MULTIMODAL UX: SYNCHRONIZING VISUAL, AUDITORY, AND HAPTIC DESIGN FOR HUMAN CENTERED INTERFACES

***Chebotarova I.**, Senior Lecturer, MST Department, KNURE*
***Gnatovych V.**, Senior Product Designer, Reddit, San Francisco, California, USA*

***Abstract.** This thesis introduces the User-Centered Sensory Integration Framework (UCSIF) – a design approach that helps UX teams create multimodal experiences aligned with human perception, cognition, and cultural diversity. Synthesizing recent studies and real-world applications, it argues that well-integrated combinations of visual, auditory, and haptic feedback enhance task flow, emotional resonance, and accessibility. Examples from education, mobility, and assistive tech show how designers can harmonize sensory input to support, not overwhelm users.*

Digital interaction has long centered on the visual. From smartphones to dashboards, sound and touch have often been treated as secondary, add-ons rather than design fundamentals. But this doesn't reflect how humans naturally interpret the world. We make sense of actions through an ensemble of sensory cues – seeing, hearing, and feeling simultaneously. New technologies like spatial audio, haptics, and AI-driven personalization offer designers more tools. But simply layering modalities doesn't guarantee a better experience. Mismatched or excessive feedback can confuse and overwhelm. The key isn't just integration – it's cohesion.

To guide multimodal design, the User-Centered Sensory Integration Framework (UCSIF) outlines four core principles (table 1).

Table 1 – User-Centered Sensory Integration Framework (UCSIF)

Perceptual Alignment	Feedback should synchronize across channels in a way users expect. A tactile click, audible tone, and visual cue for a button press reinforce trust [1].
Cognitive Complementarity	Each modality should play to its strengths. Audio excels at capturing attention; haptics at delivering private, instantaneous feedback [2].
Cultural Calibration	Norms differ across regions. In German automotive testing, low-frequency haptics conveyed authority, while Japanese users preferred high-pitched tones for urgency [5].
Adaptive Accessibility	Interfaces should let users personalize or remap inputs to match their needs, whether compensating for impairments or situational constraints. Microsoft's SEE-IT toolkit, for instance, lets users convert visual content to audio or haptics, improving usability across groups [5].

In educational VR, tactile and auditory feedback bring abstract subjects to life. Imagine stretching a molecule and feeling resistance through haptics while spatial audio explains the structure, this embodied learning strengthens comprehension and retention beyond visual-only interfaces [3]. In mobility contexts, multimodal alerts enable safer decision-making, a driver might receive seat vibrations for lane departure, spatialized audio for navigation, and minimal visual prompts, all without shifting gaze. Proper coordination reduces cognitive load, poor alignment, by contrast, can increase stress [2].

Despite its benefits, multimodal design introduces friction. Development time grows, stakeholders may doubt ROI, and users sometimes resist non-visual feedback.

Teams need iterative testing and inclusive user research to validate long-term gains in usability and inclusion. Sensory overload is another risk, interfaces must allow for rhythm, rest, and control. Systems that adapt haptic or audio intensity based on heart rate or stress signals can be powerful, but only with full user consent and transparency [5].

The future lies in adaptive systems. AI models are beginning to tailor feedback based on interaction history, emotional state, or environmental conditions. Longitudinal studies are still needed to define safe limits of sensory exposure and inform ethical standards [6]. UCSIF contributes to this future by offering a flexible, human-centered model. While past frameworks like Norman's action cycle emphasize feedback loops, UCSIF expands this by explicitly including cultural and adaptive design constraints.

Multimodal UX isn't about turning every interface into a symphony of signals. It's about knowing when vision, sound, and touch together bring clarity, comfort, or connection. The UCSIF encourages designers to orchestrate sensory feedback with empathy, not just efficiency. When perceptual, cultural, and emotional dimensions align, digital experiences feel more intuitive, more personal, and more human.

References

1. Berger, C.C., et al. (2018). The Uncanny Valley of Haptics. Science Robotics. https://doi.org/10.1126/scirobotics.aar7010.
2. Melo, M., et al. (2022). Do Multisensory Stimuli Benefit the VR Experience? IEEE Transactions on Visualization. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9646307.
3. Yoshida, K.T., et al. (2023). Exploring Human Response Times to Multisensory Cues. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.17180.
4. Lloyd-Esenkaya, T., et al. (2020). Multisensory Inclusive Design. Cognitive Research. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-020-00232-7.
5. Azofeifa, J.D., et al. (2022). Systematic Review of Multimodal HCI. Sensors. https://doi.org/10.3390/s222413.
6. ACM SIGCHI Accessibility Guidelines (2024). https://sigchi.org/accessibility.
7. Діденко, М.В., & Вовк, О.В. (2020). Дослідження методів оцінки UX інтерфейсів нового покоління. Поліграфічні, мультимедійні та web-технології. Т. 2. (с. 128-130).
8. Глюза, М., & Вовк, О. (2024). Основи UX-research. Інформаційні технології в сучасному світі: дослідження молодих вчених. (с. 112).
9. Чеботарьова, І.Б., & Черкашина, Г.І. (2024). Основні тренди UI/UX дизайну 2024 року. Поліграфічні, мультимедійні та web-технології. Т. 2. (с. 40-47).
10. Заворуєва, Ю.Л., & Чеботарьова І.Б. (2021). Дизайн сайту як спосіб залучення уваги споживача. Поліграфічні, мультимедійні та web-технології. Т. 2. (с. 98-100).
11. Вовк, О.В., & Чусь, В.В. (2024). Роль ергономіки у створенні ефективних інтерфейсів. Поліграфічні, мультимедійні та web-технології. Т. 1. (с. 199-200).
12. Chus, V., & Vovk, O. (2023). The impact of using the principles of human interface guidelines (HIG) on the time spent by users in a mobile application. Collection of scientific papers «ΛΌГОΣ». (p. 144-145).