier scores and different revision time leave alternative explanations. The evidence can support further evaluation without proving either a universal benefit or that revision is useless.

2 Practice

2.1 State the two group sizes and later quiz means.

[2]

2.2 State TWO missing pieces relevant to the claim that every attendee improved.

[2]

2.3 Identify THREE assumptions or unsupported inferences in the recommendation or draft response. [3]

2.4 Give THREE specific limitations or alternative explanations supplied by the report. [3]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 Develop a bounded thesis, acknowledge a fair counterargument and propose a useful evaluation. Explain how each relates to the source. [6]

Solutions

2.1

Thirty in each group; means seven and six out of ten.

2.2

Earlier individual scores/baseline; individual later scores or before-and-after changes rather than just group means.

2.3

Any three, B1 each: workshop caused the difference; every student benefits under compulsory attendance; all attendees improved by one; critics reject revision; argument error proves invented data.

2.4

Any three, B1 each: voluntary participation; earlier attainment not compared; reported revision time differs; no suitable assigned comparison; access effects or costs absent.

3.1

Thesis limits compulsory/universal inference; explains why comparison does not isolate cause; acknowledges possible workshop usefulness; distinguishes that possibility from guaranteed benefit; proposes baseline/suitable comparison/access evaluation; explains how it addresses a specific uncertainty without inventing results.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times$ B1: accurate group sizes and means with Report E attribution; group difference distinct from individual improvement; missing baseline and revision-time limits; no isolated causal or universal conclusion; fair possible-usefulness counterargument; useful evaluation addressing a specific gap; proportionate recommendation without invented results or dishonesty claim; coherent truthful 150–180 word response. Example: “Report E shows that thirty workshop volunteers had a later mean quiz score of seven out of ten, compared with six among thirty non-attendees (§1). This difference warrants attention, but it does not establish that compulsory attendance would improve every student’s score. Earlier scores were not compared, and attendees reported more revision time. Voluntary participation may also distinguish the groups. None of these alternatives can be identified as the true explanation from the report alone.

The claim that every attendee improved by one point confuses a difference between group means with individual change. A fair counterargument is that the workshop may still offer useful revision support. That possibility should not be dismissed simply because the evaluation is limited. However, it also cannot supply the causal and universal support missing from the compulsory-attendance prediction (§2).

A suitable next evaluation could compare earlier attainment, relevant revision activity and access needs under a clearer design. Until then, the report supports further investigation rather than a guaranteed outcome or an accusation that the author invented data.”