

# Reverse Engineering User Studies (Peer feedback)

**Peer feedback due** May 16, 2016, 6:00 AM

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

## **Context, aim, and hypotheses**

- Rate whether the context is described in adequate detail for you to understand the importance of the stated aims (1 = worst, 5 = best). Suggest what could be added to help understand the stated aims.
- For each of the research questions in the Aim section, is it either a base rate, a correlational, or a difference question (see McGrath)? Is it stated? What could be improved?
- 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 improvements.

## **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 the described characteristics represent the potential user group and the sampling method that the paper mentions (1 = worst, 5 = best). Suggest what is 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**

- Did 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**

- Were arguments supporting/opposing each type of validity present?
- Was each type of validity correctly understood and discussed by your classmates?
- For each of the arguments, rate how strong the case was built (1 = worst, 5 = best). Comment on the credibility of evidences (e.g., an argument based on specific points discussed in the paper is more credible than those that based on speculations.)
- Suggest any information supporting/opposing the validity that may have been overlooked.