

Solutions

2.1

400 litres and 250 litres; four observation days in each period.

2.2

Absolute difference 150 litres; relative difference 37.5% of the first total.

2.3

The trial's effect is not isolated because rainfall differed; planted area is unknown, so litres per square metre cannot be calculated; no supervisor approval is supplied. A criticism of everywhere based on the one-plot scope can replace one distinct criticism.

2.4

Nia asks about sufficient water or plant condition; record rainfall or planted area; Wen has not explicitly accepted the recommendation.

3.1

Totals 400 and 250 litres with four-day period labels; rainfall, area and causal limits disclosed; invites and acknowledges the plant-condition concern; invites Wen's specific view; summarises the recommendation and checks group agreement; seeks supervisor approval before continuation.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: accurate four-day 400/250 comparison; 150 litres and 37.5% relative to first total; rainfall and area limits without isolated causation; honest plant-condition concern; relevant invitation to Wen; proposed new records rather than invented results; group agreement and supervisor approval kept distinct; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: "Our comparison shows four-day recorded totals of 400 and 250 litres, a difference of 150 litres or 37.5% of the first total. However, rainfall differed and planted area was not recorded, so we cannot attribute the difference entirely to the trial or calculate use per square metre. Nia's concern about plant water needs also requires a record rather than reassurance without evidence. Wen, what would you check before recommending continuation? We could record rainfall, area and plant condition in a further limited trial. Let us check whether the group accepts that recommendation, then seek the supervisor's approval before continuing."