

Methodology: Qualitative Studies

	Exemplary 4	Proficient 3	Marginal 2	Unacceptable 1
Research Question and Goal Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The research questions are clearly identified and stated. The questions are interesting, novel and worth researching. ● It is researchable and has an appropriate scope. ● Related work is clearly communicated along with the implications on the research questions and selected methodology. ● The goals are precisely identified and discussed, and highly relevant to the research question. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The research questions are clearly identified and stated, but the questions may not be realistic, or not novel. ● It is researchable and has an appropriate scope. ● Related work and the connections between related work and the current research are clearly presented. ● The goals are identified and discussed. The goals are relevant but may not be very practical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The research questions are identified but stated in an unclear manner. The question may not be realistic, or not novel or even unresearchable. ● It is overall researchable, but the scope is too broad or too narrow. ● Related work is presented but no implications or connections are stated. ● The goals are identified but stated imprecisely. The goals may not be very relevant to the research question or not practical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The research question is not identified or wrongly stated. ● It is not researchable. ● No related work is mentioned. ● The goals are not identified.
Participant Recruitment and Ethical Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participant types (representativeness) are fully considered based on the study's purpose and participants of an appropriate size are recruited. ● Participants are informed timely, and their consent is collected at an appropriate time without disrupting their behaviour in the experiment. ● Ethical considerations are fully applied to ensure that participants are treated with respect. The privacy of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Most of the participant types match with the purposes of the study and participants of an appropriate size are recruited. ● Participants are informed and their consent is collected without disrupting their behaviour in the experiment, but the communication is not timely. ● Ethical considerations are partially applied to ensure that participants are treated with respect. The privacy of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some participant types match with the purposes of the study, but participants' numbers are not powerful enough to detect the effect or draw any conclusion. ● Participants are informed and their consent is collected, but the communication timing may affect their behaviour in the experiment. ● Ethical considerations are partially applied, but some participants may not be treated with respect. The privacy of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participant types are not representative to the purposes of the study and introduce extra messy environment factors to the experiment results. Participants' numbers are not powerful enough to detect the effect or draw any conclusion. ● Participants are not informed and their consent is not

	participants is assured and all the data is stored securely.	participants is assured but some of the data is stored insecurely.	participants is not assured and most of the data is stored insecurely.	collected. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ethical considerations are not applied during the experiment and all the data is not stored securely.
Procedure and Process:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paper reflects a variety of appropriate coding procedures (open -> axial -> selective), categorizing, and developing attributes. Categories, subcategories, and recurring patterns are detailed and explained. Development of interpretation and theory is clarified through each iteration. Principles of constant comparison of data-with-data, and data with-theory are stated in a clear manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paper reflects some appropriate coding procedures (open -> axial -> selective), categorizing, and developing attributes. Categories, subcategories, and recurring patterns are explained but missing some details. Development of interpretation and theory is mentioned through each iteration. Principles of constant comparison of data-with-data, and data with-theory are stated but in an unclear manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paper reflects some details of appropriate coding procedures (open -> axial -> selective). Categories, subcategories, and recurring patterns are stated in an unclear manner. Development of interpretation and theory is not mentioned through each iteration. Principles of constant comparison of data-with-data, and data with-theory are not stated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paper does not reflect details of appropriate coding procedures (open -> axial -> selective), categorizing, and developing attributes. Categories, subcategories, and recurring patterns are not stated. Development of interpretation and theory is not mentioned through each iteration. Principles of constant comparison of data-with-data, and data with-theory are not stated.
Data Collection and Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data sets are appropriately selected and well-matched with the research question. Data collection is clearly guided by the iteratively developing theory to test the tentative theory's weakest points. Detailed collection techniques and steps are fully explored and supported with rationale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data sets are appropriately selected and somehow matched with the research question. Data collection is guided by the iteratively developing theory to test the tentative theory's weakest points. Detailed collection techniques and steps are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data sets are appropriately selected and somehow matched with the research question. Data collection is guided by the iteratively developing theory to test the tentative theory's weakest points, but are stated in an unclear manner. Collection techniques and steps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data sets are appropriately selected but not matched with the research question. Data collection is not guided by the iteratively developing theory to test the tentative theory's weakest points.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process of data collection and methods of measurement are clearly explained with considerations to minimize explicit user intervention. • Precise reports on data and analysis methods are provided. • Clear statistical results are presented and analyzed along with the confidence of the findings. 	<p>explored but supported based on some flawed logic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process of data collection and methods of measurement are explained with considerations to minimize explicit user intervention. • Reports on data and analysis methods are provided but missing some details. • Clear statistical results are presented and analyzed along with the confidence of the findings. 	<p>are explored but supported based on some flawed logic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process of data collection and methods of measurement are explained with considerations to minimize explicit user intervention, but are missing some details. • Reports on data and analysis methods are provided but missing some details. • Statistical results are presented and analyzed along with the confidence of the findings but stated in an unclear manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection techniques and steps are explored but not logically sound. • The process of data collection and methods of measurement are not explained. • Reports on data and analysis methods are not provided. • Statistical results are missing.
Quality of conclusion/Theory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dynamics: Conclusion/Theory is formulated systematically, iteratively and timely as the analysis progresses. • Coherence(Relevance): Conclusion/Theory is precisely presented to address the research question, with a high degree of articulation. • Credibility: Conclusion/Theory remains faithful to the data and are firmly grounded in the empirical data. • Transferability: Conclusion/Theory is abstract enough and includes sufficient variation to enable its application to other contexts or situations. • Sincerity: During the development of the conclusion/theory, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dynamics: Conclusion/Theory is formulated iteratively as the analysis progresses, but may not be timely. • Coherence(Relevance): Conclusion/Theory is presented in addressing the research question, with some degree of articulation. • Credibility: Most part of the Conclusion/Theory remains faithful to the data. • Transferability: Conclusion/Theory is abstract enough and includes necessary variation to enable its application to other contexts or situations. • Sincerity: During the development of the conclusion/theory, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dynamics: Conclusion/Theory is formulated iteratively. • Coherence(Relevance): Conclusion/Theory is presented in addressing the research question. • Credibility: A few parts of the Conclusion/Theory remains faithful to the data. • Transferability: Conclusion/Theory is abstract and includes parts of the variation for further extension. • Sincerity: During the development of the conclusion/theory, self-reflexivity is missing but research methods and questions are documented transparently. • Modifiability: Part of the conclusion/theory can 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dynamics: Conclusion/Theory is frozen or not updated as needed. • Coherence(Relevance): The conclusion presented is neither relevant to the research question nor convincing. • Credibility: Conclusion/Theory disregard the collected data. • Transferability: Conclusion/Theory does not provide any details concerning its contexts and possible application. • Sincerity: No evidence of reflection during the

	<p>self-reflexivity is practiced at every stage of research and potential biases are acknowledged and presented detailedly and accurately. Research methods and questions are documented transparently.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Modifiability: The conclusion/theory is presented engaging, complex, and encourages other researchers to think, interpret, test or change. ● Contribution/Limitation: The contributions and limitations of the findings are analyzed along with some future research direction proposed. 	<p>self-reflexivity is practiced at some stages of research and potential biases are acknowledged. Research methods and questions are documented transparently.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Modifiability: The conclusion/theory is interesting and can encourage other researchers to think, interpret, test or change. ● Contribution/Limitation: The contributions and limitations of the research are discussed. 	<p>encourage other researchers to think, interpret, test or change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contribution/Limitation: The contributions and significance of the findings are unclear. No discussion of its limitations or future research direction is included. 	<p>process and research methods and questions are unclear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Modifiability: The conclusion/theory is presented ambiguously or discourages further interest from other researchers. ● Contribution/Limitation: The contributions and limitations of the findings are not analyzed
Level of Articulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The paper is organized in a highly clear and detailed manner. ● The experimental design is clearly justified to readers so that they understand why key decisions were taken. ● The high-quality qualitative report is presented with clarity with sufficient evidence and presented significantly intertwined with its content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The paper is organized in a clear manner but missing some details. ● The experimental design is clearly justified to readers so that they could overall understand why key decisions were taken. ● The qualitative report is overall clear, and evidence is provided but missing some details. The text may not be presented in an evocative way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The paper is organized in a clear manner but missing some details. ● The experimental design is justified but stated in an unclear manner, readers might find it hard to understand some of the details. ● The qualitative report is overall clear, but some of the evidence is missing. The text is not presented in an evocative way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The paper is organized in an unclear and undetailed manner. ● The experimental design is not justified, and readers find it hard to understand the details. ● The qualitative report is not clear about the contribution, and the evidence is missing. The report is full of obscure jargon.