

REVIEW OF PROPOSAL FOR THE EVALUATION OF BINGEBUDDIES

Reviewer Group: Calendories

Reviewers: Smriti PANDA, Constance ARNOUX, Debanjana HALDAR, Xingchen MA, Francisco AYORA DUARTE

Title of the reviewed evaluation proposal: Enhancing group decision-making and online viewing of video contents.

Remarks from class discussion

The research question is well-defined, and the hypotheses show a clear intention to compare decision-making processes in a group context. The methodology is well-structured and relevant to the evaluators' goals. The type of study selected appears appropriate for measuring the intended variables. Overall, the project has a lot of potential in calibrating the measures considered according to the research question.

The evaluation protocol proposed could be improved using the following remarks which we found could be relevant:

The second hypothesis mentioned AI generated recommendations however, there is no mention of how it is supposed to be tested. It also seems tedious to test this hypothesis given the other hypothesis testing, timeframe and other constraints.

The proposal also mentions the testing of decision making processes by comparison of traditional decision making methods however, the proposal doesn't exactly specify which methods are being tested. In addition, the traditional decision making processes such as debate could be done even with the application via the chat feature or via personal calls, so the proposal does not really separate traditional decision making methods from decision making by using BingeBuddies application.

There is no mention of network connectivity interference when it comes to using the application. The proposal mentions remote testing but there is no specification of whether network issues could be ignored or taken into consideration.

The participants' age-range is stated between 15-30 years which is less than 18 years. Thus, there is involvement of vulnerable groups of people involved in the experiment. However, in the questionnaire at the end of the proposal, it is specified as a 'NO'.

In the participants section, there is no indication of how a group is structured, since this application is directed at decision making for groups. For instance, there is no information on

group structure, group size, familiarity between groups (whether the group involved per experiment know each other prior to the experiment or are complete strangers.).

In the selection criteria, there is no screening for people who might be unwilling to watch a movie and whether or not it might affect their motivation to vote for a movie. Furthermore, it is not feasible to select people who have issues in decision making as a participant, because there is no clarity on how they could be selected based on this criteria. Group decisions would result in debates regardless of the individual participants as it is dependent on the group as a whole rather than the individual of the group.

For the exclusion criteria, removing participants who do not understand the usage of the application would create bias in the evaluation.

For experiment procedure, there is no control group for traditional decision making methods, there is also no measure of how a veto affects the subsequent voting. There are few other questions to consider such as : "How many vetoes are allowed per experiment?", "How many voting rounds are going to take place per experiment?"

The procedure also does not take into consideration the different aspects of colocated groups (people who want to watch movies together in one room), and remote groups. There could be a control group for that.

The risk benefit balance of the proposal shows contradictory statements regarding whether or not the experiment could lead to frustrations in participants. To elaborate, The question about "can some questions or situations make participants feel uncomfortable? " is answered no however in potential risks it is mentioned possible frustrations, therefore this answer needs to be elaborated more. Furthermore, the experiment may lead to awkward and uncomfortable situations amongst participants in a group who are strangers. Therefore there is also a psychological aspect that needs to be considered.

Suggestions

As a feedback, the proposal could use wizard of Oz testing wherein participants could play by a scenario. This could be done where the experimenters could act as participants and follow various scenarios involving, disagreements in an unfamiliar group, discussion in a familiar group, testing several decision making methods such as debates. The participants would be unaware of a decoy experimenter who is acting as a participant in the scenario.

There could be a pre-test conducted of the prototype that the experimenters intend to use in the experiment and an introspection could be performed so as to eliminate any constraints or hurdles that could affect the experiment.

The remarks could be considered to alleviate the overall proposal.