SKILLS FOR ANSWERING QUESTION TWO PAPER 1

Common problems for AS Students

Need more "Why" statements	Superficial, not thinking deep enough
Content analysis is not focused on CONTENT	Stop describing/repeating the quote
Judgements are weak or not included	Conclusions are weakly supported
Needs to be two-sided	Utilize fallacies, don't just point them out
Words need to be utilized, not just defined	Not enough pros and cons found

Analysis and Evaluation Samples

Analysis:

Since the author stares the commendable size and conditions of the study, one can assume that the data is credible and is varied as many opinions were introduced.

Though the evidence provided conducted a lengthy study with a large sample size, it failed to acknowledge were the study occurred and only used women in the study which is generalized for the entire population.

The study used contains only information about women, therefore, making it unrepresentative of whether diet drinks are worse for the whole population (men, women, and children).

Evaluation:

Sample 1:

Thus, as it is presently, the study is too weak to be used as a valuable piece of evidence because the data presented does not support the assertions given and because significant details about the study were not identified within the sample making the conclusion and overall argument unsupported.

Sample 1:

Thus, ==in assessing== the lacking information on the inner workings of the study such as the missing author and the limited scope the implications, this study is ==ineffective== as evidence to support the negativity of artificial sweeteners.

Sample 2:

In ==assessing the effectiveness== of the evidence provided in Sample 2, it is ==determined== that the presence of unrepresentative data and the generalization of the data outweighs the legitimacy of the information, as it does not advance the argument being made in the sample, therefore disqualifying the evidence from being ==meaningful.==

Sample Fallacy Usage

Sample 3 includes ==unsupported assertions== because it lists two facts that are used to come to a conclusion ==that is not proven== by those facts.

Sample 1 includes fallacies when explaining the correlation of drinking diet sodas and the increase risk of diabetes. ==This makes the study hard to accept and useless as the lack== of timeline for when the sodas were drunk ==makes the information== unreliable and untrustworthy.

The data includes a study performed by the American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, but ==without expanding on the discoveries of the study==, other than that it found "some frightening facts", the use of the study can be seen as an appeal to authority fallacy ==instead of having a purpose in supporting== the author's claims. Since the study was performed by a medical-based institution, just ==including the name== of the source is an ==attempt to persuade readers== that the information that is included is strong and supportive of these claims.

Sample 2 entails a fallacy of correlation, the observations that were recorded during their study would not be considered a useful tool in answering the question ==because the article is drawing a direct relationship, not a cause.== This is correlation because the statement shows information that is ==supportive of the point, but it cannot be used as a causation== since artificial sweeteners ==cannot be determined as the sole cause of the issues== the rats faced.