Web Design and Development Report

Jialiang Chen   u7349311

Abstract
This report analyzes two papers, including their implementation methods, discussion of strengths and weaknesses, and comparative analysis. Based on this analysis, I provide optimization suggestions and integrate the findings with concepts, theories, and models of human-computer interaction to reflect on the relevance of web design and development.

• Introduction

This report analyzes two papers: "Can Binaural Beats Increase Your Focus? Exploring the Effects of Music in Participants' Conscious and Brain Activity Responses" (referred to as the first paper) and "Popular eReaders" (referred to as the second paper). By critically reading these papers, I will reflect on aspects that need improvement in the development of interactive computer systems.

The report consists of several sections. The first section provides a summary and description of the two papers, including reading impressions and analysis of their strengths and weaknesses. The second section compares the two papers, identifying similarities and differences and discussing the reading experience. The third section discusses the relevance of user participation experiments in the context of web design and development.

These two papers address different topics. The first paper investigates the impact of different types of music on enhancing people's attention, while the second paper examines the influence of different eReader design guidelines on people's reading and user experiences. Both papers employ concepts and experimental methods from human-computer interaction. In the first paper, participants are subjected to auditory and visual stimuli, and their linguistic and physiological data are analyzed to explore the varying effects of different music types on attentional focus. The second paper compares the user experiences of different eReaders in the same usage scenario, determining the impact of different design guidelines on eReader usability concerns.

• First Paper

The paper explored the effects of six different music stimuli on emotion inference by combining language and brain activity responses. These six types of music can be roughly categorized as binaural beats, classical music, and popular music. In the experiment, participants were asked to watch emotion videos while listening to different music and perform emotion inference tasks. To minimize interference from other factors, a controlled variable design was employed. The results showed that binaural beats music may cause discomfort and distraction, while classical music with

a profound tone can help improve attention. Additionally, through further analysis of the participants' language and physiological data, the researchers found that sadness emotion music also contributes to focused attention. The final results indicated that classical music 1, popular music 1, and popular music 2 helped participants maintain attention during the experiment.

Next, the experimental procedure will be described in detail. First of all, the experiment was conducted with great rigor. To ensure the accuracy of the experiment, participants were required to wear noise-canceling headphones to prevent external noise interference. They also needed to fill out information related to the experiment to consider the impact of individual differences as much as possible. The experiment was conducted in the same environment, and the process was the same for each participant. To ensure that colors did not affect the experimental results, the videos were set in grayscale. At the beginning of the experiment, participants were asked to wear a brain signal collection device while listening to music and making emotion judgments. After each music segment, they were asked to provide evaluations of the music. In fact, I really enjoyed this experiment because it allowed me to understand how quickly I could make decisions and choices while listening to different music. However, I also find this experiment challenging as it is difficult to distinguish genuine emotions from deliberate expressions in different contexts, and I struggle to differentiate deliberately masked emotions in my daily life. If I were a participant, I would understand the researchers' request to test whether different music enhances my attention through my choices and brain responses.

Lastly, I would like to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the experiment. First, I believe the experiment is conducted with great rigor, and the researchers have tried their best to eliminate potential factors that could influence the experiment. Each step is described in detail and clarity, which is an advantage of the experiment. Additionally, I think it is beneficial that the experiment collected both brain signal data and language data from the participants for analysis and comparison, which can better reflect the impact of music on attention and enhance the credibility and reliability of the experiment. However, one weakness I see in the experiment is that it determines people's emotions through video stimuli and draws conclusions about whether attention is improved without setting a control group. It should have included a control group where people identify emotions without listening to any music. Furthermore, I believe the criteria for defining genuine emotions are not clear-cut. Defining emotions is not as straightforward as solving a mathematical problem, and there is a blurry area between genuine and feigned emotions. I think using challenging mathematical problems might be more suitable. Additionally, I also believe the sample size of the experiment is small, and the sample group consists of young university students in their twenties, which may yield different conclusions from different populations.

• Second Paper

This article evaluates the usability of four different brands of e-book readers (A (Nook), B (Kobo), C (Kindle), D (Sony)) by simulating consumer trials within a limited budget using principles of human-computer interaction (HCI). The researchers created an ideal e-book reader model called Acola, which incorporated touch and gesture sensing panels. The experiment simulated user scenarios, but the focus was not solely on reading tasks; instead, it simulated users quickly navigating to specific file locations to highlight differences between the e-book readers. Twelve participants were invited to record their impressions, and the results showed that device A (Nook) performed the worst, devices B (Kobo) and C (Kindle) performed similarly and were among the best, and device D (Sony) fell between the best and worst devices. Acola's performance was very similar to the worst-performing device A(Nook).

As a participant in the experiment, I felt like I was asked to perform mechanical tasks, simply following the experimental instructions to complete a series of operations and fill out a questionnaire evaluating the usability of the e-book readers. I did not enjoy the experiment as I did not actually get to use the e-book reader for reading, and the entire experiment overlooked the real experience of using different e-book readers. While I understand the researchers' aim to understand the differences in navigational capabilities among e-book readers with different design standards, I wish the experiment could have been more closely aligned with real-world usage scenarios.

Moving on, I would like to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the paper. I believe the paper addressed user needs by setting relevant usage scenarios, making the experiment practical. The overall experimental process was well-executed, with two participants assigned to each group to avoid confusion. However, I think the number of participants was too small, and they were all university students, which may not accurately reflect the real-world conditions and lacks generalizability. Consequently, the statistical significance and reliability of the experimental data are questionable. Furthermore, I believe the experimental setup did not cover the users' everyday usage situations. The most important function of an e-book reader, in my opinion, is reading books, but the experiment only gathered user impressions during navigation tasks, failing to capture the users' overall usage experience with different e-book readers. Therefore, the conclusions regarding e-book readers with different design standards may be somewhat biased. Finally, I believe the coverage of only four e-book reader devices in the experiment was too limited, and more e-book readers should have been included to draw more comprehensive conclusions.

• Comparison of the two experiments

Although the research topics are different, I believe both papers utilize the concept of human-computer interaction (HCI) in their experiments and research. They involve participant interaction with the experimental devices to gather user experiences and

draw conclusions by comparing different experimental results. The first paper compares the accuracy of human emotion recognition for different types of music stimuli, while the second paper compares the user experiences of different e-readers through simulated usage scenarios and draws conclusions on usability. Additionally, both papers share similarities in terms of the participants being university students, having a relatively small sample size, and employing statistical methods to analyze the experimental results.

Next, I would like to discuss the differences between these two papers. Firstly, I believe the first paper employs more rigorous experimental conditions. The researchers strive to eliminate unnecessary factors that could interfere with the experiment, such as ensuring consistent environments for the participants and controlling the order of audio and video stimuli, as well as mitigating the impact of video colors on the results. On the other hand, the second paper focuses more on the participants' subjective user experiences and does not establish strict experimental conditions. Secondly, the data collection methods differ between the two papers. The first paper uses both brain signals and participant verbal as data, while the second paper solely relies on the participants' subjective experiences. The first paper derives conclusions by comparing the participants' language and physiological responses, while the second paper emphasizes the participants' experiences during the experiment.

Overall, I believe neither of these papers has arrived at highly reliable conclusions, but they both hold reference value and provide foundations for future in-depth research. Although both papers employ statistical analysis, the sample size is small, and the participants are predominantly young university students, which limits the statistical significance. Furthermore, I believe both papers have certain flaws in their experimental designs. The first paper lacks a control group where participants are tested on emotion recognition without listening to music, while the second paper only utilizes four types of e-readers with prices ranging from $50 to $75, which fails to cover the majority of e-reader types available on the market. In my opinion, the first paper holds more reference value due to its higher experimental rigor, the use of brain monitoring equipment and language data collection, a larger number of participants, more detailed analysis of experimental conclusions, and stronger statistical significance.

• Relevance of user-participation experiments to web design and Development

User participation in experiments is a crucial component of Human-Computer Interaction. Through analyzing two research papers and combining them with my understanding of web design and development, I have gained the following insights:
1. In the process of web design, it is essential to consider user usability. While providing useful information on a website is important, it is even more crucial to ensure that users can comfortably browse the web pages. If users are not willing to navigate the website, the content becomes useless. This is specifically manifested

in the navigation functionality of the website design, the user-friendliness of the interface, and the ability to set user preferences, enabling users to easily access the content they need.

2. When collecting user data, it is advisable to avoid complex and burdensome forms that users have to fill out. Complicated forms can make users feel frustrated, decrease their motivation, and consequently lead to decreased accuracy. Instead, a relaxed and interactive approach should be employed to collect user data.

3. Make full use of the concepts and models of Human-Computer Interaction. Both research papers utilized theoretical concepts and models of HCI in their experimental designs, with the first paper being particularly effective in its application. In web design, after determining the website's theme, it is important to consider the target user group, such as their age range, professional scope, and religious background. Then, from the user's perspective, design website content centered around understanding user needs and expectations. Finally, combine the website's functionality, interface, and interaction patterns to create a website that users will enjoy.

References

• Rahman, J. S., Gedeon, T., Caldwell, S., & Jones, R. L. (2021). Can Binaural Beats Increase Your Focus? Exploring the Effects of Music in Participants' Conscious and Brain Activity Responses. Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 1– 6. https://doi.org/10.1145/3411763.3451813

• Rampaul, U., & Gedeon, T. (2014, April). Evaluation of e-Readers: A Preliminary Analysis. Research School of Computer Science, Australian National University.