

# Criteria for ACM *Computers in Entertainment Video Journals*

## INTRODUCTION

What follows is a first version of quality criteria for ACM *Computers in Entertainment Video Journals* to be used as a basis for submission guidelines as well as for the reviewing process.

Three notes on the context of the criteria:

- Video Journals are envisioned as an archival-quality forum for academic publication within the brand of ACM *CiE*, with a careful peer-review process and selective acceptance.
- The reason for ACM *CiE* Video Journals to exist is to provide an academic forum for experiential aspects of interaction design and new media.
- Submissions to ACM *CiE* Video Journals are video-articles, consisting of a video and a text together forming a whole knowledge contribution.

It is understood that the criteria will evolve over time, as the body of submitted and accepted work starts to grow and the character of ACM *CiE* Video Journals starts to form. Nevertheless, a first version is necessary to get off the ground.

The criteria are in two parts. The first part contains the criteria that are specific to the video-article format, with a couple of criteria concerning the choice of video-article as publication form and then a number of more specific criteria on the video part of the submission. The second part pertains to the academic quality of the video-article as a whole, including video as well as text.

## MEDIA-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

**Type of contribution:** *Is the contribution of a kind that is better communicated through video and text than through text alone?*

This could include, but is certainly not limited to, contributions concerning the audiovisual, dynamic behavior of a new method, design or technology. Fine-grained explorations of interaction qualities such as motion, rhythm and timing belong here. It could include representations of complex real-world use contexts, social phenomena and other aspects of the world that are best expressed audiovisually. Other types of knowledge contributions that benefit from video communication are also welcome.

**Balance of media:** *Is the distribution of material between video part and text part appropriate to exploit the communicative strengths of each medium? Does the combination of video and text form a coherent contribution?*

What we are looking for here is the synergy of video and text, where the whole becomes something more than duplicate documentation.

**Video-specific qualities:** *Does the video part present its material in an "honest", criticizable and intelligible way as expected from an academic contribution?*

Efforts should have been made to avoid "sales rhetoric" such as gratuitous music and visual effects, unreflected close-ups and excessive voice-of-God narration. Production value must be such that the contribution can be perceived without distraction: image in focus, audible sound, etc.

*Does the video part use appropriate conventions to ease the viewer's task of appropriating the contribution?*

Examples could include a suitable narrative structure; a documentary format including first-person footage on empirical data; a news format combining interview footage with clips from demonstrations using the interview audio as voice-over.

*Does the form and expression of the video part support (or even better: enhance) the intended contribution?*

As the underlying idea of ACM CiE Video Articles is to support academic communication of experiential aspects of interaction design and new media, the video part should be produced in such a way that the experience of viewing it harmonizes with the experience it describes.

*Is the video part of suitable length to communicate its material?*

Most likely case: Is it too long, and how should it be shortened?

#### **GENERAL ACADEMIC CRITERIA FOR A COMPLETE CONTRIBUTION**

**Relevance:** Does the work address a worthwhile goal? Are the outcomes of interest to the academic community? Are the outcomes and their implications meaningful to the world outside academia?

**Novelty:** Does the contribution represent an addition to existing knowledge in the academic community?

**Additivity:** Does the contribution build upon and acknowledge previously reported work of relevance?

**Soundness/Criticizability:** Are the methods used to reach the reported contribution sound and rigorous? Is it possible to assess the grounds on which conclusions are formed?