

*Commenced Publication in 1973*

Founding and Former Series Editors:

Gerhard Goos, Juris Hartmanis, and Jan van Leeuwen

## Editorial Board

David Hutchison

*Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK*

Takeo Kanade

*Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA*

Josef Kittler

*University of Surrey, Guildford, UK*

Jon M. Kleinberg

*Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA*

Alfred Kobsa

*University of California, Irvine, CA, USA*

Friedemann Mattern

*ETH Zurich, Zürich, Switzerland*

John C. Mitchell

*Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA*

Moni Naor

*Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel*

Oscar Nierstrasz

*University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland*

C. Pandu Rangan

*Indian Institute of Technology, Madras, India*

Bernhard Steffen

*TU Dortmund University, Dortmund, Germany*

Demetri Terzopoulos

*University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA*

Doug Tygar

*University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA*

Gerhard Weikum

*Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarbruecken, Germany*

For further volumes:

<http://www.springer.com/series/7409>

Achim Ebert · Gerrit C. van der Veer  
Gitta Domik · Nahum D. Gershon  
Inga Scheler (Eds.)

# Building Bridges: HCI, Visualization, and Non-formal Modeling

IFIP WG 13.7 Workshops  
on Human–Computer Interaction and Visualization:  
7th HCIV@ECCE 2011  
Rostock, Germany, August 23, 2011, and  
8th HCIV@INTERACT 2011  
Lisbon, Portugal, September 5, 2011  
Revised Selected Papers

*Editors*

Achim Ebert  
Inga Scheler  
University of Kaiserslautern  
Kaiserslautern  
Germany

Gerrit C. van der Veer  
Open University The Netherlands  
Heerlen  
The Netherlands

Gitta Domik  
University of Paderborn  
Paderborn  
Germany

Nahum D. Gershon  
The MITRE Corporation  
McLean, VA  
USA

ISSN 0302-9743

ISBN 978-3-642-54893-2

DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-54894-9

Springer Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

ISSN 1611-3349 (electronic)

ISBN 978-3-642-54894-9 (eBook)

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014936290

LNCS Sublibrary: SL3 – Information Systems and Applications, incl. Internet/Web and HCI

© IFIP International Federation for Information Processing 2014

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (<http://www.springer.com>)

# **Building Bridges – From Non-formal Modeling to HCI and Visualization**

In 2011, two HCIV workshops took place at renowned conferences. HCIV is a new major program in Human–Computer Interaction and Visualization. The aim of this initiative is to establish a study and research program that will combine the knowledge of both the science and the practice in the fields of human–computer interaction and visualization. From 2009, HCIV [1] is an official working group of the IFIP Technical Committee on Human–Computer Interaction (TC13). The first workshop at ECCE 2011 [2] focused on “Non-formal Modeling for Interaction Design.” The second one was held at INTERACT 2011 [3] with the main topic “Building Bridges—HCI and Visualization.” Proposals for both workshops were successfully submitted to the two conferences. After acceptance, the workshops were advertised on academic email lists and on a special website. The submissions to our workshops were made in the form of extended abstracts and carefully reviewed by the organizers. During the workshops the authors presented their work in short talks followed by intense discussions. Furthermore, two very inspiring keynote talks were given by Mary Czerwinski (Microsoft Research, Redmond, USA) and Bob Spence (Imperial College London, UK). In a final discussion, all participants agreed that the topics definitely deserve a visible platform for presenting the single ideas and contributions to the research communities involved in this field. The idea to publish two books based on the outcomes was born. However, after the two fruitful workshops took place, we – the organizers – found that both workshops, despite their contrasting research topics, were very similar in their results and take-away messages. Thus, it seems that (non-formal) modeling, HCI, and visualization are more tightly connected than the literature and conferences imply. Clearly missing are the bridges connecting these important research fields. We hope that this book will help build some of these bridges, allowing us to explore new horizons.

## **Non-formal Modeling**

If modeling is included in the requirements analysis phase of a systematic interaction design method, it mostly focuses on some kind of formalism, e.g., task modeling and requirements specification. However, when designing in collaboration with nonexpert stakeholders this will not work. On the other hand, it is exactly this creative collaboration between stakeholders and designers in a very early design phase which allows us to explore and consider new solutions before these need to be prototyped or implemented.

Non-formal modeling tools and techniques for early collaboration with stakeholders [like sketching, (paper) prototyping, and storytelling] are relatively cheap and, on the other hand, uniquely stimulating techniques for identifying both the boundaries and the opportunities of the design space for interactive systems.

Using visuals, however, is not without pitfalls. Designers who communicate with stakeholders should be aware of how humans perceive and understand. The human visual system, the “mind’s eye,” relies in large part on the eye and on the processing and the interpretation of the information processed by the brain. Visual design utilizes both. Additional care must be taken to present and highlight important information. Thus, at least a basic knowledge of perceptual and cognitive issues is needed to avoid a poor usage of different features in visual design.

One of the main issues is drawing a user’s attention to where it is needed. Here, the so-called preattentive processing, the step that occurs before the attention of the user is concentrated on the visual image, plays an important role. Preattentive processing is performed automatically on the entire visual field detecting basic features of objects in the display. It is done quickly, effortlessly, and in parallel and can therefore greatly improve the intuitiveness of representations. It is a strong instrument for enabling a fast and natural way of acquiring information.

One of the key elements of preattentive processing is the theory of visual or retinal variables, which can be compared effortlessly [4]. Bertin identified eight visual variables: form, orientation, color, texture, value, size, and position (position counted twice). In addition, he divides the characteristics of perception of visual variables into four groups: associative, selective, ordered, and quantitative perception. The knowledge of visual variables and their perception criteria is essential for an intuitive, user-centered interaction design.

All the above-described techniques have in fact been elaborated, and sources as well as resources are available. Teaching design students how to locate and apply them in a creative way strengthens their ability to develop user-centered solutions from the start.

A key problem of visual design in public services and applications is the lack of time and money. The lack of time means stakeholders cannot invest enough time to develop a formal model to define the design process because they are stuck in their principal tasks. The lack of money leads to short-term design processes without having enough time for evaluation. On the other hand, stakeholders mostly cannot really outline their needs because they are often non-professional users, and thus are not able to clearly define their requirements. In fact the design is done based on rare information about requirements followed by the implementation of a rough model as end result. The non-professional users need intuitive, self-explaining systems. If we do not meet this interest, users will not accept a system. Therefore, an important and crucial step is to identify their special needs by involving the users in design decisions. This results in the need of non-formal modeling processes to achieve reasonable results.

Therefore, we need a way to reach an optimized model in interactive design based on the specified needs of the stakeholders. One possible solution might be a more or less “online” evaluation. Once the implementation of different methods has started, the stakeholders have to be involved in the design process by evaluating the current results. This means the implementation has to be based on perceptual and cognitive issues following the steps of the well-known evaluation cycle [5] in a very condensed way. This kind of evaluation tailored for the stakeholders leads to a faster correction of possible faults within the development phase. Implementing a new design method with an immediate evaluation and response by the stakeholders themselves yields an

“online” evaluation to reach the users’ desires. While evaluating one method, the next method can be implemented. This leads to a user-specified and convenient visual design.

This way is less time consuming because in the beginning some coarse requirements are sufficient to get started. During the design process, it always takes a few minutes to define the next steps because the users get a visual impression of their ideas. Another advantage is to get a visual result of what might be the final result in an early project stage.

## Visualization and HCI

Whenever discussing the relationship between HCI and visualization in general or when presenting research results in these areas, questions arise about the differences between these research fields. Are not both fields just the same? And if not, where is the common ground? Can we combine the separate viewpoints and paradigms in a unified and complementary approach, or are we forced to choose one or the other? How can we give the general public (the developers and users of visualization and HCI and the engineers implementing our designs) a precise and practical enough idea about what is happening in these fields and what is not? What are the consequences of the answers on the previous questions: how and what should we teach? What will be the future? This dilemma is a topic of frequent discussion around the water cooler, lecture halls, as well as in the boardroom.

One of the major issues is that it is not easy to precisely define the terms visualization and HCI and there are many interpretations of these two fields that appear to be distinct.

ACM SIGCHI tries to give people a working definition for HCI: “Human–computer interaction is a discipline concerned with the design, evaluation and implementation of interactive computing systems for human use and with the study of major phenomena surrounding them” [6]. However, at the same time the applicability of this definition is significantly limited by adding that it “at least permits us to get down to the practical work of deciding what is to be taught.”

Similar imprecise descriptions can be found for visualization. One possibility is the classic definition given by ACM SIGGRAPH: “visualization is [...] the formation of mental visual images, the act or process of interpreting in visual terms or of putting into visual form” [7], although the visualization subcommittee of the SIGGRAPH Education Committee in 1997 provided an alternative: “A computer generated image or collection of images, possibly ordered, using a computer representation of data as its primary source and a human as its primary target” [8]. Foley [9], in 1994, states: “A useful definition of visualization might be the binding (or mapping) of data to a representation that can be perceived. The types of binding could be visual, auditory, tactile, etc. or a combination of these.” Kosara [10] tries to better conceptualize the term visualization by defining some criteria forming a minimal set of requirements for any visualization: “Visualization is based on (non-visual) data, produces an image, and results in a readable and recognizable output.” Finally, some definitions approach

the concept from the point of view of computing: “Visualization is a method of computing. It transforms the symbolic into the geometric, enabling researchers to observe their simulations and computations. Visualization offers a method for seeing the unseen. It enriches the process of scientific discovery and fosters profound and unexpected insights. In many fields it is already revolutionizing the way scientists do science” [11].

As mentioned, questioning similarities, differences, and correlations of HCI and visualization forms an important part of our daily work life. In order to better (or at all) answer these questions, questions like the ones listed below need to be discussed and – if possible – answered:

- What is HCI? What is visualization? What is a working description that is practical for highlighting the special features of each of the fields as well as supporting mutual understanding between them?
- Are there other disciplines involved in this struggle (e.g., visual analytics)?
- How can we take advantage of the two fields and how can we find ways for people with different inclinations to collaborate and take advantage of the strengths of each other?
- What are the similarities of the disciplines? What are the major differences?
- Do we need to really split the domains? Or do we need to join them and provide a joint curriculum for studying and practicing them?
- Can we give definitions that are better applicable in real situations?

Does one need to further research ways of making people take advantage of both disciplines in designing interactive visual systems? In that case, what are the research agenda(s) and what are the top 10 research challenges?

In the current volume, we provide some visions from scholars in these fields, working at – or across – the borders between these fields. Their work may point to possible directions to answer our questions, and will help in the understanding and developing of a holistic cross-discipline.

February 2014

Achim Ebert  
Gerrit C. van der Veer  
Gitta Domik  
Nahum Gershon  
Inga Scheler

## References

1. HCI & Visualization (HCIV, IFIP WG 13.7). <http://www.hciv.de>
2. Dittmar, A., Forbrig, P. (eds.): ECCE 2011 - European Conference on Cognitive Ergonomics. In: Proceedings of the 29th Annual Conference of the European Association of Cognitive Ergonomics. ACM (2011)
3. Campos, P., Graham, N., Jorge, J., Nunes, N., Palanque, P., Winckler, M. (eds.): INTERACT 2011, Part I. LNCS, vol. 6946. Springer, Heidelberg (2011)
4. Bertin, J.: *Sémiologie Graphique. Les diagrammes, les réseaux, les cartes.* Mouton/Gauthier-Villars (1967)
5. Kerren, A., Ebert, A., Meyer, J.: *Human-Centered Visualization Environments.* Springer, Heidelberg (2007)
6. Hewett, T., Baecker, R., Card, S., Carey, T., Gasen, J., Mantei, M., Perlman, G., Strong, G., Verplank, W.: ACM SIGCHI Curricula for Human-Computer Interaction; Chapter 2: Human-Computer Interaction. Last updated in 2009
7. ACM SIGGRAPH: Definitions and Rationale for Visualization. Last updated in 1999
8. Domik G.: Computer-generated Visualization 1. Introduction to Visualization (2008). [www.cs.uni-paderborn.de/fileadmin/Informatik/AG-Domik/VisCurriculum/pdf/introduction.pdf](http://www.cs.uni-paderborn.de/fileadmin/Informatik/AG-Domik/VisCurriculum/pdf/introduction.pdf). Accessed 14 March 2011
9. Foley, J., Ribarsky, B.: Next-generation data visualization tools. In: Rosenblum, L., Earnshaw, R.A., Encarnacao, J., Hagen, H., Kaufman, A., Klimenko, S., Nielson, G., Post, F., Thalmann, D. (eds.) *Scientific Visualization, Advances and Challenges.* Academic Press, New York (1994)
10. Kosara, R.: Visualization criticism – the missing link between information visualization and art. In: Proceedings of the 11th International Conference Information Visualization (2007)
11. McCormick, B.H., DeFanti, T.A., Brown, M.D.: Visualization in Scientific Computing. *Comput. Graph.* **21**(6), 3 (1987)



# Workshop Organization

## **Achim Ebert**<sup>1,2</sup>

University of Kaiserslautern  
Gottlieb-Daimler-Straße, 67663 Kaiserslautern  
Germany  
ebert@cs.uni-kl.de

## **Gerrit C. van der Veer**<sup>1,2</sup>

Open University The Netherlands  
Valkenburgerweg 177, 6419 AT Heerlen  
The Netherlands  
gerrit@acm.org

## **Gitta Domik**<sup>2</sup>

University of Paderborn  
Fürstenallee 11, 33102 Paderborn  
Germany  
domik@uni-paderborn.de

## **Nahum Gershon**<sup>2</sup>

The MITRE Corp.  
7515 Colshire Drive, McLean, VA 22102-7508  
USA  
gershon@mitre.org

## **Inga Scheler**<sup>1</sup>

University of Kaiserslautern  
Gottlieb-Daimler-Straße, 67663 Kaiserslautern  
Germany  
scheler@rhrk.uni-kl.de

<sup>1</sup> Organizer of the 7<sup>th</sup> HCIV workshop on “Non-formal Modelling for Interaction Design” held at the 29<sup>th</sup> ECCE conference, 2011.

<sup>2</sup> Organizer of the 8<sup>th</sup> HCIV workshop on “Building Bridges – HCI and Visualization” held at the 13<sup>th</sup> INTERACT conference, 2011.

# Contents

## **Building Bridges: HCI and Visualization (INTERACT 2011)**

Teaching Information Visualization via Creative Design . . . . .	3
<i>Bob Spence</i>	
Learning HCI and InfoVis in the Open . . . . .	8
<i>Erik Duval, Gonzalo Parra, Jose Luis Santos, Sam Agten, Sven Charleer, and Joris Klerkx</i>	
How to Investigate Interaction with Information Visualisation: An Overview of Methodologies . . . . .	17
<i>Margit Pohl and Florian Scholz</i>	
A Participatory Perspective on Cross-Cultural Design . . . . .	30
<i>Kasper Rodil</i>	
Recognizing Complexity: Visualization for Skilled Professionals in Complex Work Situations . . . . .	47
<i>Arne W. Andersson, Anders Jansson, Bengt Sandblad, and Simon Tschirner</i>	
Applying CTA to the Design of SA-Oriented Visualizations: Heuristics and Recommendations . . . . .	67
<i>Rosa Romero, Sara Tena, David Díez, and Paloma Díaz</i>	
Cognitive Ergonomics in Visualization . . . . .	80
<i>Michael Raschke, Tanja Blascheck, and Thomas Ertl</i>	
Perception or Pixels – Designing a Visual World from the User’s Point of View . . . . .	95
<i>Els Rogier, Gerrit C. van der Veer, Laura Benvenuti, and Teresa Consiglio</i>	
Patterns in the Clouds - The Effects of Clustered Presentation on Tag Cloud Interaction . . . . .	124
<i>Johann Schrammel and Manfred Tscheligi</i>	

## **Building Bridges: Non-formal Modeling (ECCE 2011)**

Non-formal Techniques for Early Assessment of Design Ideas for Services . . .	135
<i>Gerrit C. van der Veer and Dhaval Vyas</i>	

We Need Non-formal Methods Based on Formal Models  
in Interaction Design. . . . . 150  
*Andreas Maier and Steffen Hess*

Verbal Use Case Specifications for Informal Requirements Elicitation . . . . . 165  
*Eliezer Kantorowitz*

Software Design and New Media Design. . . . . 175  
*Geert de Haan*

A Documentation-Centred Approach to Software Design,  
Development and Deployment . . . . . 188  
*Brigit van Loggem and Gerrit C. van der Veer*

eCITY: Evolutionary Software Architecture Visualization – An Evaluation . . . . . 201  
*Taimur Khan, Henning Barthel, Liliana Guzman,  
Achim Ebert, and Peter Liggesmeyer*

**Author Index** . . . . . 225