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?