

Solutions

2.1

First group 8 of 12; revised-notice group 10 of 12.

2.2

Two more correct respondents; doubling 8 would be 16, not 10.

2.3

Any three, B1 each: denominators hidden; colour-only distinction; unreadable limitation; unsupported causal claim; written length does not prove delivery duration.

2.4

Correct answer about event time; different participants/days or no controlled assignment; original fictional classroom record supplied in this sheet.

3.1

Question/change slide; results table 8/12 and 10/12; visible limit/source/next-check slide; explains clear labels/denominators or readable contrast; explains accessible description/backup or visible uncertainty; actual timed rehearsal/listener feedback checks delivery/understanding.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: accurate eight/twelve and ten/twelve result; measured event-time answer rather than whole-event understanding; two-response difference without doubling; different-group/day causal limit; readable labelled media with denominators; visible fictional source and uncertainty; actual timed rehearsal/listener understanding and useful backup; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “Our fictional classroom record shows eight correct event-time answers out of twelve in the first group and ten out of twelve in the revised-notice group. That is two more correct responses, not a doubling. Different participants and days prevent us from isolating the notice revision’s effect. I would show both denominators in a clearly labelled table and keep the limitation and source visible. A final slide could propose a more comparable test. Before presenting, I would time the actual rehearsal, check whether a listener understands the difference and its limit, and prepare an accessible static backup.”