

## Claims Analysis

<b>Proposed Activity Design Feature</b>	<b>Hypothesized Pros (+) or Cons (–) of the Feature</b>
Putting exhibits online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ remove many constraints regarding space and diversity in layout</li> <li>+ facilitates an iterative process of design, construction, and editing</li> <li>+ simplifies access to the exhibits by people separated in space and time</li> <li>– but may lead to a decreased emphasis or interest in physical components</li> <li>– but exhibitors may try to include too much, making exhibits complex</li> </ul>
An exhibit template with traditional science project components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ simplifies and guides the exhibit planning process</li> <li>+ builds on prior exhibiting experience of fair participants</li> <li>+ enhances consistency and comparability of exhibits for viewers and judges</li> <li>– but may discourage more inventive and creative exhibit structures</li> </ul>
Integrating the products of common tools into the online exhibits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ builds on exhibitors' existing skills and preferences</li> <li>+ extends the apparent diversity of the fair and its services</li> <li>– but visitors may be confused about what is and is not "part" of the fair</li> <li>– but students may wish that flashy new tools had been provided</li> </ul>
Email notices of the virtual science fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ can be directed specifically to individuals expected to be interested</li> <li>+ may include a direct link to the online activity, simplifying access</li> <li>– but people without email accounts may feel excluded or slighted</li> </ul>
Exhibiting projects that are not yet completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ emphasizes the extended and ongoing nature of science projects</li> <li>+ encourages future visits for purposes of checking progress</li> <li>– but students may be embarrassed about showing a project that is not yet done</li> </ul>
Archiving discussions at an exhibit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ enables less redundancy in question answering by exhibitors</li> <li>+ offers visitors more options, for a richer browsing experience</li> <li>+ emphasizes the ongoing and community-oriented nature of the fair</li> <li>– but visitors may feel obliged to read all archives before asking anything</li> </ul>

Editable judging forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ acknowledges that judging is never completely objective or predictable</li> <li>+ increases judges' feeling of control and contribution to the rating process</li> <li>– but may lead to evaluations that are difficult to interpret or compare</li> </ul>
Authentication of the judging forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ reminds judges that their evaluations are valuable and confidential</li> <li>– but may be annoying if the number of forms is large</li> </ul>
Preserving exhibits after the fair is over	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ simplifies access and review of example projects</li> <li>+ emphasizes a view of the fair as an ongoing event, extended in time</li> <li>– but isolated exhibits (e.g., without students or other visitors) provide only a partial and perhaps misleading picture of the overall fair activity</li> </ul>

From: Rosson and Carroll. Usability Engineering. Academic press 2002.