**Mat Laibowitz**

**Assignment 6**

**1.** I think that it depends on how you define fun. The readings tend towards fun being a real-time entity that generates happiness. So the question is does something that is painful but for greater future enjoyment count as fun? For the sake of argument let's say that it doesn't, and that fun is just something that generates immediate happiness. In that case, I would say the relationship to deep engagement is loose at best. While happiness and fun can engage someone, it is no guarantee, and can potentially be subconsciously discarded as "just fun" and the details of the fun easily forgotten. Of course, you can easily (and some of the readings do) define fun as the psychological state of being engaged. In that case, the answer is in the question and is mostly invalid.

**2.** The general argument in the funology readings is that when we design solely for cognition, although we may increase usability, we operate at too shallow a level for people to be engaged and have an enriched experience. The proposal is therefore to design for emotional response. A counter argument is presented that states that emotion is quite ephemeral and contains too much contextual information to be appropriately designed into the experience. Basically, it is difficult to separate the cognition from emotion. I think this pertains to designing deeply engaging experiences by highlighting the inability to separate the experience into large general categories such as the components that aid in cognition and the components that provide an emotional stimulus. It might illustrate that to design an experience one must look at the experience from a much finer perspective and see the specific details (possibly within the zones of cognition and emotion) and really look into how these details interact with each other and not within a vacuum.

**3.** The basic argument about usability from the readings is that usability is not enough to enrich the experience and make the interface compelling enough to be dedicated to learning it and using. It needs to be attractive, exciting, interesting, and fun in order to be compelling. But the argument that I find more intriguing is from the designer's perspective. The idea is that usability can be summarized as a series of rules, and that anything that is simply a bunch of known rules is not that fun or interesting to do. If we set out to design something by the rules, we will be bored, and we will design a boring experience for the end user. The engagement really happens from the ground up. If the creator feels that they are creating a compelling experience and the process they use is compelling, the end result will have these same attributes and be fun and desirable to experience.