

Solutions

2.1

Sixteen selected helpful; twenty voluntary website responses.

2.2

Any two, B1 each: all 500 students' views; actual fairness/outcomes of every disputed case; consistency across repeated surveys.

2.3

Voluntary 20 responses do not establish 80% of all 500; helpful answer does not prove fairness of every case; official-looking page does not establish consistency or absence of bias.

2.4

Website-only voluntary responses may miss other views; fair/helpful wording frames the procedure positively; no suitable repeat/comparison supplies consistency evidence.

3.1

Broader accessible recruitment addresses missing/nonresponding views without guaranteeing representation; neutral wording measuring the intended judgement addresses leading framing/construct mismatch; a suitable repeated or comparable measurement supplies evidence about consistency rather than assuming it.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: accurate sixteen-of-twenty result; respondent population versus all five hundred; helpfulness versus case fairness; possible wording and selection mechanisms; no assumed reliability without suitable repetition; does not label every response false; specific improvement proposals with remaining limitations; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: "Sixteen of twenty voluntary website respondents selected helpful, but these answers do not establish the views of all five hundred students or the fairness of every disputed case. The positive wording may frame the answers, and website-only recruitment may miss other views. These concerns do not make every response false. An official-looking page also cannot establish reliability; no suitable repeated measurement is supplied. A stronger review would recruit more broadly through accessible routes, use neutral questions matching the intended judgement, and examine consistency under comparable conditions. It should report remaining limitations rather than present broader recruitment as a guaranteed cure."