Informed Consent

Thank you for participating in our experiment. In this experiment, we investigate the impact of various graphic representations on the quality assurance of hazard-mitigating requirements. By participating, you gain valuable insights into the methods of empirical software engineering and broaden your knowledge with model-based specification techniques.

The experiment consists of three phases

1. In the first phase, some demographic information are collected. These are treated anonymously and are used purely to guide the analysis of experimental data.
2. The second phase will start with an in-depth introduction to the quality assurance task at hand. You will be asked to visually inspect a model-based requirements specification consisting of one diagram at a time. After you've finished inspecting a diagram, you're asked to decide whether the functionality specified in the diagram leads to injury to humans or damage to other systems (in the following, this is called a "hazard"). Indicate your answer by clicking on either "yes" if you think a hazard might occur during operation or "no" if you think the system is safe. Also, please provide a brief written rationale of why you made that decision.
3. In the last phase, you're asked to provide answers to a few questions. These questions aim at assessing your personal experience during quality assurance.

The experiment takes approximately 30 minutes.

Your participation is absolutely voluntary. You are free to discontinue at any point without penalty. Your data will be treated anonymously - it is not possible to associate any data set with a concrete person and your data will be used only for non-commercial scientific research.

If you have questions regarding the experiment, are experiencing strain or discomfort after participating, or would like to know more about this research, please contact the principle investigator:

Bastian Tenbergen, BSc, MA
Assistant Professor for Computer Science
Department of Computer Science
State University of New York at Oswego, USA
bastian.tenbergen@oswego.edu

This experiment was approved by the Human Subjects Committee at SUNY Oswego. If you have questions about participating in the study or its approval, please contact David Bozak (david.bozak@oswego.edu), chair of the committee.

By signing here, you give your consent to participate:

ID	Question	Rather HRDs		Rather ADs w/ Tables::		
PH01_01	I could complete requirements reviews better using this diagram type if I had done it before.	O	O	O	O	O
PH01_02	The results of using this diagram type are more apparent to me.	O	O	O	O	O
PH01_03	This diagram type improves by performance in reviewing requirements.	O	O	O	O	O
PH01_04	I believe I could better communicate to others the consequences of reviewing requriements using this diagram type.	O	O	O	O	O
PH01_05	The data that I need is displayed in a form that is more readable and easier to understand in this diagram type.	O	O	O	O	O
PH01_06	Using this diagram type, the exact meaning of data elements is either more obvious or easiert to find out.	O	O	O	O	O
PH01_08	There is so much information in different places and in so many forms that it is harder to know how to review requirements effectively using this diagram type.	O	O	O	O	O

ID	Question	Rather HRDs			Rather ADs w/ Tables::	
PH02_01	This diagram type enhances my review effectiveness.	O	O	O	O	O
PH02_02	I have less difficulty telling others how my review results using this diagram type.	O	O	O	O	O
PH02_03	This diagram type increases my review productivity.	O	O	O	O	O
PH02_04	I could complete requirements reviews better using this diagram type if some-one showed me how to do it first.	O	O	O	O	O
PH02_05	I could complete requirements reviews better using this diagram type if no one was around to tell me what to do as I go.	O	O	O	O	O
PH02_06	I am getting more of the training I need to be able to use the data of this dia-gram type during requirements reviews.	O	O	O	O	O
PH02_07	There are so many different information in this diagram type, that it is harder to understand which one to use for requirements reviews.	O	O	O	O	O
PH02_08	This diagram type is missing more ciritical data that would be very useful to requirements reviews.	O	O	O	O	O

ID	Question	Rather HRDs			Rather ADs w/ Tables::	
PH03_01	I find this diagram type to be more useful in reviewing requirements.	O	O	O	O	O
PH03_02	There is not enough training on how to find, understand, access or use the information in this diagram type.	O	O	O	O	O
PH03_03	I would have more difficulty explaining why using this diagram type may or may not be beneficial.	O	O	O	O	O
PH03_04	The data maintained in this diagram type is exactly what I need to review requirements.	O	O	O	O	O
PH03_05	The exact meaning of modeling elements in this diagram type is simpler to comprehend.	O	O	O	O	O
PH03_06	The data in this diagram type is presented in a more readable and more useful format.	O	O	O	O	O
PH03_07	It is more difficult to do my job effectively using this diagram type because some of the data I need is not available.	O	O	O	O	O

DG01_01	How old are you?
	5 / 6

DG04	What's your gender?
☐	I am female.
☐	I am male.
☐	I prefer not to say.

DG08	Please enter the last four digits of your student ID.

DG05_01	What is the highest degree you prossesss (incl. degree program)

DG06	What is your current (main) occupation?
☐	Undergraduate student
☐	Graduate student
☐	Researcher / Academic Staff / Professor
☐	Employee in the Industry

DG02_01	Degree currently pursued

DG02_02	Current degree program (major)

DG02_03	How many semesters have you been studying that major?

DG02_04	When do you expect to graduate?

DG07_	How much experience do you have in the following areas?					
Area		**Experience from…**				
		… multiple industry projects	… one industry project	… ne or multiple academic projects	… academic homework	I have no experience in this area.
01	Automotive Software Engineering	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
02	Requirements Engineering in general	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
03	Modeling using Activity Diagrams	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
04	Modeling using State Machine Diagrams / Automata	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
05	Requirements Reviews or Inspections	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
06	Requirements-based Testing or Software Quality Assurance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
07	Functional Design / Architecture	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
08	Software Component Design / Architecture	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐