NCKU, IMBA - FEEDBACK, CLASS PRESENTATIONS

THE GROUP YOU ARE *ASSESSING:*	**Save your file. Use this format: group being assessed your group.doc So an example would be TIV Voltes5.doc – where TIV is the group being assessed and Voltes5 is your group.**
ABEBE	
YOUR GROUP NAME:	
INSTRUCTOR	

A	B	C	D
Are ideas presented connected with the aim of the presentation?	Are the ideas presented clearly supported with evidence and logical argument?	Is it easy to follow & to understand? (Are the slides clear and easy to follow e.g. use of new pictures, words, graphs)	Overall impression (is it a group presentation etc.?)
40%	30%	20%	10%

5%	5%	5%	5%

Comments (space will expand as you type)
Cell phone :(

Animate the points

Qu: -ROs
Qu - interview guideline
Qu - selective coding / in-vivo coding? Here you are coding with your own labels. This is not selective coding (revisit Strauss and Corbin)
Qu - memos - use memos (where are these in your process?) to keep track of category meanings and your own research interpretation
Qu - many respondents said….
Qu - This is consistent with . . .
Qu - Table 1 No. 7 -- avoid this in a presentation - because your audience does not have access to the tables
Qu - Translator

Abi - there is lots of work here. Your journey to getting so many interviews and so much data is a long hard one --- well done.
You need, though, to bring rigor to the process of coding. Make sure you are building codes, and aligning data (i.e., excerpts from your interviews) with those codes. Take time to do this part systematically -- going from one interview to the next. This way you can develop codes that are well grounded (and so substantiated) by the data.
Keep referring back to your RQs in the process to ensure your code development aligns with your research purpose.

Grade (%) 20%

Wei

- ~~The in vivo codes looks stretched in terms of length. How recurring are they?~~
- “Response of interviewees” is summarized by researcher rather than in vivo
- The presented analysis is practical and intuitive. On the other hand, how are they connected to known body of research?

Marx

- Great job in looking for respondents and interviewing!
-

Sarah

- The presentation looks so well prepared. There are many respondents who actively participated in the data gathering. Good job!
- Hope to see your process in coding, and if you choose inductive or deductive study.
- I also appreciate that the preliminary analysis have some references.

Petch J

- The amount of dedication and number of interviews as well as the work that was put on the transcribing process is shown here. “Impressive”
- Presenter knows the material really well. The presentation flow is smooth. But sometime you can slow down a little bit.

Kemi

- Very impressive number of interviewees and work of transcribing. Bravo!
- Good benchmarking with theory along the way. Do you have a research model to follow? I think it could be more engaging to have a research model.

Tony

- I was a little confused on the coding process (e.g in vivo code)
- Your amount of work for an individual is impressive and the fact that you don’t you any supporting tools for the work
- The way the content is drafted: easy to understand and you have got a rich data!

Laura

- Hard to imagine to cope with such a big amount of raw materials by individual.
- Look forward for the finalize information in the following presentation.