

12CT Critical Thinking Unit 2



Unit 2 Exam Technique

Annotating the **resource booklet** effectively

Getting the **timing** of questions right relative to the marks allocated

Understanding what the question is **asking**

Focusing answers on the question set

Using **precise** and **clear** language in answers

Analysis of Argument

Demonstrate understanding of, and use accurately, a range of **specific terms** (see below)

Key term: **counter**

Key term: **challenge**

Key term: **assess**

Key term: **opinion**

Key term: **belief**

Key term: **knowledge**

Key term: **reasoning**

Key term: **refute**

Key term: **repudiate**

Key term: **infer and inference**

Key term: **contradict and contradiction**

Key term: **coherent**

Key term: **structure**

Key term: **strength and weakness**

Key term: **support**

Key term: **inconsistent and inconsistency**

Key term: **consistent**

Key term: **imply**

Key term: **converse**

Key term: **ambiguous**

Key term: **drawing a conclusion**

Identify and explain the purpose of **intermediate conclusions** within an argument in source material

Identify and explain the purpose of **analogy** within an argument in source material

Identify and explain the purpose of **general principles** within an argument in source material

Recognising and explaining the **difference between an explanation and an argument**

Recognising that longer arguments may contain **explanations** as part of the argument

Evaluating arguments

Assessing **strengths and weaknesses** within arguments

Assessing the use of evidence in the form of **survey/research data**

Assessing the use of evidence in the form of **statistics (percentages or proportions)**

Assessing the use of evidence in the form of **statistical representations (average or mean)**

Suggesting **other conclusions that could be reasonably drawn** from evidence used in an argument

Assessing the **impact of further or additional evidence** on an argument

Evaluating the use of analogies: **identifying situations compared** in the analogy

Evaluating the use of analogies: **the conclusion drawn** from the parallel reasoning

Evaluating arguments (continued)	R	A	G
Evaluating the use of analogies: significant similarities and dissimilarities between the situations			
Evaluating the use of analogies: explaining whether the analogy is strong enough to support the conclusion drawn in the argument			
Identifying and assessing examples: commenting on the relevance of the example (which may be a good or poor example)			
Identifying and assessing examples: assessing the degree to which the example helps the author to make the point			
Identifying explanations given within an argument and offering reasonable alternatives			
Assessing the extent to which any hypothetical reasoning supports an argument			
Assessing the extent to which general principles apply in other situations and explaining where a general principle would not be applicable			
Recognising flaws (common, but erroneous patterns of reasoning where the conclusion is very unlikely to follow from the reasons given)			
Identifying flaws by name (see below) and explaining how they weaken an argument			
Flaw: slippery slope			
Flaw: post hoc			
Flaw: circular argument (begging the question)			
Flaw: false dichotomy/restricting the options			
Flaw: conflation			
Flaw: false cause/confusing cause and effect/simplifying causal relationships /'correlation = cause' confusion			
Flaw: tu quo que (two wrongs don't make a right)			
Flaw: confusing necessary and sufficient conditions			
Flaw: hasty/unwarranted/sweeping generalisation			
Flaw: straw person/man			
Flaw: ad hominem			
Flaw: arguing from one thing to another, unrelated conclusion			
Flaw: predictions about the future without sufficient evidence			
Explaining why a conclusion is unlikely to follow from the reasons given because of a flaw in the argument			
Identifying an ' appeal ' (a rhetorical device referring to swaying the audience by emotional persuasion rather than by rational argument)			
Identifying appeals to authority within arguments			
Identifying appeals to tradition within arguments			
Identifying appeals to history (where evidence of past performance is used to predict future performance) within arguments			
Identifying appeals to popularity (where the weight of numbers is used to support a conclusion) within arguments			
Identifying appeals to emotion (where rational argument is replaced by overtly emotional factors) within arguments			
Explaining why an 'appeal' may not support a conclusion			
Developing One's Own Reasoned Arguments			
Producing arguments that either support or challenge a conclusion given in stimulus or other material.			
Using a clear structure and containing a range of argument components			
Including three or more reasons that support an intermediate or main conclusion			
Including an intermediate conclusion			
Using evidence or examples to support an argument			
Including counter-assertions or counter-arguments and responding to these			
Including elements such as hypothetical reasoning or general principles			