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There are six factors that your individual grades are assembled from, and of these there are three group-based grades we assign in this project: the overall project grade (2,0) which amounts to 20% of your individual grades, the final report and presentation grade (3,0) which constitutes 10% of individual grades, and the final product grade (2,0) which is 20% of your individual grades. The individual grades vary and are assembled through self-assessment, mutual assessment, and our assessment of your group performance and your individual performance.

Overall, we saw that, in the course of the project’s timeline, you grew together as a group and made it work even though you encountered challenges, such as group communication and resource constraints. Your enthusiasm as a group, as well as the overall effort you invested are evident. While the overall group effort, as well as the final product, consisting of the technical part as well as the user study, were good, there are some aspects of the report and final presentation that could be improved.

One issue was the partly repetitive nature of the results presentation. While it is important to emphasize the important points, the repetition of some key findings had a negative impact to the overall clarity. In future presentations, a takeaway point would be to streamline your presentation narrative by diving deep into some exemplary aspects and summarizing the rest. Another aspect for improvement was the at times occurring incongruency between slides and content presented: sometimes, the slides did not match the presented content which rendered the presentation confusing. This was already discussed in the individual feedback meetings.

As for the final report, there was a portion of AI-generated sentences without disclosure of AI use. According to university policy, the use of AI for writing is completely fine, as long as it is properly marked and cited. In the future, please make sure to disclose the use of AI in every instance, just as if it were an academic text by a human that you referenced. Another issue that underlined the overall report and findings was the relative lack of orientation towards a clear research question grounding the entire project, which is an essential part of any research project. Further, the report’s understanding of certain theoretical concepts, such as discourse analysis or ethical user testing, seemed rather oversimplified. Grounding one’s own research in theoretical concepts is a key part of any research. Further, the use of methodology, as well as the result analysis, would have benefited from a justification of method use. This connects to the issue of anchoring in literature: engaging more thoroughly with academic literature on theoretical concepts, as well as on their application in analysis would make the arguments and the entire justification stronger.

And finally, maybe most important, there should be more critical reflection of your own work but also of other studies. This is core of research to challenge existing ideas as well as your own new ideas.

In total, while the product, the results, and the overall group performance were good, the report and presentation had room for improvement. We are confident that if you consider these feedback points as takeaways, then your future research work—i.e., your individual master’s theses—will be of high quality.