

Solutions

2.1 Chen brought a survey table and did not speak for twenty minutes. Neither fact alone identifies his reason or a trait.

2.2 Award B1 for each supported correction, maximum 2: the personality label is not established from one meeting; “no useful findings” is not established by silence; removing the required part is not authorised by the supplied brief. Accept two distinct conclusions with a relevant reason; do not credit two restatements of the same label.

2.3 Rui values checking each total; Lin values finishing early. For example, agree a short checking slot and an internal handover before drafting, confirming availability and retaining the required accuracy check. Accept another feasible action that addresses both priorities. No relative effort or intelligence can be inferred.

2.4 The checked table/raw-list comparison supports the two duplicate entries and a useful contribution in that meeting. The reason for silence remains unknown. Rehearse another finding or question with agreed notes/turns, compare the response with the checked table and record the result before Friday. Do not promise accuracy as the check.

3.1 Award 2 per proposal: supported correction and reason. Keep Chen’s required finding and agreed support: the brief requires each member’s contribution and silence does not establish an exemption. Check further responses: one finding and one question in rehearsal cannot establish all future answers. Keep the reason for silence open: the question preceded a checked contribution, but no record identifies why Chen had been silent.

3.2 Local analytic rubric, $8 \times$ B1: table/silence observation; unsupported original judgement identified; specific question; checked duplicates; rehearsal outcome stated accurately; scope/reason limit preserved; specific next task and recorded check respecting the brief; coherent truthful 80–110 word review. Example: “On Tuesday Chen brought a survey table but stayed silent for twenty minutes. I treated that silence as proof that he had nothing useful to present. That judgement was unsupported. I asked what he had found in the totals, and he identified two duplicate entries. We checked the raw list and corrected them together. In rehearsal he explained one finding and answered one checked question accurately. This does not establish why he was silent or guarantee Friday’s answers. Before Friday we will rehearse another question with his agreed notes and reporting turn, compare the answer with the table and record any correction.”