CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2013

Assignment 1105 Feedback

Abdulrahman M. Alzaid   *AbdulZaid*

1a — Your paper surveys a number of applications that use a second screen interface, and functions primarily is such a survey. Less space is devoted to how users might interact with such a screen, and how this relates to the way we consume entertainment. You miss what I think is the key mental model question here, which is: when people are watching show/movies/other entertainment, is the consumption of parallel or ancillary information *really* a part of that process? Sometimes, don't people just want to *watch* something, without navigating around a different set of information? The writeup seems to assume that this is what everyone wants, but does not really show much evidence or discussion that this is actually the case. (**/**)

1b — There is very little mention of metrics in your discussion. Can everyone use a second screen interface? Are they easy to learn? Can one make mistakes easily? Does the second screen detract from the primary viewing experience? As stated in *1a*, the paper does not even question whether these may be issues; it just accepts that second screens are great to have. (**/**)

1c — Your paper states a couple of guidelines, pertaining mainly to how a second screen should be displayed. You address the issue of second screen size, observing that mobile phone second screens may not be sufficient but tablets are a better fit. But you can go further—how about a second *large* screen? Would that actually be ideal? How would one interact with it?

But again, I think you can ask even deeper questions than that. Is the second screen really how everyone would like to view their video entertainment? Are people who have "just" a single screen now at a disadvantage? Is it appropriate to all *types* of entertainment (e.g., would you want to have a second screen if watching, say, a serious art film?)? Ultimately the paper sets out in the right direction, but does not go as far as it could have. (**/**)

2a — The references you found are interesting in their own right, but they are rather narrowly-focused. They mostly cover the different features that assorted second screen implementations have tried to deliver. None have actually *studied* them. Do users truly like them better? How well do users pay attention to the primary entertainment feed when there is a second screen? Are they usable by everyone? There was no sustained effort here to actually find out how well people respond to this technology. (**/**)

2b — Somewhat in-keeping with just functional/feature-oriented aspects of second screen technology, it is somewhat disappointing that your conclusion, in the end, hinges primarily on cost. Again, there is this underlying acceptance that second screen designs are good and desired. If only there were enough funds to pay for second screens, we'd all be great! However, that is not the question that we wanted to explore. We wanted to see *whether* second screens are a good idea at all, from an interaction design standpoint. (**/**)

4d — You show an ability here to find interesting and relevant references, but only for a narrow treatment of second screen technology. You need more *critical* sources rather than just *informational* ones. Further, the very concept of a second screen begs for visuals. Your paper doesn't have a single figure showing how these second screen interfaces even look! Again, many lost opportunities here. (**/**)

4e — Your commit count and messages are appropriate for work of this scale, with the one caveat that they all took place within 23 hours. This is not the timetable that is envisioned for an assignment like this. Spread the work out better and cram less. (**|**)

4f — Submitted on time. (**+**)