

https://dspace.org/

Team collaboration during the concept and viability stage of the development process

Veldsman, Dewald

2018

https://hdl.handle.net/10539/26929

Veldsman, Dewald (2018) Team collaboration during the concept and viability stage of the development process, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, https://hdl.handle.net/10539/26929

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Examiner 01

Response to external examiner's feedback

The candidate would like to thank the external examiner for the valuable feedback on the first submission of this research report. This final submission has now been revised to incorporate the feedback received from the examiner. A summary of the corrections is presented in the ensuing table.

	Examiner's Comments	Response
	Comments: • Please note that in addition to comments below, some editorial comments appear on the hard copy.	• No hard copy was provided. The candidate has also submitted an electronic copy indicating all corrections.
1	ABSTRACT, ToC: • The abstract serves its purpose and provides a clear indication of the research endeavour. It could be improved by stating exactly what is meant by "the professional team" – at first, this could mean anything to the reader. • Actually it is a list of acronyms, not abbreviations. • ToC is fine.	• The sentence: "Most construction project teams comprise participants from different professions that combine to form temporary organisations aimed at achieving the common objective of delivering a project"was added to the abstract. • This was changed to a list of acronyms. • The candidate has noted this positive feedback from the examiner.
2	INTRODUCTION, STRUCTURING AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS; LIT. REVIEW (LR) / CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK (CF) / METHODS • This is well tackled. • On occasion in the RR, there are instances where some conceptual leaps are made and too much is assumed in terms of the reader's understanding of concepts, ideas or practices. • The background to the research and the research questions are generally well explained, set out and contextualized. • The methods (not methodology) section is very well handled and the 'research onion' is well used as a structuring and explanatory 'device.' • Perhaps S3.5 should explicitly mention that a literature review was conducted. S3.7.: how was the list of respondents identified in the first place?	• The candidate has noted this positive feedback from the examiner. • The candidate edited the document to improve the "readability" between paragraphs. • The candidate has noted this positive feedback from the examiner. • S3.: This section was changed to methods. S3.7.: explains how the list was identified. • S3.8.: Discusses central tendency. • As far as the candidate has been advised, the school does not explicitly require CF. • S2.6.: An example of an online BIM collaboration tool is the 'Horizontal Glue' programme • The candidate has noted this feedback from the examiner.

	• There could be slightly more discussion on central tendency in this ch. • There is no explicit CF – is it required in this School? • Elaboration of concepts or ideas or statements is sometimes required (indicated). Just one example is on p. 23. – the "horizontal glue" sentence seems to stop mid-sentence. Whilst one can *intuit* what is meant by this, one needs to be sure of the exact meaning of, and also the ramifications of what is meant here, especially *in terms of this RR*. • This is a well – structured review of the literature, which successfully draws together various strands of the literature. The LR could perhaps be a bit deeper and more critical though.	
3	<u>RIGOUR AND EDITING (as above, see hardcopy for details-examples below are merely indicative)</u> • The RR is generally well edited, but there are occasional comma, plural and minor grammar problems. • Periods are sometimes missing. • Problems with apostrophes, e.g., p.3 (it's) • Some typos. (indicated in text). • Et al. is sometimes incorrect, as et al • Words sometimes missing. • Wrong word used, e.g., p. 27 *deduce*, not *deduct*. • Style is sometimes a bit colloquial e.g., p. 36, and elsewhere.	• The candidate has noted this feedback from the examiner and sent the document for professional editing. • Periods were corrected. • Deduct was changed to deduce. • The candidate revised S3.9.
4	<u>FINDINGS/ SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSIONS</u> • The findings and conclusions are generally well thought out and very well presented. Good use is made of the survey material and it is well dissected. • There are some vague statements, e.g., p.40" 'most" developers; p.41: the "majority" of respondents... (be specific, especially when it comes to findings). • Similarly on p.51, does the 'lowest level' refer to the mean or the median? (They appear to yield different rankings). And	• The candidate has noted this positive feedback from the examiner. • S4. was revised to be more specific. • The document does not have a S5,7,2.

	what exactly is meant by "legislative"? (Presumably this encompasses only "regulation" and the "contractual", but one needs to be certain). • S5,7,2 could be elaborated upon.	
5	<u>REFERENCING AND REFERENCE LIST; PRESENTATION; ANNEXURES.</u> • The RR is well presented. • The questionnaires are useful. • The referencing in the text and in the reference list is generally good and accurate. Some slips though, e.g., p.28 (indicated).	• The candidate has noted this feedback from the examiner and sent the document for professional editing.
6	<u>OVERALL COMMENTS AND EVALUATION</u> • This is a generally thorough and well – argued piece of work. • There are some minor editorial shortcomings, but generally the editing is good. • The writing style, structure and expression of ideas is all clear. • The mark could have been even better with a bit more depth and critique and elaboration of ideas, findings and recommendations. • Nevertheless, this is an interesting and relevant RR and it certainly adds to our theoretical and practical knowledge base.	• The candidate has noted this feedback from the examiner and sent the document for professional editing.