

Usability Evaluation of Accessible Complex Graphs

Dimitris Spiliotopoulos, Despoina Antonakaki,
Sotiris Ioannidis, Paraskevi Fragopoulou

Distributed Computing Systems, Institute of Computer Science
Foundation for Research and Technology – Hellas, Heraklion, Greece
{dspiliot, despoina, sotiris, fragopou}@ics.forth.gr

Abstract. This work explores the use of speech enabled complex graphs that are designed to enable non-technical users to edit and appraise visually complex semantic structures. The standard usability evaluation that was performed previously, employed young, computer-literate participants that were familiar with such concepts and tools. We report on the findings of how technically-savvy and technically challenged users experience the different modalities, make choices and identify each modality advantages and shortcomings as well as the ability of each user group to optimally exploit modality combination paths.

Keywords: speech enabled graph, usability, accessibility, non-technical users.

1 Introduction

Visualization of data is used abundantly to convey complex semantic meaning [9] and facilitate data exploration [14]. As part of the latest data-driven visualization approaches, storytelling is also based on the visualization using descriptive complex design [11].

Auditory feedback was used successfully for the simple math graph [2] and more complex visual chart [3] accessibility for visually impaired users, as well as combination of haptic and auditory feedback [16]. Other approaches used natural language generation for fine tuned speech rendering of complex visual objects, such as graphs [4]. Evaluating such approaches constitutes a similarly challenging task, leading to works exploring ways to enable the user-driven design and usability evaluation of technologies for accessibility [1].

This work examines a domain of high societal impact that potentially affects all citizens of the democratic world. Policy modelling utilizes moderated crowdsourcing argumentation from social media that can enable policy makers and other users to visualize the citizen opinion. Policy models are represented and visualized as relational graphs, semantically linking policy components, entities and arguments with sentiment, the latter mined from social media [12]. Related works examined design considerations for creating effectively usable tools using social media data [5] and sentiment [8].

Dedicated e-participation and e-government tools designed for modelling policies present unique advantages to the policy makers [6,10]. However, evaluations showed

tion they deemed optimal. The aim was to examine whether the choices of the two groups aligned and their feedback on the usability differentiated between them. Both groups were given ample time to familiarize with the interface, functionalities, the modalities and speech commands. The interaction of each participant were logged, including timestamps, providing interactional data for validation.

3 Results and Evaluation

The NTS group needed on average roughly twice the time to familiarize with the interface. The speech modality consistently took less time to familiarize with than the visual, the former averaging a 30% longer than the TSN group, while the latter about 80% longer on average. For simpler tasks (e.g. adding a new node) each user group opted for different modality as their main choice. Tasks considered as less complex were treated in a uniform manner, involving both modalities for optimal interaction. However, concrete differences were observed when the complexity of the graphs increased. The TSN group explored four times more possible combinations to achieve optimal results, mainly in understanding and keeping up with the graph semantic complexity (e.g. deciding where to link a new policy component).

The NTS group insisted on making themselves more involved with selected choices, identifying themselves as the factor that hindered their progress rather than the interface. Content creation was differentiated heavily between the two groups. The TSN participants followed a path of creating very descriptive, long texts that resulted in more cluttered graphs. The NTS group, with their expertise in paper and pen approach limited by the size of the paper itself, introduced abbreviation and provided feedback as to how that abbreviation should be part of the interface, essentially partially overcoming the visual modality disadvantage.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the FP7 Marie-Curie ITN iSocial funded by the EC under grant agreement no 316808.

References

1. Bigham, J. P., & Murray, K. (2010). WebTrax: visualizing non-visual web interactions. In *Computers Helping People with Special Needs*, pp. 346-353. Springer.
2. Choi, S. H., & Walker, B. N. (2010). *Digitizer auditory graph: making graphs accessible to the visually impaired*. Proceedings from CHI'10 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems, pp. 3445-3450.
3. Elzer, S., Schwartz, E., Carberry, S., Chester, D., Demir, S., & Wu, P. (2008). *Accessible bar charts for visually impaired users*. Proceedings from Fourth Annual IASTED Intl. Conf. on Telehealth and Assistive Technologies, pp. 55-60.

4. Ferres, L., Lindgaard, G., & Sumegi, L. (2010). *Evaluating a Tool for Improving Accessibility to Complex Visual Objects*. Proceedings from 12th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility.
5. Jung, H., Hong, S. R., Meas, P., & Zachry, M. (2015). *Designing tools to support advanced users in new forms of social media interaction*. Proceedings from 33rd Annual International Conference on the Design of Communication.
6. Kamateri, E., Panopoulou, E., Tambouris, E., Tarabanis, K., Ojo, A., Lee, D., Price, D. (2015). A comparative analysis of tools and technologies for policy making. In *Policy Practice and Digital Science*, pp. 125-156. Springer.
7. Koliba C., Zia A. (2015). Educating Public Manager and Policy Analysts in the Era of Informatics. In: M. Janssen, M. A. Wimmer, & A. Deljoo, *Policy Practice and Digital Science – Integrating Complex Systems, Social Simulation and Public Administration in Policy Research*, pp 15-34, Berlin, Springer Verlag.
8. McGuire, M., & Kampf, C. (2015). *Using social media sentiment analysis for interaction design choices: an exploratory framework*. Proceedings from 33rd Annual International Conference on the Design of Communication.
9. Olshannikova, E., Ometov, A., Koucheryavy, Y., & Olsson, T. (2015). Visualizing Big Data with augmented and virtual reality: challenges and research agenda. *Journal Of Big Data*, 2(1), 1-27.
10. Ruppert, T., Bernard, J., & Kohlhammer, J. (2013). Bridging Knowledge Gaps in Policy Analysis with Information Visualization. *EGOV/ePart Ongoing Research*, 221, 92-103.
11. Segel, E., & Heer, J. (2010). Narrative visualization: Telling stories with data. *Visualization and Computer Graphics*, IEEE Transactions on, 16(6), 1139-1148.
12. Spiliotopoulos, D., Dalianis, A., Koryzis, D. (2014): Need driven Prototype Design for a Policy Modeling Authoring Interface, HCI (27) 2014: 162-166, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
13. Spiliotopoulos, D., Dalianis, A., Koryzis, D. (2015): Speech Enabled Ontology Graph Navigation and Editing. Proc. 9th International Conference, UAHCI 2015, LNCS 9175, pp. 487-494, Los Angeles, CA, USA, 2-7 August, 2015.
14. Stevens, J.-L. R., Rudiger, P., & Bednar, J. A. (2010). HoloViews: Building Complex Visualizations Easily for Reproducible Science.
15. Tambouris E., Dalakiouridou E., Panopoulou E., and Tarabanis K. (2011) Evaluation of an Argument Visualisation Platform by Experts and Policy Makers. In E. Tambouris, A. Macintosh and H. de Bruijn (Eds.): ePart 2011, LNCS 6847, pp. 73–84.
16. Yu, W., Ramloll, R., & Brewster, S. (2001). Haptic graphs for blind computer users. In *Haptic human-computer interaction*, pp. 41-51. Springer.
17. Wöckl, B., Yildizoglu, U., Buber, I., Aparicio Diaz, B., Kruijff, E., & Tscheligi, M. (2012). Basic senior personas: a representative design tool covering the spectrum of European older adults. Proceedings from 14th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 25-32.