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| Section | Comments (based on L7 marking criteria) | **Marks** |
| Writing, structuring, grammar, spelling of the report | *Merit: (60-69%)*  Observes appropriate academic form. Fluent & persuasive.  There was strong adherence to academic principles and styles throughout, with the document implementing recognised structures and forms. The written content was generally compelling and articulate, though at times could be too dialogic. There were some grammatical errors and areas for enhancement, but these did not detract significantly from the underlying points and information. Better alignment of the text (e.g., justify-aligned) would have been preferable. Images/figures, especially in Chapter 4 could have been bigger and chapter prefixed figure numbers would have assisted the reader. | 6/10 |
| Literature, context, related work, references | *Distinction (>70%)*  A high degree of engagement with research and/or practice pertaining to field(s) and disciplines of study. Substantial range and sophisticated use of sources.  A range of sources, including many contemporary articles, are leveraged to justify and contextualise the work undertaken. This provides a solid and compelling bedrock for the dissertation. As research and outcomes are discussed, there is an attempt to provide the reader with a broad picture of the field, highlighting some of the boundaries and considerations that need to be kept in mind. Extending this further, by critiquing these research activities to a more granular extent, would have resulted in evidence of greater research and analytic skills, although there is consistent use of a *broad* critical lens. | 21/25 |
| Intellectual performance, originality and independence | *Distinction (>70%)*  A high degree of analysis and evaluation;  A sustained argument with the possibility for new insights.  Throughout, the dissertation evidenced that the student is comfortable and confident in the range of user experience principles and values. These manifest themselves throughout the report and the related tools and practices were integrated well into the design, development and evaluation activities. Approaching the research aspect by specifying and justifying a series of *research* methods could have expanded this further, alongside more formal presentation of null and alternative hypotheses. | 25/30 |
| Engineering, professionalism/ choice of methodology | *Distinction (>70%)*  Excellent interpretation, application and evaluation of the possibilities and limitations of the methodologies used by  the student and key scholars/ practitioners pertaining to the field(s) of study.  Methods used may offer new insights or contributions to knowledge. Very high professional and/or personal standards of engagement and conduct throughout.  The design and development of the prototype is clear and follows a suitable series of phases, along with evidence, which also included conscious signs of reflection on the part of the student. It would have been interesting to hear more debate about the adoption of Knapp’s principles. Whilst these are recognised and seminal in the field, interrogating the process, especially within the scope of a dissertation, would have been informative and stimulating. Specifically addressing the process of testing with five users (Knapp and Nielsen generally agree on this), when a much larger sample might have been sought to obtain statistical power and led to additional metrics. | 20/25 |
| Usefulness of results and findings | *Merit: (60-69%)*  Report as submitted is close to the standards required for academic publication, in terms of content and originality, as well as presentation.  The program, design or other solution produced is close to being ready to be applied successfully to a real problem, and meets (or is very close to meeting) all relevant standards  There is high validity present in the outcomes from the underlying data. Whilst it is specific to the prototype, it is logical that these outcomes would generalise to some extent. This is helped by relating the information gathered back to the literature. The approach of observing users/think aloud is one less seen in dissertations and introduces potential for subjective viewpoints, especially when the researcher is also the developer, but was also a bold and relevant decision. Recognising and controlling these factors would have tempered the outcomes, although they show signs of balance whenever possible. | 6/10 |
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| Second Marker’s Overall Mark (%) | The dissertation showcases a deep understanding of the subject matter, backed by extensive research. The work is organized logically, with a clear structure that allows for a smooth and coherent flow of ideas. A full phase of design, development and testing has been undertaken methodically and with due rigour. Although there was scope within the timeframe to go further with development of gamification and design elements, along with larger scale testing, the results are still compelling and demonstrate strong skills across the board. | 78 |