

Literature-Quality Source Evaluation and Scientific Argument

g12_u08_w31

Use original fictional paper excerpts only. Evaluate claims; do not conduct research, collect data, intervene, regulate, or make real-world decisions.

Excerpt P: “In a fictional closed-vial model, labeled mixture P changed more quickly than Q at one stated temperature.” **Excerpt R:** “A fictional report proposes that the labeled additive caused the change; its method card omits a control.” **Excerpt S:** “A fictional review summarizes P and R and notes that both cards have narrow boundaries.”

1. Identify the direct claim in Excerpt P.

2. Identify the boundary in Excerpt P.

3. What evidence type does P describe?

4. What does “more quickly” require before comparison?

5. State one claim P does not support.

6. Identify R’s causal claim.

7. What methodological omission weakens R?

8. Why is correlation not automatically causation?

9. What would a fictional control card help test?

10. What does S contribute that P alone does not?

11. Why is a review not automatically stronger than its underlying evidence?

12. Define a claim-evidence-reasoning argument.

13. Write a cautious claim using P.

14. Name evidence that could challenge the P interpretation.

15. Identify one uncertainty that should appear in a careful argument.

16. Explain why a precise sentence can still be weak evidence.

17. Sort P, R, and S by their stated roles: observation, explanation, or synthesis.

18. Write one question a source card should answer about method.

19. Draft a bounded two-sentence argument using P and S.

20. State one prohibited real-world conclusion that the excerpts cannot establish.
