CMSI 370-01
INTERACTION DESIGN
Fall 2014

Assignment 1021 Feedback

Jackson Souza   *jacksonsouza / jacksonsouza@me.com*

Your paper is a bit of a mixed bag—first of all, it dares to tackle and interesting but ultimately perhaps overly challenging area, which is the application of ubiquitous computing devices to pedagogy, "ubiquitous learning." Definitely a lot of potential here, and you make a game attempt to look at the work found through the lens of Don Norman's Seven Stages of Action.

But I think that struggles emerged at a couple of levels: first, the mental model transfer examined here is at the teaching and learning level, which, though a completely valid application of the theory, still ends up not being served well by the work found. There is an emphasis on overviews, concepts, and top-level architectures that really does not lend itself to mental model transfer at the *user interface* level. i.e., The theory has been applied to *utility* (What can the systems do? What do they accomplish?) rather than *usability* (How easy are the systems to learn? How quickly can users accomplish tasks? How error-prone are users in these systems?). Second, the Seven Stages of Action is the *only* concept from the course that is brought to bear here. How about the five metrics? The many principles we have seen? Interaction styles? Those have gotten lost because of the perspective taken in the paper.

You do demonstrate a solid understanding of mental models and how they may transfer, first by your own observation that this process is applicable to teaching & learning, and second through your responses to the cognitive psychology questionnaire. Unfortunately thing stops short there, as the approach taken toward the chosen topic precludes the integration of other notions from the course into the study.

1a — **+**

1b — **/** …In the end, unfortunately, there is only one interaction design concept in this paper, and it turns out to not be applied to interaction design.

2a — **|** …A study was definitely conducted and it is reasonably well-documented, with a decent review and analysis of the selected prior work. Some execution/polish elements could have been done better—e.g., the figure numbering/captioning (only the GlobalEDU figures had captions, and they kept the numbering from the original paper), uncaught bad encodings of the apostrophe, the occasional typo. And of course the overall issue, with the paper veering away from usability and interaction design and more into a utility survey of the selected u-learning approaches, also casts a shadow here.

2b — **|** …Effort is definitely made in applying the Seven Stages of Action to the pedagogic flow of the covered systems, and that is acknowledged here. However, due to the way the paper developed, no further concepts were brought into the discussion and thus no further application of such concepts could be done.

4d — **|** …You certainly chose an interesting variant to the ubiquitous computing option and found some good sources for it. But in the end, the information from the *course* got short shrift.

4e — **/** …Gah, one commit, no go. A paper of this scale must have gone through additional distinct phases of progress—and each of those should have rightly constituted a commit.

4f — **+**