CTAs have 3 parts:

(A)Hypotheses,

(B)NULL hypotheses

( c)Evidence,

(D)Conclusion.

Hypotheses should make clear, concise and specific predictions. They should, generally, have the following structure: X causes/correlates/results in Y.

X and Y should be something narrow in scope and clear to most educated people. Big, broad open-ended topics make for poor hypotheses.

The relationship between X and Y (i.e., the hypothesis) should be easy to falsify or reject if untrue.

Evidence should be facts discovered through empirical/scientific research. Evidence should not be confused with expert opinion. Opinions represent an analysis (i.e., potentially an alternative hypothesis) or belief about the evidence reported.

Conclusion should summarize the evidence in one sentence and clearly state whether the evidence supports the hypothesis and the null.

Below are some examples. examples Sample /

Template 1:

1. Hypothesis: Language comprehension (hearing) and language production (speech) are located in different parts of the brain.

(b) Null: Language comprehension (hearing) and language production (speech) are located in the same parts of the brain.

(c) Evidence:

 (1) fMRI shows that speech production activates Broca’s Area in frontal lobes and (2) speech perception (hearing) activates Wernicke’s Area in the posterior temporal lobes. Research on brain damages patients show that

 (3) damage to Broca’s area affects speech production but not general language comprehension.

(4) Damage to Wernicke’s Area in the temporal lobe affect language comprehension but not speech fluency.

(d) Conclusion: Given the evidence from fMRI and brain damaged patients showing that Broca’s area is associated with language production and Wernicke’s Area with language comprehension, we can reject the null and accept the hypothesis that speech production and language comprehension are localized to different areas of the brain.

Sample / Template 2:

(a) Hypothesis: Reading atypical stylized fonts (italicized, bolded) leads to better learning than reading typical non-stylized fonts (non italicized, bolded).

(b) Null: Reading typical non-stylized fonts (non italicized, bolded) leads to better learning than reading atypical stylized fonts (italicized, bolded).

(c) Evidence: Research shows that participants (1) have better recall after reading atypical than typical fonts, (2) studied passages longer when fonts were small than when they were larger and (3) answered more questions correctly (improved comprehension) when reading a passage in atypical stylized fonts than in typical non-stylized fonts.

(d) Conclusion: Together, results show that reading stylized (small, italicized and/or bolded) fonts has a direct impact on learning, improving recall and language comprehension. These results are consistent with the hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis.

FOR CONCLUSION

The first sentence summarize the efficient

the second and third one should state which of the the hypothesis is rejected/supported and why?

and not quote from the article.

need to use as simple as possible for rephrasing the words