

**CMSI 370-01**  
**INTERACTION DESIGN**  
Fall 2013

**Assignment 1105 Feedback**

Miguel A. Vazquez

*mva@que*

*1a* — Your paper shows a rudimentary but implicit understanding of how interaction design relates to mental models. When you discuss your respondents' answers to your questions, you bring up a number of issues about how they perceive multiple-monitor systems and what they expect from them. What's missing, though, is explicit use of vocabulary and terminology to show that you are really looking at these results from the "lens" of mental models, and not just applying common sense. (/)

*1b* — Short of your brief mention of the University of Utah study, the paper does not say much about usability metrics and how these might be able to address the question of multiple monitors. Ultimately that is the main issue with your choice of study: objective measurements are still always the king, but your writing does not indicate acknowledgment of this. It is true that you can't be expected to conduct such a study for this assignment, but on the other hand a full appreciation of the role that usability metrics play may have prompted you to change your approach, like perhaps expand your literature search or ask questions that are more substantive than just yes/no. (/)

*1c* — Your writing does not specifically call out any interaction design guidelines, principles, theories, or other concepts seen in class. There are implicit hints here and there, particularly from the responses of your survey subjects; due to their non-expert status, however, it is more likely that any correlation is more coincidental than an actual application of the knowledge. (/)

*2a* — You conducted a real-world *survey* consisting of two yes-or-no questions, and not necessarily a real-world study. As mentioned earlier, you actually weren't expected to conduct something firsthand; instead, more of a literature review could have filled this area in. Then, the survey would be a better fit, supplementing what you found from prior work. Although it is true that some interesting notions came out of the answers that you got, as a basis for drawing a conclusion there's definitely room for improvement. (/)

*2b* — And speaking of that conclusion, based on the writing, it comes off as being based more on the yes/no answers of your 20-something subjects rather than on concepts seen in class or published literature. The survey-based approach is not the type of investigation expected by this assignment. (/)

*4d* — You found a couple of good references, but those only scratch the surface of the subject matter. You really need more meat in this area so that the survey that you conducted slides into a better role than it does now. (/)

*4e* — Only three commits, and all within a 48-hour span. Plus it's hard to draw a conclusion about your commit messages given that there are so few of them. Definitely lots of room for improvement here. (/)

*4f* — Paper submitted on time, but responses to questions from Dr. Hellige's talk were not submitted. (/)