

3.1 Identifying claims and evidence

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____

Total: 11 marks

KEY WORDS reasoning 推理

Objective

Build the skills to identify claims and evidence where the **reasoning** 推理 connects them.

You must be able to:

- identify the claim a piece of evidence is intended to support
- state the assumption that must hold for the link to work
- notice where evidence supports a weaker claim than the one made
- distinguish sufficient from merely relevant evidence

1 Worked examples

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

■ The hidden assumption

Every move from evidence to claim rests on an unstated assumption. “Test scores rose after the new curriculum” supports “the curriculum worked” only if nothing else changed. Naming that assumption is the sharpest analytical move available.

■ Weaker claim than made

Evidence often supports something true but smaller than what the writer concludes. Data showing a correlation supports “these vary together”, not “one causes the other”. Say what the evidence actually earns.

■ Relevant against sufficient

Evidence can be genuinely relevant and still not enough. One case study is relevant to a national claim and nowhere near sufficient for it.

2 Practice

2.1 State what every move from evidence to claim depends on. [2]

2.2 State the difference between relevant and sufficient evidence. [2]

2.3 A writer notes that crime fell after more officers were hired and concludes that hiring caused the fall.

(a) State the assumption. [1]

(b) State the claim the evidence actually supports. [1]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 A correlation between two variables supports the claim that [1]

- **A** one causes the other
- **B** the two vary together
- **C** neither is real
- **D** the sample is biased

3.2 One detailed case used to support a national claim is [1]

- **A** sufficient but irrelevant
- **B** relevant but insufficient
- **C** both sufficient and relevant
- **D** neither

3.3 A passage argues from a survey of its own readers to a claim about the country.

(a) Name the problem. [1]

(b) Explain what would be needed instead.

[2]

Solutions

2.1 an unstated assumption connecting them, which must hold for the evidence to support the claim.

2.2 relevant evidence bears on the claim; sufficient evidence is enough to establish it.

2.3 (a) that nothing else that could affect crime changed at the same time. (b) that the fall followed the hiring — a coincidence in time, not a cause.

3.1 B. correlation establishes co-variation only.

3.2 B. it bears on the claim but cannot establish it.

3.3 (a) an unrepresentative sample. (b) a sample drawn to represent the national population, since readers of one publication differ systematically from the country.