

Reverse Engineering User Studies (Peer feedback)

Peer feedback due May 12, 2014

You will receive links Google Docs with two of your peers' submission. Give feedback to them by adding comments in the document. For each of the submission, you will need to selectively read the user the main paper that is assigned to your peer group. Then, add comments on the shared document in the points below.

In the final submission, your peer will be able to rate the feedback quality. This will influence the pairing for peer feedback in the next assignment. If you give high quality feedback in this assignment, we will pair you with the team that give high quality feedback for the next round of peer feedback.

Context, aim, and hypotheses

- Rate whether the context are described in adequate detail for you to understand the importance of the stated aims. (1 = worst, 5 = best) Suggests what could be added to help understanding the stated aims.
- For each of the research questions in the Aim section, is it either a baserate, a correlational, or a difference question? (See McGrath) If not, suggest what could be improved to stated the question.
- Rate how precise the formed hypotheses are (1 = worst, 5 = best). Point out any terms/phrases that may be ambiguous, describe alternative explanations, and suggest alternatives.

Independent and dependent variables

- For each of the variables, check whether the definitions are complete (IV: scale, possible levels, measurement units, and manipulation techniques; DV: scale, possible levels, measurement units, operational definition)
- For each of the variable, rate (1 = worst, 5 = best) how unambiguous the descriptions are. Suggest any changes to improve the description.

Participants

- Rate how well do the described characteristics represent potential user group and the sampling method that the paper concerns. (1 = worst, 5 = best). Suggest what missing from the characteristics to improve the representativeness.

Task, apparatus, experimental design, experiment procedure

- Rate how detailed the description of each section was described (1 = worst, 5 = best). Point out any ambiguities and suggest improvements.

References

- Were the references provide adequate information to retrieve the articles? (Minimum: author names, article title, journal/conference name, year, page number). Name any missing components.
- Rate how credible the references are (1 = worst, 5 = best). E.g., referring to an article from Wikipedia is not credible. Referring to an article published at CHI is highly credible.

Internal, construct, and external validity

- Do you agree with the research approach and contribution type identified for each paper? If not, add a comment on which types you believe they are and justify your reason.