Focus Groups Sessions Questions

C1	Code	Question
C2 Some participants said the instructions were clear. Others said they here not clear. After all, in your opinion, the instructions were clear or not? Why do you think that there was this discrepancy? C3 In your opinion, is it possible that the authors could have thought that people with a degree in computing would have at least a notion of how to install an Integrated Development Environment and that is why they did not took took up much space explaining that on the web site? C4 Explain how you installed undertaker. Did you try to run the algorithms without undertaker installed simply to see what would happen? E1 Was it difficult to run the algorithms? Why? List some hardships. E2 By the forms answers, most of the people agreed that the algorithms execution tutorial (from the study's website) could be better. But do you think that a more descriptive tutorial would be only something that would be better or would it be fundamental for the replication success? During the activity I have noticed that for some teams was strange to perceive that samples/file and configurations per file were the same thing. Why do you think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people had this difficulty? E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? Ia General was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? E71 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? E72 Do you think this activity was usef		•
clear. Åfter åll, in your opinion, the instructions were clear or not? Why do you think that there was this discrepancy? In your opinion, is it possible that the authors could have thought that people with a degree in computing would have at least a notion of how to install an Integrated Development Environment and that is why they did not took took up much space explaining that on the web site? Explain how you installed undertaker. Did you try to run the algorithms without undertaker installed simply to see what would happen? Explain how you installed undertaker. Did you try to run the algorithms without undertaker installed simply to see what would happen? Explain how you installed undertaker. Did you try to run the algorithms without undertaker installed simply to see what would happen? Explain how you installed undertaker. Did you try to run the algorithms without undertaker installed simply to see what would happen? Explain how you installed undertaker. Did you try to run the algorithms without undertaker installed simply to see what would happen? Explain how you installed undertaker. Did you try to run the algorithms without undertaker installed simply to see what would happen? Explain how you think that ne people agreed that the algorithms execution tutorial (from the study's website) could be better. But do you think that as more description why do you think that go you think that was not so clear? Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? Explain the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? Explain the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) Explain the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? Explain the activity was useful for your to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper?		
think that there was this discrepancy? In your opinion, is it possible that the authors could have thought that people with a degree in computing would have at least a notion of how to install an Integrated Development Environment and that is why they did not took took up much space explaining that on the web site? Explain how you installed undertaker. Did you try to run the algorithms without undertaker installed simply to see what would happen? Explain how you installed simply to see what would happen? Explain how sanswers, most of the people agreed that the algorithms execution tutorial (from the study's website) could be better. But do you think that a more descriptive tutorial would be only something that would be better or would it be fundamental for the replication success? Explain how the fundamental for the replication success? During the activity I have noticed that for some teams was strange to perceive that samples/file and configurations per file were the same thing. Why do you think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people had this difficulty? Explain you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? Explain your description of the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? Explain the point of the training session you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? Explain the point in the point your academic background		
In your opinion, is it possible that the authors could have thought that people with a degree in computing would have at least a notion of how to install an Integrated Development Environment and that is why they did not took took up much space explaining that on the web site?		
with a degree in computing would have at least a notion of how to install an Integrated Development Environment and that is why they did not took took up much space explaining that on the web site? C4	СЗ	
Integrated Development Environment and that is why they did not took took up much space explaining that on the web site? Explain how you installed undertaker. Did you try to run the algorithms without undertaker installed simply to see what would happen? E1 Was it difficult to run the algorithms? Why? List some hardships. E2 By the forms answers, most of the people agreed that the algorithms execution tutorial (from the study's website) could be better. But do you think that a more descriptive tutorial would be only something that would be better or would it be fundamental for the replication success? E3 During the activity I have noticed that for some teams was strange to perceive that samples/file and configurations per file were the same thing. Why do you think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people had this difficulty? E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? I1 What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? I2 In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from I to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was t	10000000	
Explain how you installed undertaker. Did you try to run the algorithms without undertaker installed simply to see what would happen? Was it difficult to run the algorithms? Why? List some hardships. By the forms answers, most of the people agreed that the algorithms execution tutorial (from the study's website) could be better. But do you think that a more descriptive tutorial would be only something that would be better or would it be fundamental for the replication success? During the activity I have noticed that for some teams was strange to perceive that samples/file and configurations per file were the same thing. Why do you think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people had this difficulty? E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? I1 What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? I2 In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? I4 When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would		
tuturidertaker installed simply to see what would happen? Was it difficult to run the algorithms? Why? List some hardships. By the forms answers, most of the people agreed that the algorithms execution tutorial (from the study's website) could be better. But do you think that a more descriptive tutorial would be only something that would be better or would it be fundamental for the replication success? During the activity I have noticed that for some teams was strange to perceive that samples/file and configurations per file were the same thing. Why do you think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people had this difficulty? E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? I1 What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? I2 In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? I4 When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ERI Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? P(Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availabilit		
tuturidertaker installed simply to see what would happen? Was it difficult to run the algorithms? Why? List some hardships. By the forms answers, most of the people agreed that the algorithms execution tutorial (from the study's website) could be better. But do you think that a more descriptive tutorial would be only something that would be better or would it be fundamental for the replication success? During the activity I have noticed that for some teams was strange to perceive that samples/file and configurations per file were the same thing. Why do you think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people had this difficulty? E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? I1 What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? I2 In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? I4 When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ERI Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? P(Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availabilit	C4	Explain how you installed undertaker. Did you try to run the algorithms with-
E2 By the forms answers, most of the people agreed that the algorithms execution tutorial (from the study's website) could be better. But do you think that a more descriptive tutorial would be only something that would be better or would it be fundamental for the replication success? E3 During the activity I have noticed that for some teams was strange to perceive that samples/file and configurations per file were the same thing. Why do you think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people had this difficulty? E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? I1 What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? I2 In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer		
E2 By the forms answers, most of the people agreed that the algorithms execution tutorial (from the study's website) could be better. But do you think that a more descriptive tutorial would be only something that would be better or would it be fundamental for the replication success? E3 During the activity I have noticed that for some teams was strange to perceive that samples/file and configurations per file were the same thing. Why do you think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people had this difficulty? E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? I1 What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? I2 In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer	E1	Was it difficult to run the algorithms? Why? List some hardships.
more descriptive tutorial would be only something that would be better or would it be fundamental for the replication success? During the activity I have noticed that for some teams was strange to perceive that samples/file and configurations per file were the same thing. Why do you think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people had this difficulty? E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? I1 What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? I2 In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? I4 When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	E2	
E3 During the activity I have noticed that for some teams was strange to perceive that samples/file and configurations per file were the same thing. Why do you think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people had this difficulty? E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? I1 What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? I2 In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? I4 When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER6 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		tutorial (from the study's website) could be better. But do you think that a
During the activity I have noticed that for some teams was strange to perceive that samples/file and configurations per file were the same thing. Why do you think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people had this difficulty? E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? I1 What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? I2 In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? I4 When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		more descriptive tutorial would be only something that would be better or
that samples/file and configurations per file were the same thing. Why do you think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people had this difficulty? E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? I1 What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? I2 In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		would it be fundamental for the replication success?
think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people had this difficulty? E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? I1 What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? I2 In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	E3	During the activity I have noticed that for some teams was strange to perceive
had this difficulty? E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? I1 What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? I2 In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? I4 When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		
E4 Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the task somehow? In what exactly? I1 What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? I2 In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? I4 When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		think that, even though these concepts are defined on the paper, many people
task somehow? In what exactly? What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		had this difficulty?
What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	E4	Did you managed to check the algorithms' source code? Did that helped the
ing, etc)? Do you think that the way the study was reported was appropriate for a replication? Why? In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		
In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	I1	What was your overall impression about the paper (in terms of structure, writ-
In general was the paper reasonable to understand (even you not having a wide domain of its subject?) Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		
domain of its subject?) 13		
I3 Can you recall some specific part that was not so clear? I4 When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	I2	
When I asked you in the form "do the results diverge", what was your comprehension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	13	· ,
hension about the divergence or not divergence of the results? Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	0000000	
ER1 Was there any point on the training session you think could be better explained? How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	11	
How exactly? What do you think I could have done to make the concepts and the activity more clear? ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	ER1	
ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	23101	
ER2 Do you think my intervention was essential for you to be able to replicate the experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		
experiment? Did it help on your comprehension about the paper? ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	ER2	
ER3 How the experiment could be better detailed in order to facilitate the replication? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		
tion? ER4 Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation? (Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	ER3	
(Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		
(Please be honest; you do not have to please me at all). ER5 Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	ER4	Do you think this activity was useful for your academic background formation?
experiment was to you? ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		
ER6 Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	ER5	Ranging from 1 to 5, what score would you give to describe how interesting the
course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		experiment was to you?
subject's motivation and time availability? ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?	ER6	Do you think if the activity would have been applied in the beginning of the
ER7 How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humiliated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		course would it change something on the experiment execution in terms of
iated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward to synchronize tasks and meetings?		
to synchronize tasks and meetings?	ER7	How was the task division among you (being in mind that no one will be humil-
		iated or pusnished by the content of any answer given). Was it straightforward
ER8 Do you think the lack of experience with scientific research (not restricted to	ER8	Do you think the lack of experience with scientific research (not restricted to
Software Engineering) was something that played against you when executing		Software Engineering) was something that played against you when executing
the experiment's task? Why?		the experiment's task? Why?