

7.14 Selecting relevant and sufficient evidence

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____

Total: 13 marks

KEY WORDS revise an interpretation 修正解读

Objective

Build the skills to **revise an interpretation** 修正解读.

You must be able to:

- state what evidence may require
- explain why revising is a strength rather than a failure
- state the conditions for effectiveness and sufficiency
- recognise when a claim must change

1 Worked examples

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

■ The claim

Textual evidence may require revision to an interpretation and a line of reasoning if the evidence does not sufficiently support the initial interpretation and line of reasoning.

■ Revision as strength

The CED builds revision into the process. An interpretation held against the evidence is not loyalty to a reading; it is a refusal to read.

■ The conditions

Effective when commentary explains a logical relationship between evidence and claim; **sufficient** when quantity and quality aptly support the line of reasoning.

■ When to change

If defending the claim requires ignoring a passage, quoting selectively, or explaining away what a character plainly does, the claim needs revising rather than better defending.

2 Practice

2.1 State what textual evidence may require. [2]

2.2 Explain why revising is a strength. [2]

2.3 Some signs indicate a claim must change.

(a) Name two. [2]

(b) State the conditions for effectiveness and sufficiency. [2]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 Evidence may require revision when it does not [1]

- **A** sufficiently support the initial interpretation
- **B** rhyme
- **C** fill the page
- **D** name the author

3.2 Holding an interpretation against the evidence is [1]

- **A** a refusal to read
- **B** loyalty to a reading
- **C** required
- **D** sophisticated

3.3 Defending a claim requires explaining away what a character plainly does.

(a) State what this indicates. [1]

(b) Explain the correct response.

[2]

Solutions

2.1 revision to an interpretation and a line of reasoning if the evidence does not sufficiently support them.

2.2 the CED builds revision into the process, so an interpretation held against the evidence is a refusal to read rather than loyalty to a reading.

2.3 (a) any two of: ignoring a passage; quoting selectively; explaining away what a character plainly does. (b) effective when commentary explains the logical relationship to the claim; sufficient when quantity and quality aptly support the line of reasoning.

3.1 A. insufficient support.

3.2 A. a refusal to read.

3.3 (a) that the claim is not supported by the text. (b) revise the interpretation to one the evidence supports rather than defending the original more elaborately.