

## **RESEARCH SUMMARY**

The following critique is for the paper: “As We May Ink? Learning from Everyday Analog Pen Use to Improve Digital Ink Experiences” written by Yann Richie, Nathalie Riche, Sarah Fuelling and Sarah Williams for their approach to focus on lack of compatibility between analog and digital pens used by people in different walks of life. It shows what motivates diversity of people to use analog and digital pens in their respective lives.

The paper is about the study that the authors conducted on a particular set of people from diverse backgrounds and different areas of profession and age group. It states the difference between usage of analog and digital pen experiences.

## **GOOD EVALUATION**

What I appreciated about their approach and their study was that they have conducted study on different groups of people and have deduced the results based on the experiences of different affordances that they extracted from the diary entries of the group that they surveyed.

The affordances used in the research study range from expressing the current thoughts and memories to creating doodles and games through usage of digital or analog pen. The study also shows how much people use digital or analog pens in their daily lives and how much is it making the difference in their lives. The categories that affordances are divided into shows the depth and motivation of affordances itself.

Also, a good thing that they have described the limitations of their paper.

## **CRITICAL EVALUATION**

Although their approach of evaluation of their study was efficient, yet it was biased towards the analog pen users. Secondly their data set could have been much wider than they actually used.

The digital pen device that they gave to the users for their second set of study was not frequently used by the digital pen users while in their first study which involved using analog pens they involved the people that heavily used analog pens in their daily lives. Also, the set of people i.e., students, homemakers and graphic artists that they took for their second study are those people who would rather prefer analog pens than the digital ones. These were the group of people that used digital pens just once a week.

For their first study on analog pens, they also characterized the types of activities people use analog pens for.

In their paper, as much as we think the analog world is better and how much digital pens are not user friendly this is totally not the real-world scenario.

As much as we know the analog world is thriving, we cannot deny the fact that digital world is taking over in a slow pace. Their research paper has been conducted on people of specific set of profession or of the age group who still carry out their work in analog world.

Analog is more cumbersome and costly than its digital equivalent, although it provides richness of experience.

The paper suggests that the tip of digital pens that can serve dual purpose of writing as well as pointing might confuse the user at times. Although that is not the case, the digital pens in this case makes a user's life much easier when it comes to solving purpose in the busy life of a person.

The motive of the research field has definitely been shifted from the different usage of digital and analog pens to how much more digital pens need to improve in order to give users a real feel of analog pens.

## **QUESTIONS**

Following questions can be raised based on the paper about digital vs analog pens:

- Was their study on different areas where analog and digital pens are used justified?
- Is there a possibility, had they taken same set of people in both their study their results would have been much more unbiased?
- Had they involved larger data sets for their study, the results would have been different from what they were now?
- The teased-out affordances in their study was based on analog pen users first and then digital pen users. What would be the results if they had taken affordance from digital pen user's snippets?

## **CONCLUSION**

In conclusion to the paper, it seems the authors want to show how despite long usage of digital pens, there is shortage of literature which shows what type of marks would people prefer in their daily lives and what would motivate them to use analog or digital pens. This depiction of author is justified to some extent such that their study has shown what all spheres of life would users prefer using digital over analog or vice versa. But in their research the authors have used a small dataset which is also much more inclined towards the analog users. The study has been much more biased towards the analog pen users than digital pen users.