

Solutions

2.1 P: location-choice errors. Q: layout preference.

2.2 R changes software wording length; B changes spacing and alignment together, retaining wording.

2.3 Award B1 each for distinct comparisons of participants, tasks, features or outcomes, tied to the cards. For example adults versus college volunteers/students; location choice versus software steps; accuracy/errors versus preference. Do not count the same distinction twice.

2.4 Instruction design may affect responses. Ask whether A/B differ in complete success on the bounded class paper task, without predicting a winner. Find/read/verify real sources and methods instead of citing invented cards.

3.1 Award correction B1 and reason B1 per claim. Q measures preference, which does not measure task accuracy. R changes wording in software, whereas B changes spacing/alignment with wording held constant. State only the limits of the evidence inspected: three fictional cards are neither a comprehensive real search nor evidence about all research worldwide.

3.2 Local analytic rubric, $8 \times$ B1: common instruction-design theme; P outcome and transfer limit; Q preference/accuracy distinction; R wording/software distinction; proposed package and fixed wording; no winner or worldwide-gap claim; bounded next question and real-source verification; coherent truthful 100–130 word response. Example: “The three teaching cards suggest that instruction design may affect responses, but they measure different things. P reports fewer location-choice errors among twelve adults; its task and participants differ from our class paper sorting task. Q records eight college volunteers’ preference for a spacious layout, so it cannot confirm improved accuracy. R concerns shorter software wording and correct steps, whereas our layouts keep wording fixed and change spacing and alignment together. These fictional cards neither prove that B will win nor establish a worldwide research gap. They motivate a limited classroom question about complete sorting success. Before a real proposal uses published evidence, we must find and verify accessible real sources and record their methods and limits.”