

**CMSI 370-01**  
**INTERACTION DESIGN**  
Fall 2014

## **Assignment 1021 Feedback**

Joseph Barbosa

*jbarbosa1 / jbarbos1@lion.lmu.edu*

Some nice touches and reference in your paper, but in the end I was left with the feeling that you were just scratching the surface of the subject matter. The Rust et al. paper was a great start for known studies on touch screen interaction, but the paper implied there were more without mentioning them. The Victor and Hooper references make some great points which your paper summarizes nicely and connects to our course terms, but again just when things were building up they seemed to lose steam.

And...no sign of that cognitive psychology questionnaire. Alas that affects *1a* and *4f*.

*1a* — / ...This would be a | if the cognitive psychology question were there. It isn't a + because there is this underlying ambiguity about the use of the term "mental model"—remember, this refers to how people perceive a device. The device itself does not *have* a "mental model." The funky usage implies some lack of understanding of the idea. Go back to Norman and reach Chapter 1 for a refresher.

*1b* — | ...Good job translating Victor and Hooper's concerns to concepts we have used in class. The Rust et al. study was also a good find and mapped nicely to your topic. Overall, this needs a few additional, similar items so that your breadth and depth of support for the course concepts reaches a + level.

*2a* — / ...This is where the "scratching the surface" notion comes in. Plus, a lot of mechanics come to roost here also: the prevalence of typos (I fixed quite a few—I don't count strictly, but I go by when the number of them starts feeling like a distraction), occasional hiccups in the writing, missing citations. Oh, and the mere *inclusion* of the bibliography as well: fixed by two lines, which I committed at the bottom.

*2b* — | ...The coverage of the Rust et al. study, plus Victor and Hooper's ideas, was a great start, but more of *your* thoughts was missing. The discussion section seemed like just a repetition of what came in the background, even though it claimed to be the addition of your thoughts.

*4d* — / ...In the end, I think you could have done more literature search. Fill in those "advancements" and "studies" that you indicate in your text. And do cite them better—if BibTeX wants a piece of information, then it probably has good reason to seek that.

*4e* — Looks like you ran into some *git* usage trouble. A touch surprising because the prior paper seemed to get committed and pushed OK. Practice makes perfect. Also, you saved the files under a different folder name than specified in the assignment. Simple thing, I know, but then if it's that simple, why diverge from the instructions, right? (|)

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