Assignment 1021 Feedback

William Husted *whusted / whusted@lion.lmu.edu*

Some good literature search here with decent writing and analysis, though occasionally digressing away from the initial privacy/security emphasis promised by the abstract. Some things are also out of context, like the technology bits from Reiser's paper—I mean, much has changed since 1993, right? Finally, the writing is pleasant and mature but shows some inexperience with formal scholarly work: lots of direct quotes, some unnecessary verbosity when talking about other people's work, and some missing information in the bibliography. The good news is that these are primarily mechanical and can be fixed simply by additional exposure to formal computer science academic writing. Pay attention to these aspects when you look at the computer science literature in the future.

Your cognitive psychology questionnaire is generally on the money with the lone weak spot being your use of emotional responses as a connection between cognitive psychology and interaction design. Sure, there is *some* consideration of emotion, but that is not the star; instead, the focus remains on input, processing, and output by the human brain in response to stimuli.

1a — **+** …If your questionnaire were way off base, it would have hit you here, but fortunately you weren't way off base **:)**

1b — **|** …You make reference to a few concepts from class, such as my favorite, Fitts's Law, and some of the metrics, but I think additional breadth and depth in this area are needed for the full monty on this outcome. Yes, I know this would have made the paper longer, but actually that would be counterbalanced by some things that I mention in the next outcome.

2a — **|** …This is where the aforementioned "newbie"-related issues with regard to formal scholarly writing show up. In academic writing, you want to paraphrase more and quote less; there is also a shorthand when referring to other authors (e.g., no need for full names; no need to mention titles unless they are particularly relevant to the prose) that allows you to get to the point faster; and finally, you definitely want some thorough information in that bibliography, so that readers can easily reference those sources also. They don't hit you as hard because these are all fixable with increased exposure to the literature, fortunately. I know you are very capable of it; just merely haven't had enough exposure.

2b — **+**

4d — **|** …The thing that sticks out is how you just took Reiser somewhat literally even though his paper's perspective on technology is of 1993 vintage. You should have at least acknowledged the time warp, then adapted his concerns to what they imply for *today's* mobile and large-screen tech.

4e — **+**

4f — **+**