

2.1 Understanding people through checked observations

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____

Total: 24 marks

KEY WORDS personality trait 人格特质 • self-awareness 自我认知 • empathy 同理心
• values 价值观

Objective

Distinguish an observation from an unsupported explanation, invite a specific contribution and review a team interaction. This is original GAC006-aligned practice, not an official assessment. All people, records and task instructions are fictional.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

■ Key knowledge: a label is not the evidence

A **personality trait** 人格特质 describes a relatively lasting tendency in thought, feeling or behaviour. One meeting does not establish it. Introversion and extraversion are broad tendencies along a range, not fixed team roles. APA definition.

Self-awareness 自我认知 uses observations about your own responses and limits. **Empathy** 同理心 involves trying to understand another perspective; ask rather than treating a guess as fact. **Values** 价值观 are things a person considers important. Stated priorities can help explain a disagreement; disagreement alone cannot establish its cause.

For a task problem, record what happened, ask about the relevant work, check the answer and agree a next action. Keep the actual task rules and agreed support arrangements in view.

■ Source A: meeting record and task brief

The fictional project requires each of four members to explain one checked finding in a Friday presentation. Agreed support may include prepared notes and rehearsal. No member has been excused from the presentation.

At Tuesday's meeting Chen brought a survey table but did not speak for twenty minutes. Wei said, "He is an introvert and has no useful findings, so we should remove his presentation part." Chen's reason for being silent was not recorded.


Rui said, "Checking each total matters most to me." Lin said, "Finishing early matters most to me." Both wanted an accurate report on time. No evidence about their relative intelligence or effort was supplied.

■ Source B: a question and a trial

Wei asked, “Chen, you checked the totals. What did you find?” Chen explained that two entries were counted twice. The team compared the table with the raw list and confirmed the duplicates. They corrected the totals together.

For Wednesday’s rehearsal Chen agreed to use prepared notes and take the second reporting turn. He explained one corrected finding and answered one question accurately when the team checked it against the table. Only that finding and question were checked. Friday’s presentation has not happened.

■ Worked example: preserve the unknown reason



Known: Chen brought a table and was silent. Why ask about the table? It gives a specific opening linked to his prepared work, without assigning a personality or motive. His later explanation was checked against the raw list, so the duplicate-entry finding is supported.

The rehearsal supplies one further observed contribution. It does not explain Tuesday’s silence, establish a personality trait or prove that every Friday response will be accurate. Keep his required part and agreed support, rehearse another question and record its result.

2 Practice

2.1 State TWO observations about Chen at Tuesday’s meeting before Wei asked the question. [2]

2.2 Identify TWO unsupported conclusions in Wei’s statement, and explain why the meeting record does not establish them. [2]

2.3 State Rui’s and Lin’s explicitly reported priorities, and give ONE feasible action that can respect both under the brief. [3]

2.4 Describe what the checked duplicate-entry finding establishes, what remains unknown about Chen, and ONE relevant next check before Friday. [3]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 Evaluate THREE proposals using the supplied records: “Remove Chen’s required part because he was quiet”; “Assume the rehearsal proves every Friday answer will be accurate”; “State as fact that Wei’s question explains why Chen was silent”. Give a supported correction and a reason for each. [6]

Solutions

2.1 Chen brought a survey table and did not speak for twenty minutes. Neither fact alone identifies his reason or a trait.

2.2 Award B1 for each supported correction, maximum 2: the personality label is not established from one meeting; “no useful findings” is not established by silence; removing the required part is not authorised by the supplied brief. Accept two distinct conclusions with a relevant reason; do not credit two restatements of the same label.

2.3 Rui values checking each total; Lin values finishing early. For example, agree a short checking slot and an internal handover before drafting, confirming availability and retaining the required accuracy check. Accept another feasible action that addresses both priorities. No relative effort or intelligence can be inferred.

2.4 The checked table/raw-list comparison supports the two duplicate entries and a useful contribution in that meeting. The reason for silence remains unknown. Rehearse another finding or question with agreed notes/turns, compare the response with the checked table and record the result before Friday. Do not promise accuracy as the check.

3.1 Award 2 per proposal: supported correction and reason. Keep Chen’s required finding and agreed support: the brief requires each member’s contribution and silence does not establish an exemption. Check further responses: one finding and one question in rehearsal cannot establish all future answers. Keep the reason for silence open: the question preceded a checked contribution, but no record identifies why Chen had been silent.

3.2 Local analytic rubric, $8 \times$ B1: table/silence observation; unsupported original judgement identified; specific question; checked duplicates; rehearsal outcome stated accurately; scope/reason limit preserved; specific next task and recorded check respecting the brief; coherent truthful 80–110 word review. Example: “On Tuesday Chen brought a survey table but stayed silent for twenty minutes. I treated that silence as proof that he had nothing useful to present. That judgement was unsupported. I asked what he had found in the totals, and he identified two duplicate entries. We checked the raw list and corrected them together. In rehearsal he explained one finding and answered one checked question accurately. This does not establish why he was silent or guarantee Friday’s answers. Before Friday we will rehearse another question with his agreed notes and reporting turn, compare the answer with the table and record any correction.”