

Solutions

2.1 Four minutes = 240 seconds. $90 + 45 = 135$ seconds. All five planned allocations sum to 240.

2.2 Award B1 each for two: actual eligible submitted sheets for a layout; complete-success count; success rate. Targets are not collected counts.

2.3 It avoids within-person practice/order effects from seeing both layouts. It does not guarantee equal group ability or school-wide sample representation. Accept another distinct supported unresolved limit, such as task-to-real-tray transfer.

2.4 Spacing and alignment together with wording fixed. Teacher approval before volunteer work. Check timed transitions/total or whether the speaker can explain key method/ethics without dropping them.

3.1 Award correction B1 and reason B1 per ending. Results are pending: no participant data exist. Bound any later comparison to this volunteer task: assignment is not representative sampling or universal benefit. Describe a spacing/alignment package: both change together, so one feature's separate effect cannot be identified.

3.2 Local analytic rubric, $8 \times$ B1: planned A/B complete-success task and common key/time; one-layout practice reason; remaining group limit; combined spacing/alignment limit; no collected results; local sample limit; named source/script/file/rehearsal actions with pending permission before recruitment; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “We propose comparing complete four-item sorting success under layouts A and B, using the same wording, key and two-minute limit. Each volunteer will see one layout to avoid practice from repeating the task, although group ability may still differ. B changes spacing and alignment together, so we cannot identify spacing alone. Our table is a plan, not collected results, and class volunteers will not represent the whole school. Mei will verify the question and real sources, Rui will check the information script and pending teacher permission, and Dan will organise the matching task files and timed rehearsal before recruitment.”