

Claim: Group assignments that students must work together to complete should replace a substantial amount of traditional lecture-based instruction in college and university courses.

Reason: It is vital for students to gain experience collaborating with peers to study a topic and to achieve a common goal.

Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the claim and the reason on which that claim is based.

(1) agree + disagree 둘 다? vs 한쪽 집중?

결론: "양면 언급 + 명확한 최종 입장"이 가장 안정적

단, 두 가지를 구분해야 함:

X 절대 하지 않아야 할 서술 구조

반반 균형 ("agree 도 맞고 disagree 도 맞다"로 끝) → 입장이 흐려짐 → 점수 손실

O 추천하는 구조

부분 동의 (**qualified agreement**) 또는 조건부 반대 → 한쪽을 중심으로, 반대 측은 제한·조건·예외로 처리

실전 전략 (GRE 채점 기준 반영)

- 1) "I largely agree, but only if ~"
- 2) "While the reason is valid, the claim overextends"

핵심 패턴

valid ↔ insufficient / necessary ↔ not sufficient

즉,

- 1) Reason 은 인정하면서
- 2) Claim 은 과도함(overreach)으로 약화(qualification)

이 구조가 가장 안정적인 고득점 서술 방식

2) 논의 방향 (핵심 논점 구조)

이 문제는 사실 하나의 구조로 압축:

핵심 논리

collaboration skill (필요) ≠ lecture replacement (정당화)

필수 논점 3 개 (이 3 개면 충분)

① Reason 인정 (but → 약화 qualification)

Topic 143

1) Signal: **"indeed / certainly"** → **but**

2) 협업 능력은 중요 (↔ individual mastery 도 중요)

ESOTERICA Method 로 말하면

Paired Words: collaboration ↔ independent cognition

② **Claim** 과도함을 지적하여 공격 (핵심 포인트)

1) Signal: **however / yet**

2) "replace a substantial amount" → 과도한 generalization

Logic Pattern

necessary ≠ sufficient

즉 Collaboration 경험 필요 → 그렇다고 강의 대체까지는 아님

③ 역할 분리 (가장 중요한 논점)

1) lecture ≠ group work (기능 다름)

다시 ESOTERICA Method 로

Paired Words: lecture = knowledge transmission

group work = application / interaction

추가로 넣으면 좋은 논점 (선택)

④ 학문 분야 차이

STEM 기초 vs 세미나 중심 인문학

⑤ 현실 문제

1) free-rider problem

2) unequal participation

3) assessment difficulty

다시 ESOTERICA Method 로

Paired Words: equal contribution ↔ uneven effort

구조 요약 (바로 글 쓰는 틀)

Intro:

Reason 인정 + Claim 제한

Body 1:

협업의 가치 인정 (but 단독으로 충분 X)

Body 2:

lecture 의 대체 불가능성 강조

Body 3:

가장 좋은 모델: **integration (not replacement)**

Conclusion:

Reason 은 타당하지만 Claim 은 과도

Topic 143

한 줄 핵심 정리 (Analytical Writing 에 전형적인 Thought Frame)

valuable ≠ replaceable

necessary ≠ sufficient

complement ↔ substitute

Draft before revision

The claim that group assignments should replace a substantial portion of lecture-based instruction is ultimately overextended, even if the reason supporting it is sound. While it is indeed vital for students to gain experience collaborating with peers, this need does not justify diminishing lectures to the extent the claim proposes. The argument conflates what is valuable with what is replaceable.

To begin with, the reason is undeniably valid. Collaboration enables students to negotiate meaning, test interpretations, and refine their understanding through interaction. In such settings, ideas are not merely received but actively constructed, often leading to deeper engagement. Especially in disciplines that require discussion, interpretation, or problem-solving, **collaborative work can expose students to diverse perspectives and promote intellectual flexibility**. In this sense, collaboration is not optional but necessary for a well-rounded education.

However, necessity does not entail sufficiency. The claim assumes that because collaboration is important, it can substitute for lecture-based instruction. This is a logical leap. **Lectures serve a distinct and irreplaceable function: they provide structured, authoritative transmission of foundational knowledge. Without this baseline, group work risks devolving into the exchange of partial or misguided understandings.** Students cannot effectively collaborate on what they do not yet comprehend. Thus, lectures and group assignments are not interchangeable; they fulfill complementary roles.

Moreover, replacing lectures with group work on a substantial scale introduces practical and pedagogical concerns. **Group assignments often suffer from uneven participation, where some students contribute disproportionately while others remain passive. Assessment also becomes less precise, as individual understanding may be obscured within collective output.** These limitations do not negate the value of collaboration, but they underscore the risk of overreliance on it. A system that privileges group work at the expense of lectures may inadvertently weaken both accountability and conceptual clarity.

The most effective educational model, therefore, is not one of replacement but of integration. **Lectures can establish core frameworks and essential knowledge, while group assignments can reinforce and apply that knowledge through interaction.** In this balanced approach, each method compensates for the limitations of the other, creating a more robust learning environment.

In conclusion, although the reason rightly emphasizes the importance of collaboration, it does not adequately support the claim's call for substantial replacement of lectures. **Collaboration is necessary, but it is not sufficient; it should complement, rather than displace, traditional instruction.**

Topic 143

평가:

매우 그럴듯하다. 하지만 5.5-6.0 에는 미치지 못한다.

이유

1. 현재 상태 진단

1) 강점 (특점 포인트)

necessary ≠ sufficient 구조를 명확하게 설정하였다

complement ↔ substitute 대비도 정확하다

Signal 흐름 (while → however → moreover) 안정적이다.

즉, 논리 구조 = 상위권 (5.0 수준 충분)

2) 약점 (감점 요소)

분량이 충분하고 문장이 완벽하지만 감점을 받게 될 핵심 문제:

general claim ↔ 구체적 근거 부족

예:

"collaboration promotes engagement"

"lectures provide structured knowledge"

→ 옳은 진술이지만 **too generic** → 설득력 미흡

3) 무엇이 부족한가 (진단)

지금 글은 **mechanism (essay 의 논지를 이끌어 가는 필자의 기본 입장)은 있음**
but

evidence (현실 anchoring)가 약함

4) 어떻게 보완해야 하는가 (핵심 2 가지)

① **micro-example** 추가 (가장 효과 큼)

현재: group work risks uneven participation

개선: In group projects, some students assume leadership while others remain passive, producing an uneven distribution of effort.

abstract → concrete

general ↔ specific

② **implicit theory** 삽입 (언급하고 싶은 이론, 원리 등의 명칭만 언급하는 것은 특점에 도움 없고 오히려 명칭 언급 없이 구체적인 설명이 특점 요인)

현재: lectures provide foundational knowledge

개선: Without a shared baseline established through structured instruction, students may circulate incomplete or inaccurate interpretations.

theory name 없이 mechanism 강화

5) GRE 식 핵심 대비

structure 와 mechanism 이 있기 때문에 5.0 특점은 가능하지만

Topic 143

evidence 가 부족하여 이렇게 힘들게 쓴 글이지만 5.5~6.0 득점에는 실패한다.

내가 GRE 논리 방식을 설명하기 위해 사용하는 용어인 Paired Words 로 말한다면 logic ↔ evidence 의 상호 보완이 필요하다.

6) 채점 (현실적 평가)

현재: **5.0**

개선 후: **5.5 ~ 6.0**

그 차이는 오직 구체성: **essay 에 담겨 있는 논증들의 치밀성 density**

한 줄 결론

논리는 이미 충분하다 → 점수를 올리는 건 “구체적 **mechanism**”이다

1. INTRODUCTION

BEFORE

While it is indeed vital for students to gain experience collaborating with peers, this need does not justify diminishing lectures to the extent the claim proposes.

AFTER

While it is indeed vital for students to gain experience collaborating with peers—by testing interpretations, negotiating meaning, and revising their views through feedback—this need does not justify diminishing lectures, which establish a shared conceptual baseline that prevents fragmented or inaccurate understanding.

수정 포인트

collaboration (label) → what happens (mechanism)

lecture (label) → function (baseline, error prevention)

label → mechanism → scene 이란 무엇인가?

2. label (이름 붙이기: 추상적이다)

한 단어/짧은 표현으로 개념만 말함: **정보는 맞지만 설득력 약함**

예:

collaboration improves learning

lectures provide structure

문제: Reader 가 공감은 하지만 Reader 에게 주는 impact 없다

reader: “그래서 어떻게?”

2. mechanism (작동 원리)

왜/어떻게 그런 효과가 나는지 설명

인과 연결 등장

예:

students challenge each other's reasoning

structured instruction organizes concepts into sequence

how / why 추가

3. scene (시각화)

실제 상황처럼 눈에 보이게 만들어 누가 무엇을 하는지 드러나게 한다.

예:

one student proposes an idea, another points out a flaw, and both revise their understanding

who + what happens

한 번에 비교

1) label 만

Group work improves learning.

2) mechanism 추가

Group work improves learning because students test and revise their ideas through peer interaction.

3) scene 까지

Group work improves learning because one student proposes an interpretation, another challenges it, and both revise their understanding through discussion.

GRE 채점과 직접 연결

1) label 만 → 논리는 맞지만 알팍하고 공허하다 (**empty** 느낌)

2) mechanism → 설득력 상승

3) scene → **6.0** 수준 핵심 요소

핵심 패턴 (실전에 응용)

1) label = what

2) mechanism = how / why

3) scene = what actually happens

Paired Words

abstract ↔ **concrete**

한 줄로 결론 요약

label 은 주장이고, **mechanism** 은 논증이며, **scene** 은 설득이다

Topic 143

이제 위의 ESSAY 에 이 원칙을 적용하여 6.0 의 만점 ESSAY 로 만들어 본다.

1. BODY 1 (collaboration 가치)

BEFORE

Collaboration enables students to negotiate meaning, test interpretations, and refine their understanding through interaction.

AFTER

Collaboration enables students to negotiate meaning, test competing interpretations, and revise flawed assumptions as peers question and challenge their reasoning in real time.

수정 포인트

refine understanding → revise flawed assumptions (구체화)

interaction → peers challenge reasoning (시각화)

BEFORE

collaborative work can expose students to diverse perspectives and promote intellectual flexibility.

AFTER

collaborative work can expose students to conflicting perspectives—for instance, when one student defends an interpretation that another finds inconsistent—forcing participants to reassess their assumptions and adopt more flexible lines of reasoning.

수정 포인트

diverse perspectives (추상) → conflicting perspectives (긴장 생성)

시각적인 장면 삽입 (one student vs another)

2. BODY 2 (lecture 필요성)

BEFORE

Lectures serve a distinct and irreplaceable function: they provide structured, authoritative transmission of foundational knowledge.

AFTER

Lectures serve a distinct and irreplaceable function: they provide a structured and sequenced framework in which key concepts are introduced, defined, and systematically connected, allowing students to build a coherent understanding rather than assembling fragmented pieces of information.

수정 포인트

structured knowledge → 어떻게 구조화되는가 (sequence, connection)

결과 명시: coherent vs fragmented

BEFORE

Without this baseline, group work risks devolving into the exchange of partial or misguided understandings.

AFTER

Without this baseline, group work risks devolving into the circulation of partial or incorrect interpretations—for example, when students confidently reinforce one another's misunderstandings rather than identifying and correcting them.

수정 포인트

misguided understandings → incorrect interpretations (정확화)

reinforce misunderstanding (메커니즘 추가)

3. BODY 3 (group work 문제)

BEFORE

Group assignments often suffer from uneven participation.

AFTER

Group assignments often suffer from uneven participation, with one or two students organizing, drafting, and completing the work while others contribute minimally or remain passive throughout the process.

수정 포인트

uneven participation → who does what (역할 분해)

BEFORE

Assessment also becomes less precise,

AFTER

Assessment also becomes less precise, since a single group product can obscure significant differences in individual understanding and effort.

수정 포인트

less precise → why (obscure differences)

4. BODY 4 (통합 모델)

BEFORE

Lectures can establish core frameworks and essential knowledge, while group assignments can reinforce and apply that knowledge through interaction.

AFTER

Lectures can establish core frameworks by clearly defining concepts and organizing them into a logical sequence, while group assignments can then require students to apply, test, and extend those concepts by explaining them to peers, resolving disagreements, and collaboratively solving problems.

수정 포인트

reinforce/apply → how exactly (explain, resolve, solve)

5. CONCLUSION

BEFORE

Collaboration is necessary, but it is not sufficient; it should complement, rather than displace, traditional instruction.

AFTER

Collaboration is necessary, but it is not sufficient: it deepens understanding only after a coherent foundation has been established, and thus should complement, rather than displace, traditional instruction.

수정 포인트

necessary ≠ sufficient → 조건 명시 (after foundation)

전체 수정 패턴 (핵심 요약)

BEFORE 의 문제

abstract label 중심

Topic 143

reader: “그래서 어떻게?”

AFTER의 원리

label → **mechanism** → **scene**

GRE 논리

abstract ↔ concrete

claim ↔ instantiation

general ↔ mechanism

Final revised version

The claim that group assignments should replace a substantial portion of lecture-based instruction is ultimately overextended, even if the reason supporting it is sound. While it is indeed vital for students to gain experience collaborating with peers, this need does not justify diminishing lectures to the extent the claim proposes. The argument conflates what is valuable with what is replaceable.

To begin with, the reason is undeniably valid. **Collaboration enables students to negotiate meaning, test competing interpretations, and revise flawed assumptions as peers question and challenge their reasoning in real time.** In such settings, ideas are not merely received but actively constructed, often leading to deeper engagement. Especially in disciplines that require discussion, interpretation, or problem-solving, **collaborative work can expose students to conflicting perspectives—for instance, when one student defends an interpretation that another finds inconsistent—forcing participants to reassess their assumptions and adopt more flexible lines of reasoning.** In this sense, collaboration is not optional but necessary for a well-rounded education.

However, necessity does not entail sufficiency. The claim assumes that because collaboration is important, it can substitute for lecture-based instruction. This is a logical leap. **Lectures serve a distinct and irreplaceable function: they provide a structured and sequenced framework in which key concepts are introduced, defined, and systematically connected, allowing students to build a coherent understanding rather than assembling fragmented pieces of information. Without this baseline, group work risks devolving into the circulation of partial or incorrect interpretations—for example, when students confidently reinforce one another’s misunderstandings rather than identifying and correcting them.** Students cannot effectively collaborate on what they do not yet comprehend. Thus, lectures and group assignments are not interchangeable; they fulfill complementary roles.

Moreover, replacing lectures with group work on a substantial scale introduces practical and pedagogical concerns. **Group assignments often suffer from uneven participation, with one or two students organizing, drafting, and completing the work while others contribute minimally or remain passive throughout the process. Assessment also becomes less precise, since a single group product can obscure significant differences in individual understanding and effort.**

These limitations do not negate the value of collaboration, but they underscore the risk of overreliance on it. A system that privileges group work at the expense of lectures may inadvertently weaken both accountability and conceptual clarity.

The most effective educational model, therefore, is not one of replacement but of integration. **Lectures can establish core frameworks by clearly defining concepts and organizing them into a logical sequence, while group assignments can then require students to apply, test, and extend those concepts by explaining them to peers, resolving disagreements, and collaboratively solving problems.** In this balanced approach, each method compensates for the limitations of the other, creating a more robust learning environment.

Topic 143

In conclusion, although the reason rightly emphasizes the importance of collaboration, it does not adequately support the claim's call for substantial replacement of lectures. **Collaboration is necessary, but it is not sufficient: it deepens understanding only after a coherent foundation has been established, and thus should complement, rather than displace, traditional instruction.**