

Solutions

Accept equivalent correct methods and supported interpretations. The marks check reasoning; they are not an official grade.

2.1 A – Both texts explicitly recognise evening access. B rules out the schedule although both value access; C contradicts all waiting counts; D contradicts twenty morning visits.

Correct response linked to the given case.

2.2 B – $10/18$ exceeds 0.2 for both other groups. A ignores differing proportions; C and D each equal 20%, below $10/18 \approx 56\%$. Raw attendance is not the requested denominator-free comparison.

Correct response linked to the given case.

2.3 20 – $6 \div 30 \times 100 = 20$; use afternoon visitors as the denominator.

Correct response linked to the given case.

2.4 False – The observations identify a problem but do not compare all remedies causally.

Correct response linked to the given case.

3.1 A protects evidence of earlier categories; B improves task-based retrieval while preserving a size index for rare combinations. Keep a dated record of old labels and changes, provide task trays for frequent combinations, and retain the size index for the remainder. This follows both texts without claiming their purposes are identical.

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

3.2 Frequent kits fall from 8 to 5 minutes, a 3-minute or 37.5% reduction. Rare kits rise from 10 to 11 minutes, a 1-minute or 10% increase. The every-search claim is contradicted; averages also do not show every individual trial.

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

3.3 A challenges discarding old labels because it removes historical evidence, but explicitly permits a new index and records of change. B challenges freezing categories because beginners benefit from task trays, while permitting old labels to be recorded separately. Both reject an extreme that erases either usefulness or history.

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