HotSoft Software as Interactive Medi



Approach

Educational multimodal software needs better evaluation methods [7]. We have proposed a walkthrough approach to evaluating the *affective design*.

MADE Affective Walkthrough

(Multimodal Affect for Design and *Evaluation*) [1] is based on:

- Wharton et al.'s cognitive walkthrough [2]
- Dormann and Biddle's affective walkthrough [3]

MADE Walkthrough

Walk through the system answering each of the questions considering the new modalities and the teaching objectives

- 1st **Exploring**: Does the system use positive emotions to encourage the user to explore the learning environment?
- 2nd Challenging: Does the system provide more difficult material to challenge the user?
- 3rd **Overcoming**: Does the system allow the user to persevere and overcome challenges?
- 4th Affirmation: Does the system gives positive affective feedback to affirm successful learning?

Underlying theory

The affective model of education from Kort et al. [4] includes four phases of emotion desirable in learning: 1st phase: Encouraging exploration with **positive affect**. 2nd phase: Introduces challenges, and negative affect is expected **3**rd **phase:** Support overcoming challenges and reduce the negative affect. 4th phase: Affirm learning and restore **positive affect**. Constructive Learning



MG MEDIA GROUP

Carleton

Canada's Capital University

UNIVERSITY

Conclusions

Evaluating Software for Affective Education: A Case Study of the Affective Walkthrough Reza GhasemAghaei, Ali Arya, Robert Biddle School of Computer Science, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada, http://hotsoft.carleton.ca/

Case Study: Museum Explorer

> Our case study is of software designed to apply **narrative visualizations** to help students visiting a museum [5]. Narrative should support continuity, storytelling and excitement [6].

 \succ To examine the effectiveness of the walkthrough, we recruited only participants with Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) evaluation experience, but not members of our own research group. > We applied a **qualitative approach**, audio recorded and took notes for our detail analysis to identify software issues.



P5: The act of exploring the exhibits is not challenging in itself. P3: The activities are a little bit passive, because all they doing is just clicking on things and they probably are not even reading them.

Negative Affect

P3 & P5: There are no challenges to overcome inherent in freely exploring a virtual museum. P4: It does not help you string together a story.

> Participants could apply the technique and make useful comments to significantly improve the software. > However, by using qualitative analysis of our observations and transcripts of participant think-aloud comments, we were able to identify several ways to improve our inspection technique. > We identified a need to de-emphasize ordinary usability, and state explicitly the teaching objectives, the educational strategies and modality advantages involved.

The Revised MADE Walkthrough

The walkthrough questions were too holistic, and did not identify the four affective steps of learning: exploring, challenging, overcoming, and affirmation. For each task only one of those steps might be appropriate. We have now revised the walkthrough to address this and other problems.

Walk through the s	
considering the ne	
1 st	What is the le
2 nd	Where in affe
	challenging, o
3 rd	Is the approp
∕ th	Doos the offer

system answering each of the questions ew modalities and the teaching objectives earning goal of this task?

ective cycle of learning is this task? (i.e. exploring, overcoming, and affirmation)

oriate affective support provided?

Does the affective support work as intended?

References and Acknowledgments

[1] GhasemAghaei, R., Arya, A., Biddle, R.: The MADE framework: Multimodal software for affective education. In: EdMedia: World Conference on Educational Media and Technology, pp. 1864-1874 (2015)

[2] Wharton, C., Rieman, J., Lewis, C., Polson, P.: The cognitive walkthrough method: A practitioner's guide. In: Usability inspection methods. pp. 105-140. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1994)

[3] Dormann, C., Biddle, R.: Understanding game design for affective learning. In: Proceedings of the 2008 Conference on Future Play: Research, Play, Share. pp. 41-48. ACM (2008)

[4] Kort, B., Reilly, R., Picard, R.W.: An affective model of interplay between emotions and learning: Reengineering educational pedagogy-building a learning companion. In: ICALT '01 Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies. pp. 43-47. (2001)

[5] Gerroir, J.: Constructing Visual Narratives of Museum Experiences. Master's thesis, Carleton University Ottawa (2015)

[6] Gershon, N., Page, W.: What storytelling can do for information visualization. Communications of the ACM 44(8), pp. 31-37 (2001) [7] Kühnel, C.: Evaluating multimodal systems. In: Quantifying Quality Aspects of Multimodal Interactive Systems, pp. 13-21. Springer (2012)

We thank the participants, lab colleagues for comments, and acknowledge funding from an NSERC Discovery Grant, and the Industry Canada GRAND NCE.