

Solutions

2.1

Thirty in each group; means seven and six out of ten.

2.2

Earlier individual scores/baseline; individual later scores or before-and-after changes rather than just group means.

2.3

Any three, B1 each: workshop caused the difference; every student benefits under compulsory attendance; all attendees improved by one; critics reject revision; argument error proves invented data.

2.4

Any three, B1 each: voluntary participation; earlier attainment not compared; reported revision time differs; no suitable assigned comparison; access effects or costs absent.

3.1

Thesis limits compulsory/universal inference; explains why comparison does not isolate cause; acknowledges possible workshop usefulness; distinguishes that possibility from guaranteed benefit; proposes baseline/suitable comparison/access evaluation; explains how it addresses a specific uncertainty without inventing results.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times$ B1: accurate group sizes and means with Report E attribution; group difference distinct from individual improvement; missing baseline and revision-time limits; no isolated causal or universal conclusion; fair possible-usefulness counterargument; useful evaluation addressing a specific gap; proportionate recommendation without invented results or dishonesty claim; coherent truthful 150–180 word response. Example: “Report E shows that thirty workshop volunteers had a later mean quiz score of seven out of ten, compared with six among thirty non-attendees (§1). This difference warrants attention, but it does not establish that compulsory attendance would improve every student’s score. Earlier scores were not compared, and attendees reported more revision time. Voluntary participation may also distinguish the groups. None of these alternatives can be identified as the true explanation from the report alone.

The claim that every attendee improved by one point confuses a difference between group means with individual change. A fair counterargument is that the workshop may still offer useful revision support. That possibility should not be dismissed simply because the evaluation is limited. However, it also cannot supply the causal and universal support missing from the compulsory-attendance prediction (§2).

A suitable next evaluation could compare earlier attainment, relevant revision activity and access needs under a clearer design. Until then, the report supports further investigation rather than a guaranteed outcome or an accusation that the author invented data.”