

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Towards a Methodology for Incorporating Human- Computer Interaction Protocols in Knowledge- Based Systems

A dissertation presented
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Computer Science
at Massey University

Elizabeth Angela Kemp

1995

006.33
Kew

PC20

Abstract

The research presented in this thesis describes the development of the FOCUS framework for use during the analysis stage of the knowledge-based system life cycle. The application of FOCUS (FunctiOns and Communication facilities for USers) helps the knowledge engineer to tackle the important human-computer interaction issues that arise when building knowledge-based systems.

The motivation for this research arises from the complexity of the interaction process. Firstly, the functions that users require to help them to achieve their goals have to be identified. Secondly, adequate communication facilities must be provided so that users can run the knowledge-based system, understand its problem solving capabilities and ask questions about the underlying domain. The situation is further complicated if users have little in common; their domain and/or computing backgrounds might be quite different. Analysis of the literature indicates that human-computer interaction is an issue of some importance but that detailed guidelines are often lacking.

FOCUS has been developed to assist the knowledge engineer during the analysis phase of the knowledge-based system life cycle. FOCUS has five stages: problem specification, preliminary analysis, user analysis, functional specification and detailed analysis. It recognises that the intended users of an expert system in an organisation may not all want the same problem-solving capabilities; the major user groups are identified and the functional requirements of each group specified. Communication issues can then be considered for each group. At the same time the analysis of the organisation's needs and elicitation of knowledge are not neglected.

By the end of the analysis stage, the knowledge engineer has completed the conceptual model with its three components: the model of expertise, model(s) of communication and user requirements. A comprehensive picture can be built up of the users' application, explanation and interface needs. The resulting user models together with the model of communication are the basis at the design stage for developing an interface to provide users with the desired functionality.

The FOCUS process has been evaluated using student enrolment at Massey University as the domain. The purpose of the case study is not to build a knowledge-based system but to assess the value of FOCUS. It is suggested that a framework of this kind, for the analysis phase, should be structured, focused, open and practicable. Experience with FOCUS indicated that these criteria could all be met.

In summary, FOCUS integrates principles from the area of human computer interaction with a user-centred approach to knowledge-based systems development.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Apperley, my chief supervisor, for his guidance and support throughout this research. In particular, I am grateful to him, during his time as head of the Department of Computer Science, for giving me the opportunity to carry out this research in a reasonable time frame.

I would also like to thank Chris Phillips, my second supervisor, for his sterling efforts in reading and correcting this thesis. The assistance of Elisabeth and Arthur Todd, John Hudson and Paul Clark is also appreciated. I am indebted as well to all the staff and students at Massey University who provided the data which enabled me to test out the ideas described in this thesis.

Finally, the love and support of my family has been crucial. I would like to thank Rebecca, Stephen and, especially, my husband Raymond, who always gave generously of his time to read the various drafts of the thesis.

Publications

The following publications all relate to the research carried out for this thesis:

Kemp, E. A. and Kemp, R. H. (1990). Integrating Expert Systems into an Information Systems Strategy. C. Yau (Ed.), *Proceedings of International Conference on Systems Management* (pp. 109-115), Hong Kong.

Kemp, E. A. (1990). Interface Issues in Expert Systems. *Proceedings of NZES 90* (pp. 145-158), Massey University, New Zealand.

Kemp, E. A. and Kemp, R. H. (1991). Explanation in knowledge-based systems: a user perspective. *Proceedings of IJCAI Workshop on explanation generation for knowledge-based systems* (pp. 57-80), The Netherlands: University of Twente.

Kemp, E. A. and Kemp, R. H. (1991). The management of the lifecycle in expert systems development. *International Journal of Information Resource Management*, 2(1), 11-23.

Kemp, E. A. (1992). Cognitive Ergonomics and the External Task. *Proceedings of 4th NZ Ergonomics Conference* (pp. 129-151), Massey University, New Zealand. Also in S. V. Burger and F. W. Darby (Eds.), *Human-Computer interaction in New Zealand* (pp. 50-70). New Zealand Ergonomics Society.

Kemp, E. A. (1992). Communicating with a knowledge-based system. P. Brezillan (Ed.), *Proceedings of ECAI-92 Workshop W15 "Improving the Use of Knowledge-Based Systems with Explanation"*, 92/91 (pp. 23-32), Paris: Institut Blaise Pascal.

Kemp, E. A. (1993). FOCUS: A User-Centered Approach to Expert Systems Development. In N. K. Kasabov (Ed.), *The First New Zealand International Two-Stream Conference on Artificial Neural Networks and Expert Systems* (pp. 188-191). Los Alamos, California: IEEE Computer Society Press.

Kemp, E. A., Todd, E. G., da Silva, A. and Gray, D. I. (1994). Knowledge acquisition applied to farmer decision making. *Proceedings of SPICIS 94* (pp. B7-B12), Singapore.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Chapter 1 Introduction | 3 |
| 1.1 The context of the research | 3 |
| 1.2 Interaction issues in knowledge-based systems | 4 |
| 1.3 The need for a framework | 5 |
| 1.4 Objectives of this research | 8 |
| 1.5 Thesis overview | 9 |
| Chapter 2 Communication Issues in Knowledge-based Systems | 11 |
| 2.1 Knowledge-based systems | 11 |
| 2.1.1 Knowledge-based systems architecture | 12 |
| 2.1.2 Knowledge-based development tools | 14 |
| 2.1.3 Knowledge acquisition | 14 |
| 2.1.4 Explanation facilities in knowledge-based systems | 16 |
| 2.2 Interaction issues in knowledge-based systems | 22 |
| 2.2.1 Diverse backgrounds of users | 22 |
| 2.2.2 Human-Computer communication | 24 |
| 2.2.3 Interaction issues in knowledge-based systems | 37 |
| 2.3 Conclusion | 43 |
| Chapter 3 A Study of Knowledge-Based Systems Usability | 45 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 45 |
| 3.2 The APPLE system | 46 |
| 3.3 The survey | 48 |
| 3.4 Analysis of results | 52 |
| 3.5 Conclusion | 64 |
| Chapter 4 A Review of Knowledge-based Systems Life Cycles | 67 |
| 4.1 Software engineering paradigms | 67 |
| 4.2 Life cycle issues in knowledge-based systems | 68 |
| 4.2.1 The role of prototyping | 70 |
| 4.2.2 The KADS methodology | 76 |
| 4.2.3 An alternative to KADS | 82 |
| 4.2.4 User-centred approaches | 83 |
| 4.3 Conclusion | 87 |
| Chapter 5 FOCUS | 91 |
| 5.1 Introduction | 91 |
| 5.2 The FOCUS framework | 94 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 5.2.1 Problem specification | 96 |
| 5.2.2 Preliminary analysis | 97 |
| 5.2.3 User analysis | 98 |
| 5.2.4 Functional specification | 100 |
| 5.2.5 Detailed analysis | 102 |
| 5.3 Conclusion | 111 |
| Chapter 6 The FOCUS Framework Applied: Initial Analysis | 113 |
| 6.1 Problem specification | 113 |
| 6.1.1 The organisation model | 114 |
| 6.2 Preliminary analysis | 115 |
| 6.2.1 The extended organisation model | 116 |
| 6.2.2 User issues | 119 |
| 6.2.3 Model of expertise | 121 |
| 6.3 User analysis | 123 |
| 6.3.1 Further user issues | 124 |
| 6.3.2 Model of expertise | 142 |
| 6.4 Functional specification | 143 |
| 6.4.1 Final organisation model | 143 |
| 6.4.2 Task model | 145 |
| 6.5 Conclusion | 146 |
| Chapter 7 The FOCUS Framework Applied: Detailed Analysis | 147 |
| 7.1 Detailed Analysis | 147 |
| 7.2 Further analysis of user needs | 147 |
| 7.2.1 Survey of new students | 148 |
| 7.2.2 Student problems | 150 |
| 7.2.3 Task analysis | 152 |
| 7.2.4 Student profile | 153 |
| 7.3 Domain analysis | 153 |
| 7.4 Conceptual model | 156 |
| 7.4.1 Model of expertise | 157 |
| 7.4.2 Communication model | 169 |
| 7.4.3 User requirements | 171 |
| 7.5 Discussion | 173 |
| 7.6 Conclusion | 176 |
| Chapter 8 FOCUS and Interface Design | 177 |
| 8.1 Interface design in the context of FOCUS | 177 |
| 8.2 Adding control to the communication model | 179 |
| 8.3 Screen sequencing and organisation | 181 |
| 8.4 Other interface considerations | 182 |
| 8.5 Interface design | 186 |
| 8.6 Conclusion | 195 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Chapter 9 Conclusions and further research | 199 |
| 9.1 Summary of the research | 199 |
| 9.2 Review and evaluation of FOCUS | 200 |
| 9.3 Contribution of FOCUS | 203 |
| 9.4 Future research | 206 |
| References | 209 |
| Appendix A APPLE questionnaire | 223 |
| Appendix B APPLE questionnaire results | 227 |
| Appendix C Extract: "Communicating with a knowledge-based system" | 229 |
| Appendix D Enrolment at Massey University | 235 |
| Appendix E Enrolment questionnaire | 239 |
| Appendix F Enrolment questionnaire spreadsheet | 245 |
| Appendix G Enrolment questionnaire analysis | 265 |
| Appendix H Enrolment questionnaire- responses | 269 |
| H1 Responses to Question 8 | 270 |
| H2 Responses to Question 22 | 278 |
| H3 Responses to Question 31 | 286 |
| Appendix I Detailed analysis | 291 |
| I1 Enrolment questionnaire - spreadsheet, 1993 | 292 |
| I2 Student choice of paper | 295 |
| I3 Information from Science handbook | 295 |
| I4 Course outline for 59324 | 297 |
| I5 Interview with the Dean of Science | 298 |
| Appendix J Extended model of communication | 301 |
| Appendix K Storyboards | 307 |

Figures and Tables

Figures

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Figure 2.1 | Expert systems components (Harmon and King, 1985) | 13 |
| Figure 2.2 | Knowledge-based system users (Kemp, 1990) | 23 |
| Figure 2.3 | Information technology acceptance model (Davis, 1993) | 37 |
| Figure 2.4 | The modality framework (de Greef et al., 1988) | 42 |
| Figure 3.1 | Standard question and answer format (Kemp et al., 1989) | 46 |
| Figure 3.2 | Graded scale for uncertain answers (Kemp et al., 1989) | 47 |
| Figure 3.3 | The Clarify option (Kemp et al., 1989) | 47 |
| Figure 3.4 | The Why option (Kemp et al., 1989) | 48 |
| Figure 3.5 | Presentation of results in graphical form (Kemp et al., 1989) | 48 |
| Figure 3.6 | Student rating of domain knowledge | 49 |
| Figure 3.7 | Question 17 | 51 |
| Figure 3.8 | Use of English phrases and sentences to input information | 52 |
| Figure 3.9 | Use of direct manipulation to input information | 53 |
| Figure 3.10 | Presentation of conclusions in English phrases and sentences | 54 |
| Figure 3.11 | Presentation of conclusions by numerical table | 55 |
| Figure 3.12 | Indicating confidence in an answer by moving a pointer | 56 |
| Figure 3.13 | Indicating confidence in an answer by numerical input | 56 |
| Figure 3.14 | Helpfulness of Clarify | 57 |
| Figure 3.15 | Helpfulness of Why | 58 |
| Figure 3.16 | Question 12 | 60 |
| Figure 3.17 | Question 15 | 61 |
| Figure 4.1 | KADS Library of generic tasks (Hickman et al., 1989) | 79 |
| Figure 4.2 | Human factors inputs to knowledge-based design | 86 |
| Figure 4.3 | Components of analysis (Kemp and Kemp, 1991b) | 87 |
| Figure 5.1 | Intermediate models (Wielinga et al., 1991) | 92 |
| Figure 5.2 | FOCUS deliverables | 94 |
| Figure 5.3 | The FOCUS framework | 95 |
| Figure 5.4 | Domain knowledge versus computing background | 99 |
| Figure 5.5 | Task model (Wielinga et al., 1991) | 101 |
| Figure 5.6 | Components of the conceptual model | 103 |
| Figure 5.7 | Domain layer for medical diagnosis (Hickman et al., 1989) | 103 |
| Figure 5.8 | Inference layer for medical diagnosis (Hickman et al., 1989) | 104 |
| Figure 5.9 | Task layer for medical diagnosis (Hickman et al., 1989) | 104 |
| Figure 5.10 | Model of communication | 106 |
| Figure 5.11 | One interface presentation style | 109 |
| Figure 5.12 | Two interface presentation styles | 109 |
| Figure 5.13 | Four interface presentation styles | 110 |
| Figure 6.1 | Academic structure of Massey University | 117 |
| Figure 6.2 | Important definitions in the lexicon | 121 |
| Figure 6.3 | Concepts, attributes and relationships | 122 |
| Figure 6.4 | Analysis of students by age | 125 |
| Figure 6.5 | Analysis of students by faculty | 125 |
| Figure 6.6 | Helpfulness of Faculty Handbook | 134 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Figure 6.7 | Helpfulness of University Calendar | 135 |
| Figure 6.8 | Extended domain layer | 142 |
| Figure 6.9 | Task model | 146 |
| Figure 7.1 | Sample course for Computer Science | 155 |
| Figure 7.2 | Inference layer template | 163 |
| Figure 7.3 | Textual description of enrolment inference layer (1) | 164 |
| Figure 7.4 | Textual description of enrolment inference layer (2) | 165 |
| Figure 7.5 | Inference structure diagram for student enrolment | 166 |
| Figure 7.6 | Decomposition of Supply Paper Numbers | 167 |
| Figure 7.7 | Developing the model of communication | 170 |
| Figure 7.8 | Model of communication | 170 |
| Figure 8.1 | Split screen interface | 178 |
| Figure 8.2 | Top level of extended communication model | 180 |
| Figure 8.3 | Decomposition of part of the extended communication model | 180 |
| Figure 8.4 | System - user flows | 181 |
| Figure 8.5 | Relationship between the two windows | 183 |
| Figure 8.6 | Options in a pull-down menu | 184 |
| Figure 8.7 | Extended communication model with options | 185 |
| Figure 8.8 | "Getting started" screen | 187 |
| Figure 8.9 | Information about the two windows | 188 |
| Figure 8.10 | Student and degree details | 188 |
| Figure 8.11 | Basic template for "Paper Selection" | 189 |
| Figure 8.12 | Student confirmation | 190 |
| Figure 8.13 | Undo paper selection dialogue box | 190 |
| Figure 8.14 | Definition of prerequisite | 191 |
| Figure 8.15 | Help - enter paper number | 191 |
| Figure 8.16 | "Course check" screen | 192 |
| Figure 8.17 | "Course check" problem | 193 |
| Figure 8.18 | "Farewell" screen | 194 |
| Figure 8.19 | "Advice Selection" screen | 194 |
| Figure 8.20 | "Paper Information" screen | 195 |
| Figure 8.21 | Timetable | 196 |

Tables

| | | |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table 3.1 | Analysis of each group by faculty | 51 |
| Table 3.2 | Percentage of users satisfied with each presentation method | 53 |
| Table 3.3 | Percentage of users satisfied with each output method | 55 |
| Table 3.4 | Evaluation of methods for indicating confidence | 57 |
| Table 3.5 | Usefulness of Clarify option | 58 |
| Table 3.6 | Usefulness of Why option | 59 |
| Table 3.7 | Evaluation of dialogue option | 60 |
| Table 3.8 | Support for Biochemical option | 61 |
| Table 3.9 | Support for pictorial option | 62 |
| Table 3.10 | Percentage of each group responding at the 3-5 level | 63 |
| Table 4.1 | Layers of a model of expertise (Hickman et al., 1989) | 78 |
| Table 6.1 | Problem areas | 126 |
| Table 6.2 | Analysis of problems by faculty | 127 |
| Table 6.3 | Problems reported by students | 132 |
| Table 6.4 | Ranking by order of usage | 133 |

| | | |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table 6.5 | Student assessment of sources of information | 133 |
| Table 6.6 | Student assessment of sources of assistance analysed by faculty | 136 |
| Table 6.7 | Analysis of computer usage | 137 |
| Table 6.8 | Analysis of software experience | 137 |
| Table 6.9 | Analysis of interface preference | 138 |
| Table 6.10 | Analysis of computerised enrolment system | 139 |
| Table 6.11 | Evaluation of proposed features | 140 |
| Table 6.12 | Analysis of student suggestions | 141 |
| Table 7.1 | Analysis of intended usage of a computerised system | 149 |
| Table 7.2 | Comparison of enrolment system preferences | 150 |
| Table 7.3 | Comparison of usage of information sources | 150 |
| Table 7.4 | Comparison of assessment of information sources | 151 |