

Solutions

2.1 Layout A versus B, combining spacing and alignment. Same words/tray names, items/key, clock or no-coaching instructions.

2.2 A completely correct four-placement sheet within two minutes. Preference is not the primary measure.

2.3 J: one complete success; K: zero; L: zero. A blank prevents complete success.

2.4 No extra help for B; retain complete-success scoring rather than change to partial marks after results; report actual consenting group size rather than invented twelve.

3.1 Award 2 per claim: correction, reason. Spacing and alignment form a package, so their separate effects are not isolated. Within-class assignment is not representative school-wide sampling. The controlled paper task does not measure real returns over a term. No main result is available yet.

3.2 Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: named A/B package; complete-success rule; willing local sample/one condition; same task/time/no coaching; actual denominators/unequal-size analysis; pending approval/no result; package and real-world limits; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “We propose comparing layouts A and B among willing classmates, with one layout assigned by shuffled slips to each person. B changes spacing and alignment together, while wording, item choices, the fixed key and the two-minute task remain the same. Our outcome is a completely correct four-item sheet; any wrong or blank placement prevents one complete success. We will report successes out of the actual participants in each group and compare proportions if sizes differ. Approval is pending and no main data exist. The comparison will concern the layout package in this paper task, not spacing alone or every real return.”