RQ MARKS

Following are your marks for the Research Question deliverable of the coursework.

Each component was assessed, then assigned a qualitative mark from the rubric on pp. 7-8 of the coursework specification.

The component's score was then computed by multiplying the component points by the percentage corresponding to the mark assigned to the component; the result was rounded to the nearest whole number.

The total net score is the sum of the component scores.

Section/+ Component Mark Marks partA: Files **Excellent** • Is there a research question file? Yes. • *Is it named correctly?* ('research_question.yml') Yes. • Is it syntactically correct? Yes. Excellent. partB: Research Question Clear fail • *Is the question (or statement) comprehensible (makes sense)?* Yes. • Is the statement an actual *question*? E.g, starts with 'How', 'When', 'Why', 'What', etc., and ends with a '?' No. Questions require a question mark $(\tilde{A}\phi\hat{A}\hat{A}?\tilde{A}\phi\hat{A}\hat{A})$ at the end. • Is the question (or statement) about Computer Science, Software En-

- Is the question appropriate for a literature review (as opposed to an
- experiment or other primary study)? Yes.
- *Is the review likely to include at least five papers?* Yes.

gineering, AI, Data Science, Cybersecurity, IT? Yes.

- Is the question so broad as to be pointless or produce too many papers to review in a semester? No.
- Is the question 'crisp' (doesn't use weasel words like 'influence,' 'efficient,' 'convenient,' etc.)? Yes.
- Is the question concise (doesn't use many words when fewer would suffice.)? Yes.
- Is the question interesting? Yes.

Summary: Question is not expressed as a question.

Excellent partC: Components

- Does the submission include a context in which the RQ should be interpreted and/or answered? Yes.
- Is the context correct? Yes.
- Does the submission include a population? E.g., Students, Scrum Masters, population of a country, etc. Yes.
- Is the population correct? Note: the sub-groups for comparison are selected from the population, which for some questions might be things like programs, news articles, text messages, etc. Yes.
- Does the submission include an intervention? E.g. A method, model, algorithm, stimulus, motivator. Yes.
- Is the intervention correct? Note: for some cases, the RQ is about finding the intervention. For example, What are the barriers to collaboration? The barriers are the interventions, collaboration is the outcome. Yes.
- Does the submission include a comparison? I.e. a baseline or control group, compared with a treatment group, or new process or practice. Or one setting/country compared with another, or men compared to women, etc. Yes.
- Is the comparison correct? Yes.
- Does the submission include an outcome? This is key, it is what you are looking for specifically in the papers. Often outcome is something measurable. E.g. productivity, code faults, turnover, faster, slower etc. Outcome could also be a set of risks or recommendations, if plotting the landscape. Yes.
- Is the outcome correct? Yes. Excellent.
- + partD: Presentation
 - Is the submission spelled correctly? Yes.
 - Is the submission punctuated correctly? E.g., one space after (but not before) colons, full stops and capitalization consistent throughout? No. Sentences should be ended with a full stop $(\tilde{A} \not c \hat{A} \hat{A}. \tilde{A} \not c \hat{A} \hat{A})$, question mark $(\tilde{A} \not c \hat{A} \hat{A}? \tilde{A} \not c \hat{A} \hat{A})$, or exclamation point $(\tilde{A} \not c \hat{A} \hat{A}. \tilde{A} \not c \hat{A} \hat{A})$. Summary: Incorrect punctuation.
- + partE: General comments
 - Any general comments? (please use column G for all comments) Yes. This is a very specific question that really would be more appropriate for a trial or experiment. It could work for a literature review if you can find enough relevant papers.

Summary: See also comments on specific components above.

Marginal fail

0