1. The flaw with this experiment is that it suffers from contextual bias. Both slogans need to given by the same person in order to eliminate the contextual bias.
2. Simpson’s paradox seems to be at work here. The lurking variable must be the friendly and unfriendly planets. If Windu had more surveys completed on the unfriendly planets than Jar Jar, this would count for why Windu did better on each planet but not overall. The flaw in the experiment is that friendly and unfriendly were weighted the same. I would fix it by picking Mace Windu.
3. The flaws in the experiment are selection bias and bias in assignment to conditions. Since the HR employees are concentrated in three countries and IT is spread out, the satisfaction for each job type might be misleading. I would include satisfaction based on location and location/job type in the report.
4. The flaw is selection bias. Since you have to opt in the company doesn’t know about the people who don’t opt in. The company should say the app is very effective after people opt in. The company could also change it to opt out instead of opt in.
5. The flaw is that the different tests were not randomly distributed. It could be that before the test some students were studying in the library and then left together to go take the test. If students who study right before the test arrived at the same time and all got version B, this could be why students who took version B got better scores.