

Engaging with Automation: Understanding and Designing for Operation, Appropriation, and Behaviour Change

Matthias Baldauf
Eastern Switzerland University of
Applied Sciences
St.Gallen, Switzerland
matthias.baldauf@ost.ch

Peter Fröhlich
AIT Austrian Institute of Technology
Vienna, Austria
peter.froehlich@ait.ac.at

Virpi Roto
Aalto University
Espoo, Finland
virpi.roto@aalto.

Philippe Palanque
Université Paul Sabatier - Toulouse III
Toulouse, France
palanque@irit.fr

Siân Lindley
Microsoft Research
Cambridge, United Kingdom
sianl@microsoft.com

Jon Rogers
Northumbria University
Newcastle upon Tyne, United
Kingdom
jon.rogers@northumbria.ac.uk

Wendy Ju
Cornell University
New York, USA
wendyju@cornell.edu

Manfred Tscheligi
University of Salzburg
Salzburg, Austria
AIT Austrian Institute of Technology
Vienna, Austria
manfred.tscheligi@sbg.ac.at

ABSTRACT

Automation has been permeating our everyday lives in various facets. Given both the ubiquity and, in many cases, the indispensability of ubiquitous automated systems, creating engaging experiences with them becomes increasingly relevant. This workshop provides a platform for researchers and practitioners working on (semi-)automated systems and their user experience and allows for cross-discipline networking and knowledge transfer. In a keynote talk, paper presentations, discussions, and hands-on sessions, the participants will explore and discuss user engagement with automation for operation, appropriation, and change. The results of the workshop are a set of research ideas and drafts of joint research projects to drive further automation experience research in a collaborative interdisciplinary manner.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Human-centered computing ! Human computer interaction (HCI).

KEYWORDS

Automation, user experience, engagement, appropriation

ACM Reference Format:

Matthias Baldauf, Peter Fröhlich, Virpi Roto, Philippe Palanque, Siân Lindley, Jon Rogers, Wendy Ju, and Manfred Tscheligi. 2022. Engaging with

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

CHI '22 Extended Abstracts, April 29-May 5, 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA

© 2022 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-9156-6/22/04.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3491101.3503735>

Automation: Understanding and Designing for Operation, Appropriation, and Behaviour Change. In CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems Extended Abstracts (CHI '22 Extended Abstracts), April 29-May 5, 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491101.3503735>

1 BACKGROUND AND GOALS

From consumer electronics in our households over assistive functions in cars to automated processes at work: we all are confronted with an increasing number of automated appliances in everyday contexts. While the inherent purpose of automation systems is to relieve humans of performing interaction tasks, they still necessitate different forms of engagement of the humans meant to live with them. In fact, one of the best known ironies of automation is that it requires human involvement (e.g., in the presence of automation degradation or failures), even though it is meant to decrease it [2, 14]. Designers thus have to think about ways to engage and train the target operators, users, and customers to be introduced appropriately before system use, they have to entice them to intervene at the right time with the right behavior, and they need to think about long-term usage retention.

Beyond these aspects of system operation, the growing autonomy of systems will increasingly enable them to “decide” when and how to take initiative and what to communicate to users. Naturally, the ways how this communication is realized can influence overall attitudes and behaviors of users. For example, automated energy feedback systems already now provide customer engagement to household owners [23], and social networks have sophisticated means of enticing communication behaviors [24].

Acceptance of a technology is the basic step towards engagement [8]. User engagement has been a topic (often implicitly) addressed in Human-Computer Interaction [7, 15], and related fields like Persuasive Technology [11] have their own tradition. However,

only recently efforts for a comprehensive conception, abstraction, and measurement of user engagement have been started [9]. While the conceptualization of human usage in increasingly autonomous and intelligent technology has progressed in recent years, the multifaceted roles for user engagement have so far not been reflected in enough depth.

Whereas previous CHI workshops on “Automation Experiences” focused on cross-domain knowledge transfer and consolidation [13] and working contexts [3], this workshop sheds light on the interplay of engagement and automation. We explore three levels of engagement with automation: (1) engagement for operation (how can users be enticed to consume, monitor and operate an automated system in a contextually suitable way?), (2) engagement for appropriation (what are recommendable ways to actively appropriate the automated system for own purposes?), and (3) engagement for behavior change (how can increasingly autonomous systems take initiative to entice humans for attitude and behavior change?). Based on these considerations, the conceptual understanding of automation experience and contextual engagement will be advanced, which eventually will result in a design space for engaging with automation systems.

The overall objective of this workshop is an exploration of the interplay of engagement and automation from a multi-disciplinary perspective. In line with this overall goal, it will pursue the following sub-goals:

- Uncovering the dimensions of automation engagement,
- Reflecting on major challenges of automation engagement,
- Identifying promising future research topics in the field of automation experience in the form of project ideas and a research agenda,
- Forming a multi-disciplinary network of automation experience researchers.

2 CHALLENGES

In the workshop, challenges with regard to three levels of engagement with automation are discussed.

2.1 Engage for Operation

Automation is about transferring some tasks from humans to the systems, which typically decreases the need for interaction. As described above, the irony of this development is that users are no longer engaged with the automated process, and are thus not able to act quickly when the system needs help. This is a major challenge, e.g., with autonomous cars that may need a human to quickly take over in surprising circumstances [4, 16]. Similarly, other automated appliances in our everyday surroundings might prepare their users for manual interventions as well.

Engagement for operation might also mean emotional engagement with interactive systems [9]. User experience research grew from the need to study emotional aspects of technology use, and we now know that interactive systems can make life more enjoyable and meaningful. However, we know too little about the means to engage users of highly automated systems. In short term, engaging operation refers to enjoyable interaction with automation without having to worry about breaking the intelligent system. Therefore, transparent and explainable automation is a burning

challenge also from the emotional perspective. In the long term, businesses are worried about consumer products losing their emotional engagement power once consumers no longer interact with them. Less engagement means also less loyal customers and less recommendations of the products to potential customers.

Research questions around the above topics include:

- How can non-experts be engaged before and during their first encounter with an automated system to a level that they comprehend its capabilities and potential risks?
- How to design take over requests that entice operators for interventions and highlight potential consequences?
- How to support long-term engagement with automated systems?
- How can automated engagement be designed in a gender and diversity sensitive manner that responds to differing motivations, competency levels and realities and ensures accessibility for different types of users?

2.2 Engage for Appropriation

With the increasing penetration of automated services and processes in everyday life, special attention needs to be put on ways to appropriate them for the personal private or working context. Following established heuristics and guidelines regarding control and flexibility [20], opportunities for customization and personalization might not only result in efficiency gains but also help to create meaningful relationships and engaging experiences with automation.

This form of appropriation and customization of automated services might occur in various forms: users might choose between varying levels of automation support, re-orchestrate an automated workflow, or contribute their expert knowledge to improve an automated service, for example. The impact of such adaptation opportunities on the users' automation experience as well as how to design for them are unclear.

Besides the adaptation of existing automated processes, even the entire creation of automated workflows and services is possible for non-programmers. Driven by intense research on so-called “end-user development” [21], several technical solutions have been reaching the mass-market. In addition to trigger-action approaches (“if, then”-style rules) [17, 25], low-code programming platforms (software creation through graphical user interfaces) and robotic process automation (recording and playing back a user's actions in a graphical user interface) have been gaining interest in industry recently. While related prior research has been investigating and proposing various approaches for enabling the creation of automated workflows for non-programmers [18], HCI research on such recent trends has just been starting (cf. [26, 27]) and little is known about the impact of the user's contribution to the overall automation experience.

Research questions regarding the user-driven adaptation and creation of engaging automated workflows include:

- What are users' requirements regarding the adaptation of automated processes and how to address and design for them in different domains?
- What impact has the adaptability of automated processes on the user's automation experience?

- How can automated processes be tailored joyfully by non-expert users?
- How can users contribute their tacit knowledge to automated processes?

2.3 Engage for Behavior Change

With rising levels of automation, systems are taking initiative in the communication with their users and thereby can increasingly influence behaviors. Promising examples of engagement for behavior change are efforts to further more sustainable energy consumption via energy management applications [23], approaches to influence mobility towards more sustainable patterns [6], or applications to support physical and mental health [19]. Automated influence, however, has also raised concerns in the ethics and policy literature, with regard to privacy in targeted advertising, autonomy in health nudges, or economic harm in dark patterns [24].

Designing such automation-based engagement systems requires careful consideration of a range of important questions among which are the given contexts within which a system will try to engage, variations in user requirements and barriers that will play a role in success and failure including underlying motivation to be engaged and expected benefits, usability parameters of users, and how these connect with specific user characteristics [1, 5]. While a considerable body of behavior change theory and suggestions for integrating them in design is available [10], these are mostly restricted systems with classical user interaction levels, such as decision support systems, recommender systems, and gamification. So far, the discussion of HCI challenges for highly automated influencing systems have mostly been restricted to certain domains, such as embodied persuasive technologies (e.g. social robotics and virtual coaches). Taking up the scattered available research results from different research areas, we aim to systematically address the role of automation and engagement for behavior change.

Related research questions include:

- How to define the right level of automation to reach users with interventions?
- How can engaging automation be designed in an ethically aware manner, enabling for a transparent behavioral goal definition and validation?
- How to prevent reactance with regard to behavioral recommendations issued by automated systems?
- What are the interaction design practices to ensure automation integrity in different types of projects and contexts?

3 ORGANIZERS

The members of the organization team cover the wide spectrum of user-centered automation research. They have previously organized successful in-person and online workshops on various topics of user experience, as well as automation in everyday life, transport, and safety-critical applications (e.g., CHI, MobileHCI, AutomotiveUI). Furthermore, several members of the team are experienced workshop and conference chairs (e.g., MobileHCI, HRI, AutomotiveUI, PERSUASIVE).

- Matthias Baldauf (main contact) is a Professor for Business Informatics at the Eastern Switzerland University of Applied Sciences in St.Gallen. He leads user-centered projects in the

domain of human-automation interaction in smart manufacturing and office workplaces.

- Peter Fröhlich is a Senior Scientist at AIT Austrian Institute of Technology, Center for Technology Experience. He investigates automation experience phenomena in industrial production, autonomous driving, and smart home environments.
- Virpi Roto is a Professor of Practice in Experience Design at Aalto University. She studies the means to design automation that improves user experience, for example, in maritime and industrial contexts.
- Philippe Palanque is a Professor of Computer Science at the University of Toulouse III. His research focuses on interactive systems design, development, certification and deployment in various safety critical contexts (e.g., aircraft cockpits, satellite workstations).
- Siân Lindley is a Principal Research Manager at Microsoft Research in Cambridge. She investigates human-AI collaboration in the context of enterprise knowledge applications, with a specific focus on sense-making, content reuse and remix, and cross-application workflows.
- Jon Rogers is Professor of Design at Northumbria School of Design. Previously he held a personal chair in Creative Technology at the University of Dundee and is a senior research fellow at the Mozilla Foundation. His work explores the human intersection between digital technologies and the design of physical things.
- Wendy Ju is an Associate Professor at Cornell University. Her work in the areas of human-robot interaction and implicit interaction highlights the ways that interactive devices can communicate and engage people without interrupting or intruding.
- Manfred Tscheligi is a Professor for HCI and Usability at the University of Salzburg and Head of the Center for Technology Experience at AIT Austrian Institute of Technology in Vienna. He leads a variety of research projects investigating automation experience in various contexts (e.g., intelligent production, driving, robotics, and retail).

4 WEBSITE

The website (<https://matthiasbaldauf.com/automationxp22>) will include the workshop description and goals, call for papers and suggested topics, detailed workshop schedule, ways to get involved during the workshop, and information about the organizers.

5 PRE-WORKSHOP PLANS

The workshop will be announced through well-known HCI related mailing lists (CHI Announcements, Ubicomp Announcements, etc.) and suitable websites. Furthermore, we will send out personal invitations to contact our scientific network directly, e.g., former participants and organizers of prior related workshops. All promotional material will include a link to the workshop website. We will solicit position papers of up to 6 pages (incl. references) in the ACM Master Article Submission Template that describe the participants' workshop contributions. Suitable contribution types include work in progress, concrete research ideas, novel perspectives, and demos

Time	Phase (details in text)	Methods and tools for hybrid setup
08:30 - 09:00	Arrival of participants	Preparation for tech troubleshooting
09:00 - 09:15	Welcome and introduction	Video conferencing/streaming in plenary
09:15 - 09:35	Participants introduction	Video conferencing/streaming in plenary
09:35 - 09:55	Keynote by V. Roto	Video conferencing/streaming in plenary
09:55 - 10:10	Coffee break	Virtual break-out room for (on-site) chat
10:10 - 11:00	Paper madness 1	On-site and remote presentations
11:00 - 11:10	Coffee break	Virtual break-out room for (on-site) chat
11:10 - 12:00	Paper madness 2	On-site and remote presentations
12:00 - 13:30	Lunch Break	-
13:30 - 13:50	Grouping and selection of challenges	Hybrid discussion, polling tool, forming of smaller groups
13:50 - 14:35	Work on selected challenges	On-site group work (posters), virtual break-out rooms (collaborative whiteboards),
14:35 - 15:00	Hybrid world-cafe	Switching groups (on-site and remote) for discussion
15:00 - 15:20	Coffee break	Virtual break-out room for (on-site) chat
15:20 - 16:00	Group presentations	Video conferencing/streaming in plenary
16:00 - 16:30	Future work and wrap-up	Video conferencing/streaming in plenary
evening	Joint workshop dinner (opt.)	-

Table 1: Preliminary schedule for a hybrid workshop, easily adaptable for both a solely on-site or virtual workshop.

systems and their user experience. In a keynote talk, paper presentations, discussions, and hands-on sessions, the participants will explore and discuss user engagement with automation for operation, appropriation, and behavior change.

Participants are asked to submit a position paper describing their relevant recent or future work. Topics of interest include but are not limited to

- Engagement of non-experts during first encounters with automated systems
- Engaging humans in dynamic work collaboration between humans and machines
- User requirements regarding the adaptation of automated processes
- Support for long-term engagement with automated systems
- Design of take-over requests for various types of automated systems
- Customizing and tailoring of automated systems by non-expert users
- Impact of the adaptability of automated processes on the user's automation experience
- Ensuring automation integrity in different contexts

Papers must be formatted according to the ACM Master Article Submission Template and comprise up to 6 pages (incl. references). Papers must be submitted in PDF format (non-anonymized) to <https://easychair.org/conferences/?conf=automationxp22>. The submissions will be reviewed by the organizers based on relevance, originality, significance, and quality. Upon acceptance, at least one author of each accepted paper must attend the workshop. Important dates:

- Position paper deadline: February 14th, 2022
- Acceptance notification: March 1st, 2022
- Workshop date: April 30th, 2022

Website: <https://matthiasbaldauf.com/automationxp22>

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is in part supported by the projects AWARD (EU Horizon 2020, 101006817), VA-PEPR (SNF Sinergia, CRSI15_189955), Sea4Value (Business Finland, 81/31/2020), and Cultural Differences in Driving Interaction (National Science Foundation, 2107111).

REFERENCES

- [1] Sophie Adams, Declan Kuch, Lisa Diamond, Peter Fröhlich, Ida Marie Henriksen, Cecilia Katze, Marianne Ryghaug, and Selin Yilmaz. 2021. Social license to automate: A critical review of emerging approaches to electricity demand management. *Energy Research & Social Science* 80 (Oct. 2021), 102210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2021.102210>
- [2] Lisanne Bainbridge. 1983. Ironies of automation. *Automatica* 19, 6 (Nov. 1983), 775–779. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-1098\(83\)90046-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-1098(83)90046-8)
- [3] Matthias Baldauf, Peter Fröhlich, Shadan Sadeghian, Philippe Palanque, Virpi Roto, Wendy Ju, Lynne Baillie, and Manfred Tscheligi. 2021. Automation Experience at the Workplace. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Yokohama, Japan) (CHI EA '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 89, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411763.3441332>
- [4] Pavlo Bazilinskyy, Sebastiaan M Petermeijer, Veronika Petrovych, Dimitra Dodou, and Joost CF de Winter. 2018. Take-over requests in highly automated driving: A crowdsourcing survey on auditory, vibrotactile, and visual displays. *Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behaviour* 56 (2018), 82–98.
- [5] Shlomo Berkovsky, Jill Freyne, and Harri Oinas-Kukkonen. 2012. Inventing Individually: Fusing Personalization and Persuasion. *ACM Trans. Interact. Intell. Syst.* 2, 2, Article 9 (June 2012), 8 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2209310.2209312>
- [6] Francesca Cellina, Dominik Bucher, Francesca Mangili, José Veiga Simão, Roman Rudel, and Martin Raubal. 2019. A Large Scale, App-Based Behaviour Change Experiment Persuading Sustainable Mobility Patterns: Methods, Results and Lessons Learnt. *Sustainability* 11, 9 (May 2019), 2674. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11092674>
- [7] Elizabeth F. Churchill. 2010. Enticing engagement. *Interactions* 17, 3 (May 2010), 82–87. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1744161.1744180>
- [8] Fred D. Davis. 1993. User acceptance of information technology: system characteristics, user perceptions and behavioral impacts. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies* 38, 3 (March 1993), 475–487. <https://doi.org/10.1006/imm.1993.1022>
- [9] Kevin Doherty and Gavin Doherty. 2019. Engagement in HCI. *Comput. Surveys* 51, 5 (Jan. 2019), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3234149>
- [10] Sarah-Jane Flaherty, Mary McCarthy, Alan Collins, and Fionnuala McAuli. 2017. Can existing mobile apps support healthier food purchasing behaviour? Content analysis of nutrition content, behaviour change theory and user quality

- integration. *Public Health Nutrition* 21, 2 (Oct. 2017), 288–298. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1368980017002889>
- [11] Brian Jeffrey Fogg. 1998. Persuasive Computers: Perspectives and Research Directions. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Los Angeles, California, USA) (CHI '98). ACM Press/Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., USA, 225–232. <https://doi.org/10.1145/274644.274677>
- [12] Peter Fröhlich, Matthias Baldauf, Thomas Meneweger, Manfred Tscheligi, Boris de Ruyter, and Fabio Paternò. 2020. Everyday automation experience: a research agenda. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing* 24, 6 (Oct. 2020), 725–734. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00779-020-01450-y>
- [13] Peter Fröhlich, Matthias Baldauf, Philippe Palanque, Virpi Roto, Thomas Meneweger, Manfred Tscheligi, Zoe M. Becerra, and Fabio Paternò. 2020. Automation Experience across Domains: Designing for Intelligibility, Interventions, Interplay and Integrity. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) (CHI EA '20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3334480.3375178>
- [14] Tania Hancke. 2020. Ironies of Automation 4.0. *IFAC-PapersOnLine* 53, 2 (2020), 17463–17468. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2020.12.2122>
- [15] Alejandro Jaimés, Mounia Lalmas, and Yana Volkovich. 2011. First international workshop on social media engagement (SoME 2011). *ACM SIGIR Forum* 45, 1 (May 2011), 56–62. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1988852.1988863>
- [16] Soyeon Kim, René van Egmond, and Riender Happee. 2021. Effects of User Interfaces on Take-Over Performance: A Review of the Empirical Evidence. *Information* 12, 4 (April 2021), 162. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info12040162>
- [17] Nicola Leonardi, Marco Manca, Fabio Paternò, and Carmen Santoro. 2019. Trigger-Action Programming for Personalising Humanoid Robot Behaviour. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Glasgow, Scotland UK) (CHI '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300675>
- [18] Monica G. Maceli. 2017. Tools of the Trade: A Survey of Technologies in End-User Development Literature. In *End-User Development*. Springer International Publishing, 49–65. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58735-6_4
- [19] Madison Milne-Ives, Ching Lam, Caroline De Cock, Michelle Helena Van Velthoven, and Edward Meinert. 2020. Mobile Apps for Health Behavior Change in Physical Activity, Diet, Drug and Alcohol Use, and Mental Health: Systematic Review. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth* 8, 3 (March 2020), e17046. <https://doi.org/10.2196/17046>
- [20] Jakob Nielsen. 2005. Ten usability heuristics. <http://www.nngroup.com/articles/ten-usability-heuristics/> Accessed 10-14-21.
- [21] Fabio Paternò. 2013. End User Development: Survey of an Emerging Field for Empowering People. *ISRN Software Engineering* 2013 (June 2013), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/532659>
- [22] Virpi Roto, Philippe Palanque, and Hannu Karvonen. 2019. Engaging Automation at Work – A Literature Review. In *Human Work Interaction Design. Designing Engaging Automation*. Springer International Publishing, 158–172. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05297-3_11
- [23] Altaf Mazhar Soomro, Gnana Bharathy, Nimish Biloria, and Mukesh Prasad. 2021. A review on motivational nudges for enhancing building energy conservation behavior. *Journal of Smart Environments and Green Computing* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.20517/jsecg.2020.03>
- [24] Daniel Susser and Vincent Grimaldi. 2021. Measuring Automated Influence: Between Empirical Evidence and Ethical Values. In *Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3461702.3462532>
- [25] Blase Ur, Elyse McManus, Melwyn Pak Yong Ho, and Michael L. Littman. 2014. Practical Trigger-Action Programming in the Smart Home. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Toronto, Ontario, Canada) (CHI '14). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 803–812. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2557420>
- [26] Judith Wewerka, Sebastian Dax, and Manfred Reichert. 2020. A User Acceptance Model for Robotic Process Automation. In *2020 IEEE 24th International Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conference (EDOC)*. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/edoc49727.2020.00021>
- [27] Judith Wewerka, Christian Micus, and Manfred Reichert. 2021. Seven Guidelines for Designing the User Interface in Robotic Process Automation. In *IEEE Int'l Workshop on Intelligent Digital Architecture, Methods, and Services for Industry 4.0 and Society 5.0 (IDAMS 2021)*, Workshop at the EDOC 2021 Conference. IEEE Computer Society Press. <http://dbis.eprints.uni-ulm.de/2056/>