Children and Emerging Technologies: Ethical and Practical Research and Design

Janet C Read*
University of Central Lancashire, UK
JCRead@uclan.ac.uk

Elmira Yadollahi KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden elmiray@kth.se

ABSTRACT

Child Computer Interaction is concerned with the research, design, and evaluation of interactive technologies for children. Working with children in HCI is rewarding and fun but managing that work so that children are kept comfortable and can participate in meaningful ways is not always easy. This course will provide attendees with practical tips to organise sessions with children, with signposts to methods for research, design and evaluation and will specifically consider the ethics of children's participation with checklists to support us in doing our most ethical work possible. Our focus on emerging technologies makes this course especially valuable to those looking at AI, robots, XR and related technologies.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Human-centered computing \rightarrow Interaction design; Interaction design process and methods.

KEYWORDS

Child Computer Interaction, Evaluation, Design, Research, Ethics, Children, Emerging Technologies

ACM Reference Format:

Janet C Read, Yoram Chisik, Elmira Yadollahi, and Matthew Horton. 2024. Children and Emerging Technologies: Ethical and Practical Research and Design. In Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '24), May 11–16, 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 4 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613905.3636275

1 BENEFITS

This course will introduce attendees to core values, methods, and techniques for working with children in CCI and Children's UX. By children we focus on ages 7 through 13 but will also talk about very young children and teens. Attendees will be given practical handouts and documentation including – personas, planning sheets, toolkits, and checklists. The course focuses on working with children in research, design and evaluation in ways that empower,

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.

Yoram Chisik Goldsmiths, University of London UK y.chisik@gold.ac.uk

Matthew Horton University of Central Lancashire, UK MPLHorton@uclan.ac.uk

and give value to, children. For this version we will specifically frame the learning around emerging technologies with case study examples from robot interaction [24, 46], AR design [8, 42] and agent technologies [10, 23].

Children are significant users of, and a large market for, interactive technology but there is still much work to be done to make technologies fit for their use [33]. Children are beginning to interact with technology at younger ages [21] but there are considerable difficulties still found when examining how children interact with mainstream technology [31]. For example, research is needed to understand how children interact with technologies like robots [22], designers need to make products intended for learning more accessible to children who may have special needs [9], and children need to be empowered to give their opinions of, and their ideas towards, new innovations [1]. In our course, these 'needs for more work' will be highlighted.

Engaging directly with children in research, design and evaluation has consequences for the child: the value of the engagement to children has to be balanced with the needs for the researcher to engage with the children. The HCI community listens to the voices of children through participatory practices [3] and through research [15], but in recent times the expanded rights of the children, in terms of their empowerment and agency, have been a major theme [11, 16, 18, 29]. As an example of a tension, in our own work, children aged 14 were prevented from being allowed to be photographed for a newspaper because their parents had decided they should not be photographed in school – the child's right to choose was taken from them. The extent to which children can consent, the difficulties around things like deception and the ad hoc selection of children for participation have all been noted as problematic [6]. Our course will 'wake up' participants to the great privilege and considerable responsibility of working with children.

At the end of the course, it is expected that attendees will:

- Better understand the unique characteristics of working with children in research, design, and evaluation, especially in the context of emerging technologies, and be enabled and challenged to improve the experiences of the children they work with
- Have a clearer understanding of the impact of method choices on children's agency and engagement and on research data, evaluation results and design ideas.
- Gain knowledge of techniques for the ethical recruitment of children, the managing of studies and the writing and reporting of work.

^{*}Corresponding author.

- Be able to locate and use techniques that will be useful in general Child-Centered Design.
- Discover new methods and tools and feel empowered to apply them in their own work.

2 INTENDED AUDIENCE(S)

This course is ideal for researchers, practitioners and designers who are interested in the research and design of digital environments for children (of all age groups). In past courses, participants included researchers, practitioners, and students.

3 PREREQUISITES

It is assumed that those attending have a basic understanding of HCI methods and/or UX research methods; outside of that there are no prerequisites.

4 CONTENT

We have actively interspersed each session with three or more activities to ensure participant engagement in either online or face to face delivery.

We will begin the course with a discussion of how to put children first in our HCI work. We will introduce a set of scenarios that can happen when working with children which will be used to challenge some of our thinking as we go along. The theoretical part of this session will focus on children's rights and the ways that children can participate. We will use video examples, case studies and children's narratives to talk about when it might not be appropriate to work with children and on what measures we can take to gain value for children in participation.

Following the introduction, we introduce a subset of methods for Research with Children, Design with Children, and Evaluation with Children. We will introduce tools and methods that have been shown to be effective when working with children. Research Methods include the PETT toolkit (in press) which can be used to describe the expertise of a sample of children. Design Methods that are described include Co-Design, Layered elaboration [45], and Obstructed Theatre [28] and we will stress the importance of using ideas from children in appropriate ways. Evaluation Methods include the MemoLine [44], This or That [48], and The Fun Toolkit [25] as well as discussion on planning evaluations and on carrying out observational and ethnographic work.

The last session is a discussion of reporting and ethics, which gives ideas for where we can go to learn more. We will specifically consider working with young (<4) children and will discuss the CHECk toolkits for ethical work [32]. Practical advice on the recruitment of children and on reporting [41], both to the scientific community, and also to the children, is included in this section of the course

5 PRACTICAL WORK

The course mingles participant activity with engaging content and short videos. There are seven practical exercises planned. The first is an introduction which has proved invaluable in previous versions as it allows the participants to make connections. Historically this course has attracted many beginner researchers, and they find this connection valuable. The next activity is a kind of 'spot the

problems' quiz where we give out scenarios and ask the participants to find what can go wrong; this is followed by a practical exercise at 'being a child' and completing a PETT questionnaire on experience of taking photos on a digital tablet device. The next session uses a planning sheet to engage individuals in planning a session with children. There are two activities where participants get to see children's contributions – both designs and survey responses – we circulate these on the day (they are collected in afterwards as we do not want them to go beyond the room) and discuss what children mean by their responses and ideas. This leads onto the last activity which is around the ethics of working with children where we complete an ethics checklist [36].

6 INSTRUCTOR BACKGROUND

Janet C Read is a Professor of Child Computer Interaction. Currently researching cross cultural CCI [20], childlike computing [34], and small CCI [37], she has previously published widely on the ethical inclusion of children [30, 35], design [4, 5, 38-40] and evaluation [26, 27]. Prof. Read is the founding editor of the International Journal of Child Computer Interaction, a previous chair (on two occasions) of the ACM Interaction Design and Children (IDC) Conference and a former chair of the ACM Child Computer Interaction Community. She is widely published in CCI and HCI, is a member of the ACM SigChi ethics committee and has over 200 articles in CCI.

Yoram Chisik is a lecturer in User Experience (UX) engineering at Goldsmiths, University of London. His research explores the ways in which young and not so young humans (and non-humans) interact with and through technology including with reading [17], tangible play things [10] and food [2] He was a founding member of the University of Baltimore Kidsteam lab [19], a chair of the Advances in Computer Entertainment (ACE) and Interact conferences and a senior advisor to companies and government agencies in the United States, Canada, Japan and Turkey. Yoram has organized numerous workshops on CCI and HCI and is widely published in both areas.

Elmira Yadollahi is a Postdoctoral fellow at KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden. She obtained her PhD in Robotics and Computer Science from École polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Switzerland and Instituto Superior Técnico, Portugal. Her research tackles the development of robots with transparent and explainable behaviours [46] for child-robot interaction and human-robot collaborations [12, 46, 47]. She is an associate editor of the International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction (IJCCI) and has served in various organisational roles in conferences and workshops.

Matthew Horton is a Senior Lecturer at UCLan with over twenty years of experience in working with schools and industry in HCI and CCI. He has actively organized more than 100 school events in and around the North of England and has recently directed a large project with over 150 children in nine different school classes. His research is broad, and he has many papers relevant to this course. In particular he has published on personas in CCI [43], and in the active involvement of children in CCI work [7, 13, 14].

7 RESOURCES

See www.chici.org for more information.

8 ACCESSIBILITY

All our content is screen reader friendly, and we will make every effort to accommodate any special needs from participants. Our own work has been with children with different needs and so we are very attuned to ensuring full participation in this course for all who attend. Previous versions of this course have been delivered to sight-limited people with no difficulties. As we will be using videos, we will ensure that these are captioned and also have a textual description to help with accessibility issues.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgments to all the children who have helped us design this course.

REFERENCES

- [1] Louanne E Boyd, Kathryn E Ringland, Oliver L Haimson, Helen Fernandez, Maria Bistarkey and Gillian R Hayes. 2015. Evaluating a collaborative iPad game's impact on social relationships for children with autism spectrum disorder. ACM Transactions on Accessible Computing (TACCESS), 7, 1 (2015), 1-18.
- [2] Yoram Chisik, Ferran Altarriba Bertran, Marie-Monique Schaper, Elena Márquez Segura, Laia Turmo Vidal and Danielle Wilde. 2020. Chasing play potentials in food culture: embracing children's perspectives. In Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Interaction Design and Children Conference: Extended Abstracts. (2020), 46-53.
- [3] Aurora Constantin, Cristina Alexandru, Jessica Korte, Cara Wilson, Jerry Fails, Gavin Sim, Janet C Read and Eva Eriksson. 2021. Distributing participation in design: Addressing challenges of a global pandemic. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction* (2021), 100255.
- [4] Aurora Constantin, Valentina Andries, Jessica Korte, Cristina Adriana Alexandru, Judith Good, Gavin Sim, Janet Read, Jerry Alan Fails and Eva Eriksson. 2022. Ethical Considerations of Distributed Participatory Design with Children. In Interaction Design and Children. (2022), 700-702.
- [5] Aurora Constantin, Jessica Korte, Judith Good, Gavin Sim, Janet Read, Jerry Alan Fails and Eva Eriksson. 2022. A Distributed Participatory Design Research Protocol for Co-designing with Children. In Interaction Design and Children. (2022) 510-514.
- [6] Eva Eriksson, Wolmet Barendregt and Olof Torgersson. 2021. Ethical dilemmas experienced by students in Child-Computer Interaction—A case study. *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction* (2021), 100341.
- [7] Daniel Fitton, Beth T Bell, Linda Little, Matthew Horton, Janet C Read, Michelle Rouse and Nicola Toth 2016. Working with teenagers in HCI research: A reflection on techniques used in the Taking on the Teenagers project. Springer, Cham, 237-267.
- [8] Daniel Fitton, Janet C Read, Gavin Sim and Brendan Cassidy. 2018. Co-designing voice user interfaces with teenagers in the context of smart homes. In Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Interaction Design and Children. (2018), 55-66.
- [9] Christopher Frauenberger, Katta Spiel, Laura Scheepmaker and Irene Posch. 2019. Nurturing constructive disagreement-Agonistic design with neurodiverse children. In Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. (2019), 1-11.
- [10] Diana Leonor Garcès Costa, Yoram Chisik and Ana Lucia dos Santos Faria. 2018. Hugvie as a therapeutic agent in the improvement of interaction skills in children with developmental disabilities: An exploratory study. In Advances in Computer Entertainment Technology: 14th International Conference, ACE 2017, London, UK, December 14-16, 2017, Proceedings 14. (2018), Springer, 117-127.
 [11] Emilia Gómez, Vicky Charisi and Stephane Chaudron. 2021. Evaluating recom-
- [11] Emilia Gómez, Vicky Charisi and Stephane Chaudron. 2021. Evaluating recommender systems with and for children: towards a multi-perspective framework (2021).
- [12] Arzu Guneysu Ozgur, Ayberk Özgür, Thibault Asselborn, Wafa Johal, Elmira Yadollahi, Barbara Bruno, Melissa Skweres and Pierre Dillenbourg. 2020. Iterative design and evaluation of a tangible robot-assisted handwriting activity for special education. Frontiers in Robotics and AI, 7 (2020), 29.
- [13] M Horton, J. C Read, E Mazzone, G Sim and D Fitton.2012. School Friendly Participatory Research Activities with Children. In CHI2012. Texas, US. ACM Press.
- [14] Matthew Horton, Janet C Read, Daniel Fitton, Linda Little and Nicola Toth. 2012. Too cool at school-understanding cool teenagers. *PsychNology Journal*, 10, 2 (2012), 73-91.
- [15] Matthew Horton, Janet C Read, Emanuela Mazzone, Gavin Sim and Daniel Fitton 2012. School friendly participatory research activities with children. In CHI'12 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems. (2012), ACM, 2099-2104
- [16] Steven Joffe. 2003. Rethink" affirmative agreement," but abandon" assent" (2003)

- [17] Nancy Kaplan and Yoram Chisik. 2005. Reading alone together: creating sociable digital library books. In Proceedings of the 2005 conference on Interaction design and children. (2005), 88-94.
- [18] Marianne Kinnula, Netta Iivari, Tonja Molin-Juustila, Eino Keskitalo, Topi Leinonen, Eetu Mansikkamäki, Toni Käkelä and Martti Similä. 2017. Cooperation, Combat, or Competence Building-What Do We Mean When We Are Empowering Children in and through Digital Technology Design? In ICIS. (2017),
- [19] K Knudtzon, A Druin, N Kaplan, K Summers, Y Chisik, R Kulkarni, S Moulthrop, H Weeks and B Bederson. 2003. Starting an intergenerational technology design team: a case study. In IDC 2003, (2003), Preston, UK. ACM Press, 51 - 58.
- [20] Dev Raj Lamichhane, Janet C Read and Dan Fitton. 2018. Beneath the Himalayas— Exploring Design for Cultural Evenness with Nepalese Children. In Proceedings of the 32nd International BCS Human Computer Interaction Conference 32. (2018), 1-5.
- [21] Jackie Marsh, Jamal Lahmar, Lydia Plowman, Dylan Yamada-Rice, Julia Bishop and Fiona Scott. 2020. Under threes' play with tablets. Journal of Early Childhood Research (2020).
- [22] Oussama Metatla, Sandra Bardot, Clare Cullen, Marcos Serrano and Christophe Jouffrais. 2020. Robots for Inclusive Play: Co-designing an Educational Game With Visually Impaired and sighted Children. In Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. (2020), 1-13.
- [23] Graham Parsonage, Matthew Horton and Janet Read. 2023. The Peer Data Labelling System (PDLS). A Participatory Approach to Classifying Engagement in the Classroom. In IFIP Conference on Human-Computer Interaction. (2023), Springer, 224-233.
- [24] Graham Parsonage, Matthew Horton and Janet C Read. 2020. Designing experiments for children and robots. In Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Interaction Design and Children Conference: Extended Abstracts. (2020), 169-174.
- [25] J. C. Read and S. J. MacFarlane. 2006. Using the Fun Toolkit and Other Survey Methods to Gather Opinions in Child Computer Interaction. In *Interaction Design* and Children. IDC2006, (2006). Tampere, Finland. ACM Press, 81 - 88.
- and Children, IDC2006. (2006), Tampere, Finland. ACM Press, 81 88.
 [26] Janet C Read. 2008. Is what you see what you get? Children, Technology and the Fun Toolkit. In VUUM 2008. (2008), Rejkyavik, Iceland. ESF, 67 71.
- [27] Janet C Read. 2007. Validating the Fun Toolkit: an instrument for measuring children's opinions of technology. Cognition Technology and Work (2007).
- [28] Janet C Read, Dan Fitton and Emanuela Mazzone. 2010. Using Obstructed Theatre with Child Designers to Convey Requirements. In CHI2010. (2010), Atlanta, GA. ACM Press.
- [29] Janet C Read, Daniel Fitton and Matthew Horton. 2014. Giving ideas an equal chance: inclusion and representation in participatory design with children. In Proceedings of the 2014 conference on Interaction design and children. (2014), ACM, 105-114.
- [30] Janet C Read, Daniel Fitton, Gavin Sim and Matt Horton. 2016. How Ideas make it through to Designs: Process and Practice. In proceedings of the 9th Nordic conference on human-computer interaction. (2016), 1-10.
- [31] Janet C Read, Matthew Horton, Suzanne Clarke, Rhia Jones, Dan Fitton and Gavin Sim. 2018. Designing for the 'at home' experience of parents and children with tablet games. In Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Interaction Design and Children. (2018), 441-448.
- [32] Janet C Read, Matthew Horton, Gavin Sim, Peggy Gregory, Daniel Fitton and Brendan Cassidy. 2013. CHECk: a tool to inform and encourage ethical practice in participatory design with children. In CHI'13 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems. (2013), ACM, 187-192.
- [33] Janet C Read, Eunice Sari, I Scott Mackenzie and Josh Adi Tedjasaputra. 2021. Words, Worlds and Freedom-Insights from School Students in Indonesia and UK. In IFIP Conference on Human-Computer Interaction. (2021), Springer, Cham, 361-370
- [34] Janet C Read, Sumita Sharma and Graham Parsonage. 2018. Childlike Computing: Systems that think like Humans and act like Children. In Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction and User Experience in Indonesia, CHIuXiD'18. (2018), 109-112.
- [35] Janet C. Read, Daniel Fitton and Matthew Horton.2014. Giving ideas an equal chance: inclusion and representation in participatory design with children. In Proceedings of the 2014 conference on Interaction design and children. Aarhus, Denmark. ACM, 105-114. DOI:10.1145/2593968.2593986
- [36] Janet C. Read, Matthew Horton, Gavin Sim, Peggy Gregory, Daniel Fitton and Brendan Cassidy.2013. CHECk: a tool to inform and encourage ethical practice in participatory design with children. In CHI '13 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Paris, France. ACM, 187-192. DOI:10.1145/2468356.2468391
- [37] Janet Read, Matthew Horton, Dan Fitton, Gavin Sim, Rhona Anne Dick, Emanuela Mazzone and Rachel Forbes. 2023. Small CCI–Exploring App Evaluation with Preschoolers. In Proceedings of the 22nd Annual ACM Interaction Design and Children Conference. (2023), 94-99.
- [38] Janet Read, Matthew Horton and Emanuela Mazzone. 2005. The design of digital tools for the primary writing classroom. In EdMedia+ Innovate Learning. (2005), Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE), 1029-1035.

- [39] Janet Read, Matthew Horton, Emanuela Mazzone, Brendan Cassidy and Lorna McKnight. 2009. Designing for Mr Hippo-introducing concepts of marginalisation to children designers. In Workshop on Designing for Marginalized Children, IDC. (2009),
- [40] Janet Read, Ole Sejer Iversen, Matthew Horton, Daniel Fitton and Rachel Smith. 2012. Designing Interactive Technology for Teens (2012).
- [41] Janet Read, Gavin Sim, Matthew Horton and Dan Fitton. 2022. Reporting Back in HCI Work with Children. In *Interaction Design and Children*. (2022), 517-522.
- [42] Gavin Sim, Brendan Cassidy and Janet C Read 2018. Crowdsourcing ideas for augmented reality museum experiences with children. Springer, Cham, 75-93.
 [43] Gavin Sim, Abhishek Shrivastava, Matthew Horton, Simran Agarwal, Pam-
- [43] Gavin Sim, Abhishek Shrivastava, Matthew Horton, Simran Agarwal, Pampana Sai Haasini, Chandini Sushma Kondeti and Lorna McKnight. 2019. Child-generated personas to aid design across cultures. In Human-Computer Interaction—INTERACT 2019: 17th IFIP TC 13 International Conference, Paphos, Cyprus, September 2–6, 2019, Proceedings, Part III 17. (2019), Springer, 112-131.
- [44] Jorick Vissers, Lode De Bot and Bieke Zaman. 2013. MemoLine: evaluating long-term UX with children. In Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Interaction Design and Children. (2013), ACM, 285-288.
- [45] Greg Walsh, Alison Druin, Mona Leigh Guha, Elizabeth Foss, Evan Golub, Leshell Hatley, Elizabeth Bonsignore and Sonia Franckel. 2010. Layered elaboration: a new technique for co-design with children. In Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Atlanta, Georgia, USA. ACM, 1237-1240. DOI:10.1145/1753326.1753512
- [46] Elmira Yadollahi, Marta Couto, Pierre Dillenbourg and Ana Paiva. 2022. Do Children Adapt Their Perspective to a Robot When They Fail to Complete a Task? In Interaction Design and Children. (2022), 341-351.
- [47] Elmira Yadollahi, Wafa Johal, Ana Paiva and Pierre Dillenbourg. 2018. When deictic gestures in a robot can harm child-robot collaboration. In proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on interaction design and children. (2018), 195-206.
- [48] B Zaman. 2009. Introducing a Pairwise Comparison Scale for UX Evaluations with Preschoolers. In *Interact* 2009. (2009), IFIP, 634 - 637.