

Solutions

2.1

18 of 30 volunteer respondents reported occasional interruptions; self-selection/nonrepresentative sample.

2.2

Voluntary participation; retain existing device-permitted room.

2.3

Proposes limited trial rather than universal/proven solution; optional device-free room; retained device-permitted space/access needs.

2.4

Any three, B1 each: everyone/learning-damage claim unsupported; copied notes do not synthesize/need honest source use; no trial outcomes or mark gains supplied; missing voluntary/access condition; no argued position/evaluation plan.

3.1

Introduction with limited thesis; distraction concern with sampling limit; voluntary/access paragraph with retained room; conclusion proposes checking trial without new invented evidence; explains a connection between relevant source ideas; explains how this connection supports the limited position.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: clear limited proposal rather than proven outcome; accurate 18/30 report; self-selection and no measured learning-gain limit; Rao source credit; relevant device-access needs and Chen credit; voluntary choice and retained device-permitted space; synthesis and proposed evaluation without invented results; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “The centre could trial an optional device-free room while retaining its device-permitted space. Eighteen of thirty volunteer respondents reported occasional notification interruptions, but the self-selected questionnaire does not establish effects on learning or represent every student (Rao, 2026). Some students need devices for dictionaries, accessible text or necessary messages, so participation should remain voluntary (Chen, 2026). Together, these notes support testing an additional choice rather than imposing a universal restriction. During a limited trial, the centre could record use and invite feedback about access and interruptions. It should evaluate those records before deciding whether to continue.”