

Section 4 – Questions about the main notation:

How easy is it to see or find the various parts of the notation while it is being created or changed? Why? What kind of things are more difficult to see or find?	Most of them agreed that it is easy because you can collapse the rationale and use Padua's approach [18].
If you need to compare or combine different parts, can you see them at the same time? If not, why not?	It is possible because you can use "part of" or "is a" relationships.
When you need to make changes to previous work, how easy is it to make the change? Why?	Easy, just erase and redraw the part.
Are there particular changes that are more difficult or especially difficult to make? Which ones?	Change task to goal and vice-versa, but also, it is proportional to the amount of change.
Does the notation a) let you say what you want reasonably briefly, or b) is it long-winded? Why?	All participants agreed that it is brief.
What sorts of things take more space to describe?	Everything that needs more detail, mainly, goal refinement to other goals.
What kind of things require the most mental effort with this notation?	It is depend on that you want to represent, for example: goal, task, resource or softgoal
Do some things seem especially complex or difficult to work out in your head (e.g. when combining several things)? What are they?	In general there are not, but internal flow between actors and refined goals in other goals could be ones.
Do some kinds of mistakes seem particularly common or easy to make? Which ones?	Mistake in using goals, tasks or resources. Sometimes it is hard to decide. Alike, when establishing dependencies between elements.
Do you often find yourself making small slips that irritate you or make you feel stupid? What are some examples?	Use goal instead of task and vice-versa
How closely related is the notation to the result that you are describing? Why? (Note that in a sub-device, the result may be part	Most of them agreed that it is close, because it is possible of mapping behaviors.

of another notation, rather than the end product).	
Which parts seem to be a particularly strange way of doing or describing something?	<i>Resource</i> refinement.
When reading the notation, is it easy to tell what each part is for in the overall scheme? Why?	At this point, the participants failed to reach an agreement. participants who are more experts said it is easy. However, the others did not agree.
Are there some parts that are particularly difficult to interpret? Which ones?	The sequence was the most mentioned feature. As well, the contributions related to softgoals and tasks and softgoals refinement.
Are there parts that you really don't know what they mean, but you put them in just because it's always been that way? What are they?	All participants agreed that there are not.
If the structure of the product means some parts are closely related to other parts, and changes to one may affect the other, are those dependencies visible? What kind of dependencies are hidden?	Most of the dependencies, including among actors, are visible.
In what ways can it get worse when you are creating a particularly large description?	The number of links among elements tend to increase. But it is possible to solve with Padua's approach[18].
Do these dependencies stay the same, or are there some actions that cause them to get frozen? If so, what are they?	At this point, the participants failed to reach an agreement. There was not accord.
How easy is it to stop in the middle of creating some notation, and check your work so far? Can you do this any time you like? If not, why not?	You can check if the SR are done and if the elements are refined.
Can you find out how much progress you have made, or check what stage in your work you are up to? If not, why not?	At this point, the participants failed to reach an agreement. There was not accord. some of them said as <i>i*</i> is not a process it is difficult to evaluate how much progress has been made. Others did not justify the answer.

Can you try out partially- completed versions of the product? If not, why not?	All agreed that it can be made.
Is it possible to sketch things out when you are playing around with ideas, or when you aren't sure which way to proceed? What features of the notation help you to do this?	All agreed that it can be made with claims or sketches.
What sort of things can you do when you don't want to be too precise about the exact result you are trying to get?	All participants agreed that they just do not detail enough or refinement.
When you are working with the notation, can you go about the job in any order you like, or does the system force you to think ahead and make certain decisions first? If so, what decisions do you need to make in advance? What sort of problems can this cause in your work?	Not necessarily, This question relates to method nor to the language.
Where there are different parts of the notation that mean similar things, is the similarity clear from the way they appear? Please give examples.	All participants agreed that there are not.
Are there places where some things ought to be similar, but the notation makes them different? What are they?	All participants agreed that there are not.
Is it possible to make notes to yourself, or express information that is not really recognized as part of the notation?	All participants agreed that it is possible using claims.
If it was printed on a piece of paper that you could annotate or scribble on, what would you write or draw?	Only one of the participants said Annotations the others did not agree.
Does the system give you any way of defining new facilities or terms within the notation, so that you can extend it to describe new things or to express your ideas more clearly or succinctly? What are they?	Some of them said that it is possible using the scenarios or Padua's approach, the others said that it is not possible.
Does the system insist that you start by defining new terms before you can do anything else? What sort of things?	All participants agreed that it is not possible.
Do you find yourself using this notation in ways that are unusual, or ways that the	They said, for example: some for designing partial models, sequences and dependencies.

designer might not have intended? If so, what are some examples?	
After completing this questionnaire, can you think of obvious ways that the design of the system could be improved? What are they?	Nor really, it could be enhanced by add-ons, also, to part task decomposition in sequence, condition to goal activation.
Could it be improved specifically for your own requirements?	It can be improved by aggregation of other elements.