

Solutions

2.1 Answer: B. Different participants serve in each condition, with the strategy manipulated between them. The other options do not satisfy the stated defining conditions.

2.2 Answer: C. The data are categorical counts in a 2×3 table, $df = (2-1)(3-1) = 2$. Compare the exact process, design or evidence, rather than an associated keyword.

2.3 Use the worked case evidence to support a bounded claim and explain why a causal, universal or stronger claim needs additional evidence. The claim must fit the specific design and observed process.

3.1 Scores within a person are related. Ignoring pairing uses an inappropriate independence assumption and loses information about within-person differences. For suitable quantitative difference data and assumptions, a paired t-test may fit; a justified non-parametric alternative may be appropriate otherwise. Randomized or counterbalanced order also addresses sequence effects. Award B1 each (authored) for the interpretation, its reasoning, a relevant limitation/alternative and an appropriate check, up to four points. Accept a different justified answer satisfying these demands.