

Evaluation of an Empathic Robotic Tutor for Geography and Sustainability Learning

Wolmet Barendregt and Sofia Serholt

Department of Applied IT, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg , Sweden,
w.barendregt@ait.gu.se, s.serholt@ait.gu.se

Abstract. This paper discusses the evaluation of an empathic robotic tutor, developed in the EMOTE project. It also argues for the adoption of a new evaluation approach for educational robots, called situated evaluation.

1 Introduction

The EMOTE project¹ is developing and evaluating an empathic robotic tutor working in conjunction with an interactive touch table for use in the geography school curriculum with children between 11 and 15 years old. In order to create a technology that is useful to the classroom, two common domains in EU geography curricula were chosen: map reading and sustainability. In map reading the tasks usually have discrete right and wrong answers and we envisaged a single user working with an assisting tutor. Sustainability was selected to contrast with the first. An important question was how a robotic tutor can work in a context where there is no single right answer but where students are learning about trade-offs and dynamics within a complex model. For this purpose a serious game concerning sustainable energy called Enercities [1] was selected and adapted into a multi-player touch-table based game, in which the robot tutor could be one of the players. Both applications were developed with input from school teachers and students in the EU. The commercially available Nao robot was used, with the Emys expressive robot head as a comparator.

2 Evaluation Approach

Praslovas [2] evaluation model was chosen to determine the evaluation criteria in EMOTE. This model describes several important elements for the evaluation of an educational technology: Reaction criteria, Learning criteria, Behavior/transfer and Results criteria. Although we have mainly focused on the first two types of criteria, we are aware of the importance of the latter. For the evaluation of the reaction criteria we have adapted several questionnaires: Empathy [3], ALMERE [4], Godspeed [5], NARS [6], MemoLine [7], and Self-assessment of learning [8]. For the learning criteria in the map application we have used map

¹ EMOTE project: <http://www.emote-project.eu/>

reading assignments that combine different map reading skills. For the learning criteria in the sustainability application we have used facts-based questionnaires, and open problem solving tasks in which children have to argue for a solution. We will also code the video-taped interaction to determine whether the robot encourages the discussion of personal values during the game play, as proposed by Antle et al. [9].

3 Discussion

The criteria proposed in [2] and used in EMOTE provide a comprehensive overview of aspects that are relevant when introducing new educational technologies in the classroom. However, the model also assumes that the innovation is a fixed object and that its benefits can be known in advance. Measuring the effects through questionnaires and tests ignores the fact that the use of these technologies is socially situated, meaning that each introduction of a technology leads to adaptations within a specific context. In EMOTE we have experienced this more than once. Bruce et al. [10] thus propose situated evaluation as an alternative approach to the evaluation of socio-technical systems. In this approach, first an idealization of a system is defined. Thereafter, the settings in which the technology is used are examined, and third the realization in different settings is analyzed to generate hypotheses about the how and why of these realizations. For the evaluation of educational robots, which can influence and are influenced by so many different aspects of the classroom practice, we would argue that a situated evaluation approach is a promising approach for future projects.

Acknowledgements This work was partially supported by the European Commission (EC) and was funded by the EU FP7 ICT-317923 project EMOTE. The authors are solely responsible for the content of this publication. It does not represent the opinion of the EC, and the EC is not responsible for any use that might be made of data appearing therein.

References

1. Knol, E., De Vries, P.: EnerCities, a serious game to stimulate sustainability and energy conservation: Preliminary results. *eLearning Papers*, 25, 1887–1542 (2011)
2. Praslova, L.: Adaptation of Kirkpatrick's four level model of training criteria to assessment of learning outcomes and program evaluation in Higher Education. *Educ Asse Eval Acc*, 22, 215–225 (2010).
3. Davis, M. H.: Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multi-dimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113–126 (1983).
4. Heerink, M.: Assessing acceptance of assistive social robots by aging adults. Doctoral thesis, Amsterdam (2010).
5. Bartneck, C., Kulic, D., Croft, E.: Measurement Instruments for the Anthropomorphism, Animacy, Likeability, Perceived Intelligence, and Perceived Safety of Robots. *Int J Soc Robot*, 1, 71–81 (2009).

6. Nomura, T., Suzuki, T., Kanda, T., Kato, K.: Measurement of Anxiety toward Robots. Paper presented at RO-MAN (2006).
7. Vissers, Y., de Bot, L., Zaman, B.: MemoLine: evaluating long-term UX with children. Proceedings of the 12th Int. Conference on Interaction Design and Children (2013).
8. Robertson, J., Cross, B.: Childrens perceptions about writing with their teacher and the StoryStation learning environment International Journal of Continuing Engineering Education and Lifelong Learning (IJCEELL), 14(6) (2004).
9. Antle, A. N., Warren, J. L., May, A., Fan, M., Wise, A. F.: Emergent Dialogue: Eliciting Values during Children's Collaboration with a Tabletop Game for Change. Paper presented at the IDC, Aarhus, Denmark (2014).
10. Bruce, B.B., Rubin, A., An, J.: Situated Evaluation of Technical Systems. In Whitworth, B., De Moor, A. (Eds.). Handbook of Research on Socio-Technical Design and Social Networking Systems. Hershey, PA: IGI (2009).