



SHARPENS YOUR THINKING

Mediating between AI and highly specialized users

PETRELLI, Daniela, DADZIE, Aba-Sah and LANFRANCHI, Vitaveska

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/2931/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

PETRELLI, Daniela, DADZIE, Aba-Sah and LANFRANCHI, Vitaveska (2009).
Mediating between AI and highly specialized users. *AI Magazine*, 31 (3).

Repository use policy

Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in SHURA to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

Mediating between AI and Highly Specialized Users

Daniela Petrelli¹, Aba-Sah Dadzie², Vitaveska Lanfranchi²

¹Information Studies, ²Computer Science
Regent Court, 211 Portobello Street
Sheffield, S1 4DP, UK
{d.petrelli, a.dadzie, v.lanfranchi}@shef.ac.uk

Abstract

We report part of the design experience gained in X-Media, a system for knowledge management and sharing. Consolidated techniques of interaction design (scenario-based design) had to be revisited to capture the richness and complexity of intelligent interactive systems. We show that the design of intelligent systems requires methodologies (faceted scenarios) that support the investigation of intelligent features and usability factors simultaneously. Interaction designers become mediators between intelligent technology and users, and have to facilitate reciprocal understanding.

Background and Main Questions

Although AI is generally focused on algorithm and system innovation, cases of successfully combining AI and HCI do exist, e.g., Amazon's recommender. However, which design process should be followed to achieve such success is not clear: Is a user-centered system design process enough or should a new practice be developed to address the specificity of systems able to take autonomous decisions?¹

In the context of the X-Media² project, a large multi-site EU project aiming at studying technology for knowledge management, sharing and reuse, we started applying user centred design but discovered standard practice needed to be modified to support effective communication between users and AI experts. From the very beginning it was clear that a participatory approach with both users and technologists discussing and contributing to the system design was not an easy goal: ambiguity in terminology and gaps in understanding could not be easily overcome.

Copyright © 2009, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

¹ This is a major topic of the Usability Engineering theme article in this issue.

² <http://www.x-media-project.org/>

A new role had to be devised, that of a mediator that moves between the two parties, facilitates the communication and helps each group see the potential in what the other has to offer. A number of tools to facilitate the mediation and preserve the original intended meaning (so as to avoid "translation mistakes" while moving from one group to the other) were devised.

Mediating between the parties meant an increase in the number of design iterations as, for example, discussing with users a potential solution generated new ideas for additional intelligent features that had to be discussed with the AI experts and then validated with users.

The rest of this paper presents and discusses this experience in more detail. Reflecting on it, the time and effort needed to design an Intelligent Interactive System (IIS) adopting a user-centred design approach was higher than what a traditional interactive system would require. It was difficult to determine when the design should be stopped and the implementation started as new ideas and more advanced AI features continued to emerge at every meeting with users and AI experts.

Users and Developers Focus Group Failure

The goal of X-Media is to study, design, implement and evaluate technology for the sharing and reuse of knowledge originated from disparate sources: text (generally technical reports), images (pictures taken in the workshops), and sensor data (from continuous monitoring of phenomena). The context of use is the manufacturing industry, in particular mechanical engineering (FIAT, the Italian car company) and aerospace engineering (Rolls-Royce plc., UK manufacturer of gas turbines).

After a small number of use cases were selected by the users' representatives in the X-Media consortium, a number of workshops were set up in Rolls-Royce and FIAT to promote mutual understanding between the different expertise of the 16 X-Media partners. We aimed at collecting users' requirements with the help of the final

users and jointly define which features the system should provide. We very quickly found out that to have AI specialists and aerospace or mechanical engineers in the same room is not enough to guarantee communication and mutual understanding.

The first problem was the terminology used by both parties. Users and AI experts used the same term to mean completely different concepts. The 'level of confidence' is one such examples: while users meant the confidence an aerospace engineer has in formulating an hypothesis on the potential cause of an observed phenomenon, AI used it to mean the confidence the system has in reasoning or a decision taken. This mismatch was not identified at first as both parties did not need an explanation for a term they considered well known.

A second, more radical problem, lay in the difficulties in understanding each others' point of view that prevented effective collaboration. AI experts in knowledge extraction and representation were not able to see how their technology could help users with their problem-solving tasks; users were unable to envisage an intelligent system that extracts knowledge from different sources, collates this and proposes solutions. Their positions were just too far apart and could not be easily reconciled.

A mediator was needed, a designer of interactive intelligent systems (IISD) able to envisage how and where intelligent technology could improve users' jobs and present it in terms simple enough for the users to understand³. Simultaneously the creativity of AI technologists had to be stimulated and channeled toward useful applications. It is essential that intelligent techniques provide a true advantage to the user if they are to be perceived as worth having (Horvitz 1999). It is the role of the IISD to combine traditional and intelligent features to support the user's tasks with whichever interaction is most appropriate in the perspective of a usable system.

Usability for AI

In X-Media we wanted to assure control and transparency (Höök 2000), that is: i) the user should be allowed to check and correct any mistake the system might have made (*control*), and ii) the system should show its internal mechanisms to the degree needed to understand why the system is behaving as it is (*transparency*). X-Media then cannot be a closed system that presents the user with already packaged knowledge, but should:

- visualise in an easy-to-understand way why a certain assertion is considered true and more likely than another;

³ As is discussed in the Usability Engineering theme article, it is important for the designers of a system to understand user needs and the context in which they work. The mediator, as described here, is an excellent way to promote this understanding .

- allow the user to track where a piece of evidence comes from (i.e., link to all the documents the pieces of information were extracted from);
- allow the user to override whatever decisions the system has taken;
- allow the user to contribute their personal knowledge.⁴

These guidelines do not impact on the user interface alone. Imposing the traceability of the source of a piece of knowledge required the knowledge base (KB) to keep the connection with the original document and any modification that occurred thereafter; the user inspection requires the KB to store data in a human-understandable format. Stating these essential guidelines oriented the design of the whole system toward a solution that was in essence different from the view, common among AI researchers, that the modeling of the user will build machines that are cognitively compatible with humans (Winograd 2006) with no real need for designing for usability. Instead in X-Media we focused on the interaction between the human and the system and explicitly designed AI features for usability.

Faceted Scenario and Vision Demonstrator

A scenario-based design was adopted. A scenario is a story describing a person with specific characteristics and motivations who performs a specific task by interacting with a specific system (Carroll 1997). Because it is essentially a narrative, scenarios are easily understood and can effectively support discussions among the members of a design team (Carroll 1997). We have revisited the basic idea of scenarios, a narrative of a specific user interacting with a system, to include all the facets of a complex discussion among partners (Figure 1). The multiple aspects embedded in a *faceted scenario* allow different project members to look at the same story from different angles, i.e., in a different column. Users concentrate on the story and can check if the workflow described and tasks are realistic or not: being a narration, it allows users to contribute their own view. Interaction designers instead mainly focus on the rationale to make explicit their design choices. The technology column is where the contribution of AI is discussed and spelled out (Figure 1). The initial scenario was written after a workshop in which a group of

⁴ These issues are discussed in the usability side effects theme article with somewhat different terminology: in terms of the problems of Inadequate Comprehensibility and Inadequate Performance (including errors). Because various different terms have been used in the literature for many years in discussions of these issues, it may be impossible ever to achieve complete uniformity of terminology. For example, the authors here are using the terminology from an influential previously published article.

Rolls-Royce engineers described their activities. This first scenario, only textual, reflected the designers' understanding of the user's task as contextualized with

respect to the interaction with X-Media. In order to be an effective instrument of discussion, sketches were added to make the designers' vision more concrete.

Timeline	Narration	Rationale	Technology	Questions	Interface
Month 0 Set up Teams	<p>During a shop visit for a gas turbine in service an issue is identified. An Issue Resolution procedure is raised and an Owner nominated.</p> <p>An Investigation Team is set up to investigate the issue and its potential impact; set up temporary solutions; identify the root cause; propose a solution and how to validate it. 15 members are recruited to the team based on expertise and availability. One member is responsible for recording the progress into the (official) problem reporting system. The investigation team collaborate/ interact with other teams to different degrees and at different times.</p>	<p>The team performs search, analysis and synthesis, produce documents for PT/CIT. Members reuse others' expertise in problem-solving. X-Media should support knowledge sharing across CoPs.</p>	<p>Representatives of each group interested in the results are notified about progress via semantic email. Each will receive information dependent on their role and the status of the issue resolution process.</p>	<p>Automatic evidence collection after samples are input?</p> <p>Need for process support? e.g., alerting the investigation team when they are due to produce status reports. Should we tag documents with the provenance ...</p>	<p>Snapshot of Issue resolution case set-up</p>

Figure 1. The initial passage of a faceted scenario.

Low-fidelity prototyping uses paper mock-ups or other forms of simulation that convey the sense of the final interaction (Catani 1998, Sefelin et al. 2003, Virzi et al. 1996). We used paper mock-ups to illustrate scenarios and create a sort of storyboard. We refined this idea and paired the scenarios with a *vision demonstrator*, an interactive simulator of a working system⁵. It provided a simple but effective tool for communicating the vision of an improved process to end users and the project team alike. Figure 2 shows an example of part of the vision demonstrator that allowed the exploration of the concept of the *knowledge cloud*, a visual representation of the aggregated data that composes an assertion (background, Figure 2). What this vision demonstrator simulates is the automatic extraction of information from different data sources (images, data tables, text) and their aggregation to a single concept.

search the knowledge base by clicking on concepts; this retrieves assertions (large panel on the right) displayed as an aggregation of heterogeneous clips such as snippets of text, images, tables, and graphs. The different sizes of the clips represent the relevance the system has given to that bit of evidence. By clicking on a snippet the single




Figure 2: An aggregation of assertions as seen by the user (*knowledge cloud* - background); the detailed information of an assertion (foreground left) and the confidence control.

A vision demonstrator shows how the system would work from the user's point of view. At the same time, it illustrates what the intelligent components are expected to produce and how the result will be presented to the user. In Figure 2, the ontology (on the left) is used to

assertion is retrieved and visualised with its associated metadata, e.g., provenance (foreground, Figure 2). The user can then inspect the piece of knowledge, can add annotations or see those left by others and can access the document that originally contained this image (example in

⁵ The vision demonstrator is a great example of a tool for conducting need validation and exploratory design, as discussed in the Usability Engineering theme article.

top left). By inspecting the original document the user can better understand why the system has extracted this knowledge and can approve or reject the suggestion by clicking on the + or – at the borders of the confidence level bar. Approving or rejecting impacts on the contribution the assertion has to the probability of the hypothesis being analysed.

The vision demonstrator provides AI experts with a “golden standard” to aim at or at least a concrete view of the user’s expectations. Independent AI modules are all combined and used in the user interface: the outcome of the information extraction process, the result of the knowledge fusion, the tracking of the provenance and the feedback to the reasoning module.

From the final user’s point of view the vision demonstrator shows what AI technology could do for them and allows

them to imagine how this innovative technology could fit in with their working practices.

Following Hounde and Hill (1997), “prototypes provide the means for examining design problems and evaluating solutions”. The vision demonstrator essentially prototypes the role and the look-and-feel of the final system, but the implementation is not considered. This proved to be a good tool for discussion among people with heterogeneous expertise, but the design team needed to constantly refer to it to ensure its functionalities would actually be implemented. Indeed there is the risk the solution selected in this phase would be forgotten once the implementation starts and the focus shifts from effective design to technical issues. The envisaged features might not be implementable as expected thus requiring a revision of the vision demonstrator that, in this way, acts as a common reference model.




Figure 3. An example of the evolution of the vision demonstrator after the validation of the scenario with users.

Mediating between User and AI Technologist

The vision demonstrator was used for the validation of the design rationale in a participatory design session: users met interaction designers to discuss features and interaction of X-Media focusing on cases like the one described in the scenario. By discussing with users on the basis of concrete examples (scenarios) it was possible to generate new interaction ideas and explore new AI features, as can be seen by comparing the 2 mock-ups in Figure 3.

New versions of the scenario and vision demonstrator were created to be discussed, this time, with the technical partners as the new layout could accommodate more intelligent functionalities. The outcome of this step was the introduction of *Technical Insertion Points* (TIPs). In fact, AI technology often works in the background and might never surface at the user interaction level. TIPs support considering those technical aspects in the context of the whole user-system interaction as they provide anchor-points for a deeper and more detailed description of the technical aspects behind the interface. In other words, as signposts, the TIPs highlighted the contribution of intelligent modules to the interaction (Figure 4). This final schema was both a representation of the user interaction

and a plan for technology development. As such it allowed the different parties to autonomously work on their parts with a certain assurance of how those modules would be incorporated into the whole system. The next step for the IIDSD was to validate the current design with users.




Figure 4. An example of a map of the contribution of intelligent modules (the hexagons) to the overall interaction (top line) and the planned prototypes.

Design Validation

Low-fidelity prototyping allows designers to explore alternative ideas at low cost. In X-Media the vision demonstrator was used to explore alternative solutions for how the knowledge should be presented to the user. To collect feedback on which visualizations were worth pursuing and which ones could be abandoned a collaborative evaluation session with engineers and designers was set up. The whole scenario was inspected and discussed.

Three possible views were considered at this point: a table based organisation, a decision tree (Figure 5.), and a knowledge graph (Figure 6).




Figure 5: Alternative knowledge views, using (left) a tree, and (right) a table.

In previous meetings with users we were shown tables and trees as working tools, we therefore expected them to prefer simpler displays such as those in Figure 5. However some advanced data visualizations were shown (by the designers): a semantic network to explore the relationships between assertions retrieved from the KB (Figure 6); a semantic filter to focus on sub-sets of data; and a parallel coordinates visualisation that provides a temporal or geographical map through data.

To our surprise the more complex visualisations were the most preferred as it was possible for the user to explore and absorb more information at a single glance. Engineers are accustomed to different plots and graphs and therefore did not have problems grasping the meaning of the visualisation and the potential manipulation. The graphical solution was therefore selected for implementation (Figure 6).

Multiple graphical visualizations were, in the end, implemented. Indeed during the discussion with users it emerged that the complex problem solving activity engineers are involved with requires different tools at different times for different purposes. The table provides an easy-to-understand summary of the current status of the analysis; the tree provides a general guidance on the investigation process (which branches have been considered and which still need attention); the graph shows connections among data not otherwise visible.

The final design includes several tools refined from this initial exploration.

An Investigation Tracking Table is provided to organise the evidence collected to better contrast and compare facts. It also provides a summary of the investigation useful for newcomers to understand the current status. While the user can benefit from using it as a way of rationalising their thoughts, the X-Media system could use the information inserted by the user in the table to reinforce its inference mechanisms as the assertions in the table can be considered true (i.e. with confidence 100%).

A Root-Cause Analysis Tree is used to represent the whole investigation space, as a visual way to collate evidence and




Figure 6: The semantic network shows relationships between assertions in the KB. Node colors map to a concept in the ontology, size maps to the probability the assertion is correct. The graph is built using *prefuse* (Heer et al. 2005) and *query sliders* (Ahlberg & Shneiderman 1992) to support dynamic searching to focus on sub-sets of data.

counterevidence and direct the (human) reasoning towards the more likely cause(s).

A number of alternative visualizations, of which the Knowledge Graph is one, support knowledge exploration and manipulation.

Design for AI Usability

Interaction designers of IIS have to work to ensure the usability of the final system as user interface issues could affect the inner levels. In the first phases of the system conception they should provide guidelines to the team at large to assure the foundation for the system usability are in place. In the case of X-Media, for example, to assure transparency and control the architecture had to be

purposefully designed to allow users to inspect the knowledge base and change values of assertions, or to create knowledge from scratch on the basis of spontaneous intuitions they may have had.

In designing usable IIS the main challenge is the negotiation between the different positions. We noticed that researchers specialised in intelligent algorithms were not accustomed to talking to users and initially failed in seeing where their technology could be useful. On the other hand, users could not always understand and appreciate the advantages of intelligent technology. To make the communication successful, interaction designers had to act as mediators between the two opposite positions. This often meant several design iterations as new ideas were generated at each meeting that needed to be validated with the opposite party. For example, during initial interviews users showed compare-and-contrast tables they use as a summary during the investigation process. A table summary was included in the vision demonstrator; discussions that followed with AI experts resulted in them suggesting the new functionality of populating the summary table automatically. This led to a new iteration with users where the possibility of automatically filling the table was discussed and new requirements were produced, e.g., graphically distinguishing in the table elements included by humans vs. those added by the system.

The use of faceted scenarios and a vision demonstrator have been instrumental in making the communication effective and helping everyone contribute ideas and expertise to the development of the X-Media design. This proved how the design of an IIS should be a collective learning process where technology is challenged by real world problems and users open their minds to new possibilities. Iterative cycles of usability analysis, user requirements and functionality analysis promoted cross fertilisation between HCI and AI: both views evolved and changed each other during the iterative design process.

To facilitate the integration of AI technology into the user interaction, the scenarios were enriched with Technical Insertion Points (TIPs), introduced to provide a deeper description of the technical aspects behind the interface. As signposts, the TIPs highlighted the contribution of intelligent modules to the interaction and allowed to more precisely define what the input/output of those modules should be to exploit AI technology and assure usability.

Besides new tools for the user-centred design of intelligent systems, a new figure has to be included in the team, that of an interaction designer aware of the possibilities AI offers as well as HCI methodologies and best practice. This figure has to mediate between the opposite positions of highly demanding users and AI experts. The design process has to be revisited to allow everyone to contribute their perspective in a mutually understandable way. To improve communication between users and AI experts

both groups were considered as users by the interaction designers and the participatory design paradigm was used to work alternatively with both.

On reflection, the main lesson learnt is that of starting the design with a "not so intelligent" version of the system and iteratively increase complexity over different versions of the design. The reason for this claim is that gaining users' confidence in professional environments is very difficult. Those discretionary users will accept new tools only if they see a clear benefit. The first clear benefit is a well-designed user interface/interaction with minimal intelligence that already improves on the tools they currently use. Intelligence can then be built on this platform as use increases and confidence grows. AI experts should be patient and wait to see where their contribution can better fit. The final outcome can be more rewarding as more innovative solutions could emerge through iterative redesign.

Acknowledgement

The research reported in this paper is funded by the X-Media project, sponsored by the European Commission as part of the Information Society Technologies programme under EC grant number ISTFP6-026978. We thank all the X-Media partners for the stimulating discussions.

References

- Ahlberg, C., Shneiderman, B. 1992 *AlphaSlider: A compact and rapid selector*. Proc. CHI '92. 365-371.
- Carroll, J.M. 1997 *Scenario-based design*. In M. Helander, T. Landauer, & P. Prabhu (Eds.), *Handbook of human-computer interaction*. Elsevier, 384-406.
- Catani, M.B. and Biers, D.W. 1998 *Usability evaluation and prototype fidelity: Users and usability professionals*, Proc. Human Factors and Ergonomics Society 42nd Annual Meeting, 1331-1336.
- Heer, J., Card, S. and Landay, J. 2005 *Prefuse: A toolkit for interactive information visualization*. Proc. CHI '05, 421-430.
- Houde, S., and Hill, C. 1997 *What Do Prototypes Prototype?*, in *Handbook of Human-Computer Interaction* (2nd Ed.), M. Helander, T. Landauer, and P. Prabhu (eds.): Elsevier Science B. V: Amsterdam.
- Höök, K. 2000 *Steps to take before IUIs become real*. *Interacting with Computers*. 12. 4009-426.
- Horvitz, E. 2002 *Principles of Mixed-Initiative User Interfaces*. Proc. *CHI 2002*, ACM Press, 1-8.
- Sefelin, R., Tscheligi, M., and Giller, V. 2003 *Paper prototyping – what is it good for? A comparison of paper and computer-based prototyping*, Proc. CHI '03 778-779.

Virzi, R.A., Karis, D. and Sokolov, J.L. 1996 *Usability problem identification using both low- and high-fidelity prototypes*, Proc. CHI'96, 236-243.

Winograd, T. 2006 *Shifting viewpoints: Artificial intelligence and human-computer interaction*. Artificial Intelligence. 170. 1256-1258.