

Karen Schrier

*Article One:*

At first I evaluated the galvactivator in terms of its possibility for measuring engagement. I thought about the unreliability of lie detector tests in terms of measuring a specific state. The experiment brought up a number of questions. Could a test on skin conductivity measure engagement in any meaningful way? For example, could it be measuring engagement with a computer program, when anger or frustration could be affecting it? Are you deeply engaged if you are very angry at a computer?

I also was initially curious about whether the researchers would ask the participants if they knew that the galvactivator was being activated. In other words, were they subjectively aware that they were aroused? In terms of deep engagement, then, is it more or less likely that someone is deeply engaged if they are aware of their state?

After finishing the article, however, I had a new set of questions. I wondered if the important aspect of the galvactivator is that it is providing feedback to the user. The user is then able to more deeply understand his or her engagement with an experience or other people. The galvactivator encourages the user to reflect on his engagement. Does this mean that the user can more deeply engage with the experience, or does this provide a way to step outside of the experience and not be as deeply engaged in it? In terms of learning, would a person learn more if he or she was deeply engaged, or would learning be enhanced if a person was slightly outside of their experience and able to be more reflective of it.

On a side note, I thought there should be a better way to capture the aggregate audience response to different aspects of the program. For example, the galvactivator could be wirelessly feeding data into a common place from each participant, and then aggregating the data over time.

*Article Two:*

I like that the researchers do not try to imagine what is going on inside the participant in terms of their inner emotional state. Instead, they try to look at patterns of postures, and changes in movement, and categorize them in general terms. Then, with this information, they can look at these patterns over time and predict whether certain posture patterns occur with or predict boredom or other affective states. I can see how looking at this data and then monitoring these patterns could help a computer program alter its content or its interactions with the user to make it more engaging for the user.

In terms of using this to measure deep engagement, we would first need to examine what exactly the posture patterns are measuring. Does the "high interest" posture pattern describe deep engagement? What are the other components of deep engagement that we would need to monitor to make a more accurate reading? How might posture patterns interact with other physiological or behavioral traits that we can measure, to create a more holistic picture of deep engagement? As an addendum to this experiment, I am interested in seeing a comparison of the activities of the computer program versus aggregate patterns of posture behavior. This is similar to what the researchers did in the first article, where they looked at the aggregate brightness level of the sensors from the audience, and then matched it to the activities of the symposium. Then, we can see whether there are similarities among respondents to the same stimuli. Researchers can also expand the experiment by asking the user to qualitatively evaluate the tasks of the computer program, to examine whether people's own judgments of the tasks match their posture shifts.