

Solutions

2.1

: an interpretive framework.: it shapes the questions or explanations considered in the club study.

2.2

: $12/24 = 50\%$.: the proportion of invited club members making at least one forum post in the seven-day period, not their interest.

2.3

each: interest was not measured; seven access and three time reports suggest alternatives; two missing reasons or unmeasured offline contributions prevent a complete account. Accept other distinct evidence-grounded limits.

2.4

: contribution by either forum or paper replaces forum-only posting.: it may count a wider set of actions.: a change in the count could reflect the new definition or week conditions, so it is not a clean measure of a platform effect.

3.1

each: motivation is a hypothesis, not measured; access reports deserve checking; time is another possible constraint; shared background does not establish identical behaviour; replacement is not guaranteed to change all participation; propose a bounded comparison with a consistent measure and no unsupported causal claim.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, 8 ×: correct 12/24 observation; distinguish posting from interest; recognise access reports; recognise time or missing reasons; reject background stereotyping; propose the paper route; acknowledge changed definition; preserve causal uncertainty; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “Twelve of the twenty-four invited members posted during the seven-day forum. This measures posting, not interest in the club. Seven nonposters reported device problems and three reported limited time, while two supplied no reason. These reports support further investigation but do not establish a single cause. A paper response route could help check whether members contribute when another route is available. We should record contributions and their routes with permission. Because this changes the participation definition and occurs in another week, the new result cannot by itself prove that the platform caused the original difference.”