

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

## **Assignment 1021 Feedback**

Jeffrey Fennell

*jtfennell / jefftfennell@gmail.com*

The strongest aspect of this paper is its survey of principles behind Google Glass and Android Wear, as given by Google. Effectively, it is primarily a study of the *developers'* mental model of these systems. That, alongside some good selections from the literature, make for a nicely detailed study of these systems' intended use.

What's missing, which would have made the paper ideal, is an exploration of whether *users* approach these devices in the same way that the developers intended. After all, successful interaction design is the effective communication of the developers' mental model to the users, through the system. After reading the paper, there is still uncertainty (at least in my mind) about whether the assorted developer suggestions will indeed have the desired effect on the devices' users.

A distracting negative of this paper is the striking number of typos and small errors seen from beginning to end. The paper could have benefited from additional re-readings in order to clean those out.

Finally, the requested responses to Dr. Hellige's cognitive psychology talk were not seen. This detracts from outcome *1a*, because mental models are precisely where interaction design and cognitive psychology intersect, and of course *4f*.

*1a* — | ...Good mental model coverage, despite being more from the developers' point of view, but still good enough to merit a +. Missing cognitive psychology responses take this down.

*1b* — + ...Assorted guidelines and principles are mentioned and used well.

*2a* — / ...The study of the subject matter is solid from the developer perspective, meriting a | because the paper needs a little more coverage of how *users* might respond to these devices. But because this outcome also covers the *documentation* of the study, the significant typo count impacts here and takes things down.

*2b* — | ...Many guidelines and principles were mentioned in the paper, and as indicated in *1b*, the paper shows good understanding of these concepts. Further, the concepts were applied well to the specific design elements of the devices, but as in *2a*, these strongly came from the developer perspective. The user perspective is needed to take this over the top.

*4d* — | ...Good selection of sources, more or less. The "less" comes from the use of a couple of references with less than stellar credibility—i.e., the ones without a known author. The way these sources were used, I think you could have found better-attributed ones.

*4e* — + ...Good frequency and messages.

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