**Markers must write comments here, justifying the mark. You can refer to the guidance provided in the following pages:**

|  |
| --- |
| **A case is made for supporting learning of past tenses in children with autism through visual novels. Background research is presented - however it could be more considered in parts. Participatory Design methodology is described: use of typically developing children as proxies for children with autism is touched on. The CARRS framework is used. The children's role as design informant could be made clearer.**  **Details are given of the workshops and expert interviews, and the outcomes of these. In the expert evaluation, feedback from experts is reported under various thematic headings. Critical evaluation was included in this. A clear account is given of how this is responded to in the design. The prototype developed is described and largely justified by the outcomes of the children's workshops and expert interviews. Design decisions could have been justified more using the research literature. Also sets of guidelines for developing games for children with autism could have been used, and requirements made more explicit.**  **Evaluation was conducted with children and experts. A clear and comprehensive account is given of the evaluation with 7 children, and of the expert evaluation. The results are presented in relation to aspects of narrative, linguistic content, and graphical and aural design, and include substantial critical evaluation of the game design. Expert evaluation highlighted some of the same issues as the children's game testing workshops. The discussion is rather brief, but does suggest future directions for the research.**  **Overall, the approach used is well motivated, and the design and game development well executed. Critical evaluation is provided throughout.** |

* *How well is knowledge and understanding demonstrated?*

Does the dissertation demonstrate a breadth of knowledge and deep understanding of the subject matter? Does it show creative, subtle, and/or original independent thinking?

* *How good is the argument?*

Does the dissertation present a compelling case by means of clear logically structured argument or debate, well supported with evidence?

* *How well written is it?*

Does the dissertation shows a good standard of academic writing, good expression, with few spelling or formatting errors? Is it well structured? Is the balance between sections good, or is there too much or too little background material relative to the amount of original content?

* *Is the referencing correct?*

Does the dissertation have, where appropriate, complete and correct referencing of sources?

* *Has the student made their original contribution of their dissertation clear?*

Is the original contribution of the dissertation explicitly stated or does it need to be inferred, or is it sometimes not clear? Does the amount of work seem adequate for an MSc dissertation?

* *Background & Literature Review*

Does this section give an appropriate background to the study? Is it critically argued, presenting important information about methodology and implications of previous studies, supported by citations? How compelling is the rationale for the present study: do the research questions and/or hypotheses follow logically from the literature reviewed?

* *Discussion*

Is the section more than just a re-statement of the results section? Is it clear that the implications of the findings are understood? Are the results discussed with reference to other studies in the field? Are the present study’s strengths and weaknesses insightfully discussed? Are the conclusions justified, and any recommendations for future research sensible?

**If the topic of the dissertation requires Methods and Results sections:**

* *Methods*

Is the methodology reasonable given the constraints on student projects? Are the methods similar to other research in the field, or are deviations from the norm clearly justified? (Or indeed, are the methods original and/or an improvement on the norm?) Is the section clearly laid out? Does it describe the selection and recruitment of subjects, the procedures and measures of the investigation, and the strategy for analysis (if the analysis strategy is not here, is it explained in the results section)? Are the analyses appropriate to the topic (do they test the chosen hypotheses/research questions)?

* *Results*

Does the presentation of results follow the analysis strategy? Are the results relevant to the hypotheses/research questions? Are the analyses conducted and presented competently, and are the results clearly and logically presented? Do the results strike a good balance between explaining and showing all the necessary and important findings (qualitative or quantitative) with the help of clear tables or figures, without including excess text, unnecessary analyses, or redundant tables or figures?