

Peer review on the Interaction Device

In general the report has a good and logical disposition, and is written in a good and fluent Norwegian.

Introduction

Good introduction – short and clear, which makes it easy for the reader to understand what the main goal of the project is.

Background

I miss a background part for your project, why you think this product is needed, what are its advantages and so on. Something like you wrote in the wonder document could be nice to include in your report (just as a short section) to help the readers understand your motivation for developing the interaction device!

Problem description

It is easy to understand what you are trying to do in this project. Still I feel your ambitions are a bit too high for what it is possible to achieve in this short project duration. It is very good that you discuss different aspects of the product, e.g. security, but for the practical work it is best to limit the work you are planning to do and maybe to focus only on one aspect of the product not both. As Silverman say on his book “doing qualitative research” it is better to say a lot about little than little about a lot.

In the section "Norsk Teknisk Museum" you assume that the ground floor steals focus from the upper floor. Is this assumption based on something concrete, or is it just based on a thought situation to point out the problem description?

User

I can't see that the user profile is clearly described. The term children seem to be used for any child from children garden to high school. Children at various ages have very different ways of exploring a museum. Smaller children are more affected by lights and sounds, and if they don't find it funny they'll leave. I don't think TID can change this behaviour. I think looking at "Aftenpostens" approach to students at high school level could be a good strategy. I think this is the more right user group, but then the "play" functions are a bit superfluous. The idea of a rebus however looks good. But remember to make it clear what user group you are reaching.

Needs

Is this system really needed and will it increase the amount of visitors to the museum? You are saying that the children are not using all the aspects of the museum, but you have not got a clear answer to why it is this way. Are the less visited fractions interesting enough? Have the children got time enough to visit them? Are they choosing what they find as funniest? Is it really needed that the children visit the whole museum in one visit or does this open for them to come back at a later time? Some groups of visitors are there in relation with a project at school and may only be interested in one part of the museum. So you should consider whether the goal of keeping the children until they've seen the whole museum is realistic

It would also be interesting with an economic calculation on how much such a project would cost. Are the services from TID worth the extra costs?

The Interaction Device

Explaining the service is done in a fluent and cohesive way. Still it would be better to narrow the focus on one aspect of the application.

Theory

The report includes relevant theory, with an interesting discussion of how this theory is

related to your project. It could be helpful to include a literature chapter, which relates some of the theory we learned at the course to your project. E.g. you mentioned usability goals but I miss some explanation of what are your product's usability goals.

Method

Good selection of various methods, though I doubt you will have the time to use them all. Observation at the beginning of the project plus interviewing some children in relation to usability tests seems enough to me. Plus the articles you read to back up some of your assumptions. It is very helpful to choose an existing case of the Norwegian technical museum to enlighten your problem area. I also miss a method chapter where you explain in a few words each method you chose and justify why this method is best to answer your research question. For example what type of interviews you will conduct: open ended, semi structured or structured interviews, and argument for that choice (why do you think X interview type fits better and so on).

References

Professional use of a system for applying references

Discussion

Good discussion of all aspects of the product. Good to narrow down the scope and concentrate on one/two user groups.