

A Framework like a tool for specify motivating Collaborative Learning Participatory Simulations

Gustavo Zurita¹, Nelson Baloian², Felipe Baytelman², Antonio Farias¹, Pedro Antunes³
Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile, ¹Information Systems Department - Business School,
²Computer Science Departments – Engineering School.
gnezurita@fen.uchile.cl;nbaloian@dcc.uchile.cl;fbaytelm@dcc.uchile.cl;anfari@fen.uchile.cl
³Department of Informatics of the Faculty of Sciences of the University of Lisboa,
Bloco C6, Campo Grande, 1700 Lisboa, Portugal
paa@di.fc.ul.pt

Abstract

Several research efforts suggest that collaborative participatory simulations improve teaching and learning, increasing motivation inside the classroom. Currently, it has been mainly applied with students of primary and secondary educational levels, leaving higher level students aside. This paper presents a framework for implementing Participatory Simulations, where social interactions and motivational effects are the main facilitators. An instance of this framework was implemented for business school undergraduate students. Its implementation is simple, lightweight, fully based on pen-based, and designed to work with handhelds over an ad-hoc wireless network.

Keywords: Handhelds. Gestures, Sketches. Collaborative Learning. Participatory Simulation.

1. Introduction

The learning value of collaborative participatory simulations may stem from students having “rich conceptual resources for reasoning about and thoughtfully acting in playful and motivational spaces, and thus can more easily become highly engaged in the subject matter” [10].

Participatory simulations use the availability of a mobile computing device giving each student having the capability of simple data exchanges among neighboring devices [17], [5]. They enable students to act as agents in simulations in which overall patterns emerge from local decisions and information exchanges. Such simulations enable students to model and learn about several types of phenomena, [5] in order to improve their knowledge about human behaviors, to help them in solving conflicts, to shape interaction protocols between humans, and to learn some aspects of collective management, games and experimental economics situations. Furthermore, the interest in participatory simulations related to experimental economics and management follows a growing trend [3], [4], [8].

Some research groups have implemented participatory simulations with handhelds and infrared beaming [15], and it has been found that this kind of activities provide

various advantages for teaching and learning: (a) they introduce an effective instructional tool and have the potential to impact student learning positively across curricular topics and instructional activities [16], (b) they increase the motivation [11], [5], and (c) they generate positive effects in engagement, self-directed learning and problem-solving [11].

The growing acceptance of handhelds enables users to take advantage of numerous advantages in scenarios that desktop computing cannot provide [11]. One of a handheld’s most natural data-entry mode is the stylus (a.k.a. a pen-based or freehand-input-based system), which imitates the mental model of using pen and paper, thereby enabling users to easily rough out their ideas and/or activating different functionalities like copy, move, delete, etc.[13]. However, most currently available handheld applications adopt the PC application approach that uses widgets (buttons, menus, windows) instead of freehand-input-based paradigms (via touch screens) and/or sketching, [8].

This paper, propose a framework for implementing Participatory Simulations, having two general research goals: (a) to propose a conceptual framework for specifying (by the teacher) and developing applications in the field of participative simulations supporting motivating learning applications, and (b) to determine the feasibility of using this in undergraduate curricular contexts of the simulation activities both in terms of intended and actualized learning outcomes; particularly in the management area. An instance of the framework is described. Its implementation is simple, lightweight and fully based on wirelessly interconnected handhelds with an ad-hoc network.

2. Participatory Simulations

A Participatory Simulation is a role-playing activity that helps to explain the coherence of complex and dynamic systems. The system maps a problem of the real world to a model with a fixed number of roles and rules. Global knowledge and patterns emerge in Participatory Simulations from local interactions among users and making decisions to understand the impact by

Zurita, G., N. Baloian, F. Baytelman, A. Farias and P. Antunes (2007) A Framework Like a Tool for Specify Motivating Collaborative Learning Participatory Simulations. The 11th International Conference on CSCW in Design, Melbourne, Australia.

an analysis and observation while doing and/or at the end of the activity.

An advantage of Participatory Simulations is the fact that the activity is highly effective and motivating even in large groups. A teacher could start or not with an introduction where he or she explains the relevant theoretical parts of the complex problem. At least the roles and rules need to be clearly specified. The students should understand the possible activities and consequences, which are available in the simulation at the end. The exchange of experiences and a discussion in small groups within or after the simulation help to increase the understanding of the simulated reality.

Short or larger Participatory Simulations can be integrated in the lecture, where a major idea is the concept of learning through doing [12]. Students participate in an active and motivating way, analyze information, interchange information among them, make decisions and see the outcome of their actions.

3. Related Work

Simulations were realized with paper and pencil in the past, but the technological advances made a complete new type of simulation possible. The ‘participatory’ aspect of these simulations can be directly enabled by the technology, which gives support for the roles and rules to be distributed among the students. Researchers are highly interested in Participatory Simulations due to these simulations appear to make very difficult ideas around ‘distributed systems’ and ‘emergent behaviour’ more accessible to students [17]. Furthermore the Participatory Simulation embeds student engagement and motivation in a playful social space [5] where they have rich conceptual resources for reasoning about and thoughtfully acting in playful spaces, and thus can more easily become highly engaged in the subject matter. Different hardware devices were used to support Participatory Simulations on various kinds of educational objectives for students of different educative levels:

- A futures trading simulation which can be used to teach concepts in a future/options or financial markets is described on [2]. The future trading is a spreadsheet program designed to minimize required input by the instructor. Student survey responses demonstrate that a simulation is a success.
- Thinking Tags [1], small nametag sized computers that communicate with each other. (Andrews et al., 2003) build an application for kindergarten children; and [6] for high-school students in a simulation of virus propagation and asked them to determine the rules of the propagation. The tag communicates with other tags, exchanges data and visualizes similar preferences of two persons.
- Klopfer et al. [11] showed that the newer and more easily distributable version of Participatory Simulations on handhelds was equally as capable as the original Tag-based simulations in engaging students collaboratively in a complex problem-solving task. They feel that handheld technology holds great promise for promoting

collaborative learning as teachers struggle to find authentic ways to integrate technology into the classroom in addition to engaging and motivating students to learn science.

- A Participatory Simulation in form of a stock exchange was designed for master’s students in financial theory, using architectures based on a server and clients running on desktop PCs or laptops as well as on PDAs, [12].
- The SimCafé experiments belong to the sociological approach, aiming at validating and consolidating models [8]. In this approach, participants are stakeholders and the witnesses of the emergence are domain experts, usually social scientists. Participatory Simulations are used as a tool to determine the condition of the emergence. As a matter of fact, this approach belongs to the experimental approach in social sciences [4], especially experimental economics.

Based on the literature above mentioned, we have identified that no system has yet been proposed or implemented for handhelds in a wireless ad-hoc network using a pen-based interface as main metaphor for user interaction.

4. Developing a Framework

Foundational concepts underpinning the design and use of Participatory Simulations include (a) immersion of students in simulations of complex phenomena; (b) development of inquiry and research design skills by the reflections and analysis of the simulation; (c) negotiation, coordination and alignment of individual local behavior in order to foster group-level systems understanding.

Participatory Simulations with handhelds offer an additional perspective providing off-screen, first person experience and insight into the dynamics and emergent behavior, as students become agents in a complex system. Information and conceptual knowledge circulates through peer-to-peer interaction by the interchange and negotiations of objects, which takes different forms in each simulation.

We propose a conceptual framework for the specification, design and creation of mobile learning Participatory Simulations based on handhelds wirelessly interconnected, Figure 1. In order to generate, specify and implement applications of Participatory Simulation, the **Teacher** must define: (a) learning goals of the reality simulated, (b) artifacts to be interchanged, (b) behavior variables and parameters, and (c) rules and roles for playing the simulation (see section 6). **Goals** (figure 1) needs to be identified in order to let students successfully learn/construct certain knowledge. These goals may include meta-objectives and they are only a mean to achieve an overall learning objective. **Roles** and **rules** are spread among students when the activity begins, but the teacher can also interact too. He or she can always access and modify simulation details: wireless connectivity lets the teacher alter any role or rule in the simulation in real-time, allowing to change behaviors on the go.

In order to configure the system for a Participatory Simulation, the **Teacher** may setup transferable objects (artifacts), their behavior parameters, rules and participant roles. Then, to begin the activity, the professor explains the goal of the activity to the students, also describing objects, rules and roles, and how these concepts are represented in their handhelds. Rules, roles and goals should be designed to achieve (a) a high social interaction between students, (b) negotiation instances, and (c) competition to encourage an active and motivated stance as if students were playing a game [12].




Figure 1. Conceptual framework

If students require assistance, our framework allows the teacher to wirelessly give them **feedback** and **assessment**. The teacher can (a) observe the simulation state of each participant device and (b) modify such state in order to solve the student inquiry.

Startup setup must ensure students play always an active and dynamic role through time. This should be based on trading between students (**Negotiation** component of Students, and **Interchange Objects** in Figure 1), or automatically among handhelds (Exchange Objects). These conditions depend on each Participatory Simulation application build, and may involve the following aspects: (a) type of exchange objects, (b) exchange amounts, (c) trade conditions, (d) parameters before and after the exchange, and (e) exchange objects. Once the simulation is done, the teacher must guide students' understanding about the activity. In this way, the students will construct the **learning objective** together.

5 Principles of the interface

Pen-Based User Interface (PUI). According to [13], [7] a handheld application interface must imitate the pen-and-paper metaphor so users can interact naturally with the computer in varied situations, especially when they are or need to be in movement,

thus freeing them to concentrate on the tasks at hand instead of worrying about the interface (interaction with keys, menus, widgets, etc.). A pen-based system offers a more natural and intuitive interface enabling the sharing and exchange so as to improve efficiency.

Gestures. Essential to the functioning of PUI is the use of gestures [14]. In [9], a survey intended to illuminate the problems and benefits users experience with gestures-PUI, it was found that the most frequent actions were deleting, selecting and moving, and that users consider these actions to be efficient as a form of interaction, as well as convenient, easy to learn, utilize and remember, and potentially an added advantage for the interface

Mobility in physical spaces and interchange object on the fly. Handhelds are an appropriate technology for providing high mobility and portability, and for creating ad-hoc networks through peer-to-peer connections between already incorporated WiFi components (Dell Axim X50). Such network allows deliberate information exchange between users, as well as to automatically interaction between devices (see section 7). Proximity detection is done with infrared sensors (IrDA) combined with WiFi.

6. A scenario for participatory simulation

In this section we describe an instance of the framework proposed on section 5. It is oriented to the last undergraduate students of business schools and related with concepts like reputation and trust.

Trust is based on customer's experience and knowledge generated by a company's performance during a good or bad experience. Repetitive interaction between a customer and a company are required to generate positive trust. This positive evaluation usually is generated when products quality is satisfactory or, even, when the company reacts appropriately after a client's complain about bad products (or services).

Companies achieve reputation when their customers trust in common transactions. With a good reputation, a company may attract new customers, even when they don't have a previous common experience: It only requires previous satisfied customers to communicate their trust and perceived reputation in the company to another consumer.

These concepts must be apprehended by students whom, during the participatory simulation, should be able to generate, communicate and/or perceive positive (good products) or negative trust (bad products) generated during transactions with each company. Acquired products will have a perceptible lifespan, directly connected to their quality. If a product last as long as the company offered, it will be considered a good product. Customers may claim bad products to the company. Simulation requires students to play companies and customers roles, where customer-students:

- Are required to acquire a basket of goods, and to replace products when they expire.

- Initially they have no knowledge about companies' reputation, but they may query and share such information with another customers, without restrictions.
- May choose to acquire a product from any company that produces it.
- May claim a money refund or product replacement when products fail before reaching its offered lifetime.

Company-students will:

- Offer homogeneous goods, with static prices and lifespan defined by the teacher.
- Generate new products units periodically.
- Freely advertise the products' features to customers. Even when a company knows its products expected lifetime, it may advertise it with a different duration in order to manage customers' expectations.
- May accept or not to refund or replace a failure product when a customer requires to.

A students' ranking will be published in order to keep the simulation highly active. Such ranking will list acquired requirements and optimal money expend, for customer-students and earned money, for company-students.

When the simulation finishes, students must analyze these results and conclude about:

- There are companies with bad reputation that, however, may achieve good results.
- Customers with previous knowledge have a clear advantage against those who don't.

Even though it looks beneficial for a company to swindle a customer (even for first time), in short term such customer will not trade again with the company and may probably convince other customers not to. In this scenario, students may recognize two cases: (a) the company reduces its earnings or (b) the company had intentions to quit its market, so it won't be affected by customers' reactions.

7. An application using the Framework

We have implemented a lightweight platform for the creation of participatory simulation applications based on the framework proposed in section 4. Using this platform we have successfully implemented an application for the scenario proposed on previous section. This application allows the teacher to assign roles to each participant. Such roles are "customer" and "vendor". Also, the teacher can create "goods", and let "vendors" produce it or "consumers" to need it. This will encourage different "vendors" and "consumers" to interact with each other in order to succeed with their role' goal.

7.1. Simulation Management

Role assignment. Our participatory simulation system allows the teacher to assign a role to each student. Under the "activity administration" mode, unassigned students are displayed in the middle of the screen over a white area. The right area of handhelds

(figure 2.a) has "vendors" and left belongs to "consumers". The teacher can drag a student icon one side or another in order to assign the roles (figure 2.a). In this way, the teacher can see who have been assigned to certain role by looking to different screen areas. In any moment, the teacher can drag any participant icon from one side to another in order to reassign selected participant the new role.




Figure 2. a) Teacher drags a student icon into the "vendor" area to assign him a new role. b) Teacher can create new goods using free-hand drawings.

Goods design. The teacher can define different goods to be produced and required by the students. In order to do this, he or she has to work under the "Goods administration" mode. Here, the teacher can draw a sketch of certain good and surround it within a rectangular shape. This will produce a "good icon", displaying an awareness of successful creation and displaying a reduced icon of the original scratch in the bottom bound of the screen. Then, additional "goods icons" may be created, as seen in Figure 2.b.

Double-clicking on a "goods icon" will bring a screen for defining default variables for such goods. Instance variables are "original price", "production time" and "product expected life". Each different "vendor" able to produce these goods will have different values for these variables, depending on a global "product variance" variable, describing how strong will be this difference among all vendors. This variable can also be manipulated in this same screen.

Goods management. Once "goods icons" have been created their icons will show up in "activity administration mode" in the lower bound region of the screen. The teacher can drag these icons over vendor icons to allow them to produce this item, or over consumer icons to ask them to acquire this item. These goods assignments can be randomized in order to simplify teacher's job and to ensure demand-supply equilibrium.

Activity status, and real time management. Anytime before or during the activity, the teacher can enter a vendor (by double clicking its icon). By doing this, he or she can check how well this vendor has performed and modify the goods he or she can produce. The teacher can drag additional products to allow additional production or remove producible goods by sketching a cross gesture over any goods icon or double

click it to see and control product's instance variables, specifically for that vendor. On the other hand, the teacher can also enter a customer and check his or her performance (feedback and assessment). The teacher can drag additional required products over the participant icon, or enter and sketch a cross gesture to remove pointed items from the requirements list. On the customer screen additional information about achieved goals (required products already acquired) and pending products can be seen.

7.2. Simulation description

Once the activity teacher has setup the simulation, each student has its role and allowed/required goods assigned. Hence, they can start seeking for their goals: (a) vendors need to sell as much as they can, (b) while customers have to acquire every item in their requirement list. Vendors will start offering shouting about how cheap and long lasting are their products while customers will walk around searching for the cheapest item available.

Customer may face vendors to acquire goods they sell. Vendors offer goods as if they would last for a certain period of time. After a customer acquires a product, it may last a certain period of time, shorter or longer than expected. If they last longer, they will get a good image of its vendor, and if they last shorter, a bad one. Once a customer faces another customer, they share information about vendor's reputation. Customers have to decide, then, whether to seek directly for vendors, saving time, or to find about whose products are good or bad.




Figure 3. Three steps in the trade process. First, the vendor offers a product, second a customer accepts it, third vendor stock and customer requirements/acquired lists gets updated.

Customers screen. This screen is divided in 5 main areas: reputation viewer, trade zone, requirements list, acquisition list and score. Reputation viewer depends whether another customer or a vendor is being faced. Trade zone (upper bound of the screen, Figure 3) is

enabled when a consumer interacts closely with a vendor (by the IrDA sensors). Requirement list displays goods, which haven't been acquired or have been acquired but already expired. Acquisition list displays both enabled and expired acquired items, showing expected life span and real life span. Items expired before the expected life span was reached gets specially highlighted, encouraging customers to engage its vendor for an answer. Customers may click acquired items to display additional information about it: (a) which vendor the item was acquired, (b) how much time the vendor offered and how much did the product last. Clicking in the reputation viewer will show a summary of reputation of all vendors current customer knows or has "heard of" from another customer.

Vendors screen. This screen is simpler than the customer's. It displays what goods the students produce and its production rate, which products have already been produced and its available stock. It displays, also, an icon representing current prestige between every customer, and a summary of overall score.

Students' interactions. At the beginning, vendors' reputation is unknown to customers. Every vendor starts up with their products' "factories" and maybe an instance of each product. Customers start up with an empty acquisition list, and a set of requirements. When a customer faces closely a vendor, first the reputation display shows that vendor known reputation. If the customer has acquired a product before or if any other customer has shared its knowledge about this vendor, it can guide the user to trade or not with this vendor. A vendor can decide how much time he or she is going to offer for a product. The vendor is aware of the product life span mean, so a different (probably shorter) life span will be offered to each customer in order to ensure the product will last at least N years (minutes in the simulation). In order to change the offered life time span, the vendor can double click on a product to enter its control screen.

The system will suggest which items the vendor should offer by highlighting them. Then, the vendor has to drag an item into the trade area to offer it. As soon as this item is offered, it appears in the trade area in the customer device screen. If the customer decides to buy the item, it has to be dragged from the trade area into the acquired items list. After a product is acquired, its life meter start running displaying how long the product has been enabled. The product may expire after or before the expected life span (the one offered by the vendor during the trade). As soon as it expires, a new item of the same kind is added to the customer's requirements list. In case the product has last the same or more time the vendor offered, automatically the vendor will get a better reputation ranking. If it lasts shorter, the product will be marked as failed and the customer could return to the vendor in order to trade it back by dragging it back to the trade area. The vendor may return the money to the customer, getting a good reputation ranking, or to argue. Depending on the result of this negotiation, the customer may decide to rank the vendor as bad, or not

to rank him or her. Customers may meet with other buyers in order to get feedback about each vendor's reputation. When two customers engage, each customer has to drag their reputation view inside the drag area, offering the information to each other. Once both have accepted to share the information, they'll add to their knowledge base all the rankings gathered (experienced or traded) from the other customer. This action is completely optional and voluntary, and customers have to decide whether or not to share their information in exchange for more accurate prestige rankings.

Simulation results. During the activity, each student can check his or her current score. The teacher can see an overall summary of the activity and can also enter any student icon to see the participant score. The teacher can modify the allowed products or required items as described in previous sections. Once enough time has passed or the activity is over, the teacher can finish the simulation and a overall summary is displayed on each device.

8. Discussion and Future Work

We believe that the most significant contribution of the work reported here is to provide a conceptual framework for applications of Participatory Simulations, which is easy to adapt to many subject-matter content knowledge and undergraduate curricular integration and encouraging the adoption of learner-centered strategies. The teachers, who pre-evaluate the application, suggest that the same technologies and ideas could be used across many subject matter areas. The design of effective learning environments of our conceptual framework have included (a) learner centered environment (learners construct their own meanings), (b) knowledge-centered environment (learners connect information into coherent wholes and embedding information in a context), (c) assessment-centered environment (learner use formative and summative assessment strategies and feedback), and (d) community-centered environments (learner work in collaborative learning norms). The next phase of our investigations will develop and explore more subject-specific applications and learning and motivational measures at the student level.

Acknowledgement

This paper was funded by fondecyt 1050601.

References

[1] G. Andrews, K.A. MacKinnon, and S. Yoon: "Using "Thinking Tags" with Kindergarten Children: A Dental Health Simulation", *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 2003, 19(2), 209-219.

[2] P. Alonzi, D. Lange and S. Betty: "An Innovative Approach in Teaching Futures: A Participatory Futures Trading Simulation," *Financial Practice and Education*, 2000, 10(1), 228-238.

[3] B. Castro and K. Weingarten: "Towards experimental economics", *Journal of Political Economy*, 78, 1970, 598-607.

[4] Chesney and E. Locke: "Relationships among goal difficulty, business strategies, and performance on a complex management simulation task", *Academy of Management Journal*, 1991, 34(2), 400-424.

[5] V. Colella. "Participatory simulations: Building collaborative understanding through immersive dynamic modeling". *Journal of the Learning Sciences* 9, 2000, 471-500.

[6] V. Colella, R. Borovoy, and M. Resnick: "Participatory simulations: Using computational objects to learn about dynamic Systems", *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1998, 9 - 10.

[7] G. Dai and H. Wang: "Physical Object Icons Buttons Gesture (PIBG): A new Interaction Paradigm with Pen", *Proceedings of CSCWD 2004*, LNCS 3168, 2005, 11-20.

[8] P. Guyot and A. Drogoul: "Designing multi-agent based participatory simulations", *Proceedings of 5th Workshop on Agent Based Simulations*, 2004, 32-37.

[9] K. Hinckley, P. Baudisch, G. Ramos, and F. Guimbretiere: "Design and Analysis of Delimiters for Selection-Action Pen Gesture Phrases in Scriboli", *Proceeding of CHI 2005*, ACM, 2005, 451-460.

[10] E. Klopfer, S. Yoon and J. Perry. "Using Palm Technology in Participatory Simulations of Complex Systems: A New Take on Ubiquitous and Accessible Mobile Computing", *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 14(3), 2005, 285-297.

[11] E. Klopfer, S. Yoon and L. Rivas. "Comparative analysis of Palm and wearable computers for Participatory Simulations", *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 20, 2004, 347-359.

[12] S. Kopf, N. Scheele, L. Winschel and W. Effelsberg: "Improving Activity and Motivation of Students with Innovative Teaching and Learning Technologies", *International Conference on Methods and Technologies for Learning (ICMTL)*, WIT press, Southampton, 2005, 551 - 556.

[13] J. Landay and B. Myers: "Sketching interfaces: Toward more human interface design", *IEEE Computer*, 34(3), 2001, 56-64.

[14] A. Long, J. Landay and L. Rowe: "PDA and gesture Use in Practice: Insights for Designers of Pen-based User Interfaces", Retrieved February, 2007 from <http://bmerc.berkeley.edu/research/publications/1997/142/clong.html>

[15] E. Soloway, C. Norris, P. Blumenfeld, B. Fishman and R. Marx: "Devices are Ready-at-Hand", *Communications of the ACM*, 2001, 44(6), 15-20.

[16] P. Vahey and V. Crawford. Palm Education Pioneers Program: Final Evaluation Report, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA, 2002.

[17] U. Wilensky and W. M. Stroup: "Learning through participatory simulations: Network-based design for systems learning in Classrooms", *Proceedings of the CSCL (CSCL'99)* (eds. C. Hoadley & J. Roschelle), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, 1999, 667-676.