

Feedback

This is an impressive report, rather than providing the minimum as outlined in the Task Description you have rather appropriately produced an actual Masters Thesis. You have improved your writing massively over the course of this MDes, very impressive development.

There are a few strange formulations in your text that mean the opposite of what you are undoubtedly trying to say. On page 3, there is for instance "While it is permanent, it is not unchanging although it is a life-long disability..." the word "although" is not meant to be there I think. And " We are looking to design a game that combats both motor skill development..." I am sure you didn't mean "combat" but quite the opposite, like "support". While it is good practice in academic writing to appear objective, in this case the use of the "we" seems a bit of a stretch as most of the work is "you" personally. For the purpose of the final report / thesis writing in the first person would have been acceptable.

Your section on children's learning is well written, very good overview of this complex matter. You also link some of this very well to your own project, most importantly.

The Classification section is placed well, better than in your first report.

The Game section is good, this was missing in your earlier work, and presents a strong foundation for your further work.

I think you are missing a section actually, about the background of your project. Now there are a few paragraphs at the beginning of the Empathy section, where they don't belong, strictly speaking. The Empathy section is still good, as I remember from the first report, but it does seem to have a lot of project context in it. Perhaps this could have been pulled apart and better presented. (It comes back like that too, maybe it shows that empathy is a core notion in your work, which I appreciate.)

The Project Research chapter indeed could have been the place for that.

Now it goes straight into the framework you like to use, and some introduction section could have been good here.

Your discussion of the concept of the TUI isn't quite on the mark, but then it is often very vaguely presented in that audio and visual modalities are seen as more 'virtual' (you call them digital) and haptic more physical. But what you say about the role of the Arduino is not quite right, though it is an example of potentially 'embedded' computation.

Your report goes from all this background straight to the design of the game of the implementation, a step seems to be missing here. It is good practice to have a section here that presents the analysis and translation to design requirements. Though it is all there, implicitly, it would have been even better to pull this apart and make it explicit, so that others can use these findings as well.

Overall a level of integration across the thesis could have been good, linking theory to practice, for instance the link between the work of Piaget and Bruner and the notion of the TUI is an obvious connection. You do bring the theories of children's learning back in the game design section, this is good,

but to state that this is a valid replacement for doing user studies is not convincing. Your section on Benjamin and McLuhan is nice, I appreciate it a lot that you went out on this tangent to look into these thinkers, however it is so short that it is slightly disappointing (possibly to other readers). The problem with Benjamin's essay is, of course, that it needs to be placed in a much more extensive historical context for it to make sense - his text was mainly concerned with the transition from the medium of theatre to the medium of cinema. This could potentially be linked to your argument, as is McLuhan's notion of 'hot and cold media', which is a diffuse and multi-faceted concept and indeed very relevant (Bill Verplank explains it well and uses it in the context of interaction design). The current presentation of this section is a bit out of place, also in the Appendix (but I do appreciate it very much that you started to look into this body of knowledge) (I don't think Benjamin was a 'sir' though).

The Conclusion section is ok but disappointingly short.

Very good reflection, using the competency framework, you cover this very well.

Report assessment criteria:

- o evidence of user testing and research activities 80
- o insightfulness of reflection and discussion design and learning 82
- o response to the analysis of problem context 78
- o design concept and insightfulness of multimodal interaction 75
- o clarity of written expression 80

85