

Solutions

Authored self-check guidance: accept equivalent correct methods and supported interpretations. The points check reasoning, not an official grade.

2.1 B – The rates use each group’s denominator. A wrongly gives B a 50% rate; C compares raw counts rather than rates; D states sample size without establishing the success proportion.

Correct response linked to the given case.

2.2 C – Requests about the same step bear on clarity. A concerns duration, B cost and D decoration; none directly indicates comprehension of the instructions.

Correct response linked to the given case.

2.3 40 – $12/30 \cdot 100=40$.

Correct response linked to the given case.

2.4 False – Group sizes can differ; compare proportions.

Correct response linked to the given case.

3.1 $p_P = 12/30 = 40\%$ before and $21/30 = 70\%$ after, a 30-point increase. $p_Q = 30/50 = 60\%$ before and $35/50 = 70\%$ after, a 10-point increase. P has the larger change; both final rates are equal.

Sound conclusion or proposed method. Relevant supporting steps or textual evidence. Accurate conditions, checks or qualification.

3.2 The final counts support Q having more second-session successes. The percentage-point changes support P improving more. Exchanging those pieces of evidence would confuse final outcome with change and counts with proportions.

Sound conclusion or proposed method. Relevant supporting steps or textual evidence. Accurate conditions, checks or qualification.

3.3 Session order, practice or different tasks could contribute; no randomised comparison is described. A control group using the original catalogue in both sessions under otherwise matched conditions could estimate practice effects. It would help test causation, not automatically prove that every user’s improvement has one cause.

Sound conclusion or proposed method. Relevant supporting steps or textual evidence. Accurate conditions, checks or qualification.