

Solutions

2.1

All four details had to match; eight of twelve and ten of twelve.

2.2

Same answer key supports consistent scoring; different volunteers/days, convenience recruitment, changed wording/layout or absent baseline/retention comparison.

2.3

Any three, B1 each: fictional source not a famous journal article; layout alone not isolated; attendance unmeasured; result not a doubling or universal; follow-up merely proposed; §2 must be read for limits.

2.4

§2 result; attendance or later retention unmeasured; fixed wording, detail-specific errors or broader reading experiences proposed in §3.

3.1

Identifies fictional report C and title; supplied classroom source and §§1–3 without invented details; accurate method/result summary; relevant strength/limit evaluation; specific suitable use or excluded claim; correct §2/§3 locator for relevant clause.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: honest fictional C/title/section identification; accurate method and eight/twelve versus ten/twelve result with §2; combined four-detail outcome; procedural strength distinguished from causal/repeat reliability proof; relevant comparison and measurement limits; specific intended use and excluded universal/attendance claim; §3 proposal distinguished from completed follow-up; coherent truthful 120–160 word response. Example: “Fictional report C, Notice evaluation, §§1–3, is an original classroom source about immediate event-notice comprehension. Two different volunteer groups viewed different notice versions on consecutive days. Ten of twelve second-group readers answered all four details correctly, compared with eight of twelve first-group readers (§2). The shared key supports a consistent scoring procedure, but convenience recruitment, different days and simultaneous wording and layout changes limit the comparison. Individual missed details and later retention were not recorded.

For an essay on understanding event information, I would use C to illustrate an evaluation design and why its limitations matter. I would not use it to prove that headings alone increase attendance or benefit every audience. Its proposed follow-up holds wording fixed and records errors by detail (§3); this is a suggested improvement, not a completed experiment. The reference should retain the fictional label rather than invented journal details.”