CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2014

Assignment 1021 Feedback

Daniel Levine   *dannymlevine / dannymlevine1@gmail.com*

You've lined up some nice references for your paper. I seem to remember that you weren't sure if you'd find anything up this alley, so I hope you feel better now about the chances that the scholarly literature may indeed have something published despite its relative newness.

The tricky aspect of your chosen topic, which I think I voiced when you checked on this with me before and now sort of stands confirmed given your final paper, is the very notion of "immersion" as the mental model being conveyed. There is certainly a way to approach it (and hints in your paper show that), but the issue with "immersion" is that the very *feeling* of immersion can be viewed more as a *utility* issue rather than *usability*. i.e., "Immersion" is making sure that the user is completely enclosed and feeling transported into the alternative environment. Note how that is more of a *functional* perspective rather than a user interface one—it's just after "giving that feeling." Unfortunately, this is where most of your paper lived.

The key here is to extract the *usability* aspect of immersion. And in your paper you start grazing this—for example, you talk about the idea of controls in an immersive environment. Where do keyboards or controller belong in a VR interface? For that matter, where are the controls in an *AR* interface such as RoomAlive? That is the intended thread of the assignment, and unfortunately your paper only grazes it. More examples: how quickly can a user accomplish tasks in the immersive environment? Faster, slower, or the same as in real life? Or, what errors will a user commit in the immersive environment (e.g., overshoot an object, misjudge its size, etc.)? Note how these correlate better to interaction design, because they study *how* a user interacts with the environment (usability), and not *whether* the user feels/does something in it (utility).

Meanwhile, your responses to the cognitive psychology talk are not seen, and that affects outcome *1a* because the area of mental models is where the two fields intersect, and then of course *4f*.

1a — **/** …The whole issue of getting a handle on "immersion" as a mental model is given a game try, but as mentioned above falls somewhat short. Add to that the missing cognitive psychology questionnaire responses and one cannot really say that mental model understanding (and its relationship to interaction design) was demonstrated that well.

1b — **/** …The focus in the "sensation" of immersion sort of undermined the opportunities to consider the interaction design concepts seen in class. The notion of controllers and keyboards is a step toward this direction, but that discussion is over before it has a chance to gain steam.

2a — **|** …You certainly did some good leg work in gathering up references for your study, and that is the main way that the paper exemplifies this outcome. However, execution is a part of this outcome also, and noticeable spacing glitches, typos, misused quotes, non-standardized citation placement, etc., all detract from the experience of reading the paper, thus dragging down the proficiency.

2b — **/** …Because the discussion barely goes away from the utility aspects of immersion, there isn't much opportunity to apply interaction design concepts to make determinations about the usability of an immersive system, whether Rift or RoomAlive.

4d — **+** …As mentioned before, the found pool of references is of quality. This outcome is focused on that, independent of how they were used.

4e — **/** …One commit; 'nuff said.

4f — **|** …We count the cognitive psychology questionnaire as late.

CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2014

Assignment 1021 Feedback

Updates as of 12/6/2014:

1a — The mental model content has not shifted too much, but the questionnaire has been supplied and so that counts for something. (**|**)

1b — No substantial conceptual additions seen. (**/**)

2a — Some fixes noted, but some major ones remain: most glaring is the use of LaTeX quotes. I have mentioned this more than once in class, and of course it is also easily spotted in the most basic LaTeX tutorials on the web. I know it may seem tiny, but after quotes have been called out already, to see it "fixed" the *wrong* way just doesn't help. Other typos remain also—"Sega" uncapitalized, "experience" misspelled as "expierience," etc. So execution can't really be said to have gone over to the next level. (**|**)

2b — Without substantial conceptual additions, application can't really change. (**/**)

4e — No real improvement here…wholesale changes in a single commit, with questionnaire in another. (**/**)