

Niels Henze and Susanne Boll University of Oldenburg forename.lastname@uni-oldenburg.de

Static paper maps



http://www.zombiezodiac.com/rob/ped/archives/tokyo/maps_of_ne ighborhoods.html

Magic lens vs. dynamic peephole



Visualizing the off-screen for digital maps



[Henze et al. 2010]

Informal tests of different visualizations

Decided for a simple arrow-based approach

Arrows' orientation show the direction

Arrows' length show the distance



Implementaion

Phone's position in relation to "physical" map

- Large screen as physical map
- Phone's camera image transmitted to server
- Localization with ~10 fps

Visualization on physical map

- Plain map (dynamic peephole)
- Map and objects location (magic lens)

Augmentation

- Embedded coloured rectangles
- Arrows pointing at off-screen objects



65.00cm



User study

Independent variables

- Off-screen arrows vs. no visualization
- Dynamic peephole vs. magic lens

Tasks

- 1. Find and select the "greenest" object among 2-12 objects
- 2. Select all objects from green to red for 2,4, and 6 objects

Design & participants

- 12 Participants
- Four conditions
- Repeated measurement
- NASA TLX, completion time and error rate

Task completion time for task 1



No significant effect on the error rate

Off-screen visualization

- Reduces task completion time (p<0.01)</p>
- Reduces perceived task load (p<.01 & p<0.05)</p>
- Significant effects on individual NASA TLX scores are consistent with overall results

Dynamic peephole vs. magic lens

- No relevant differences found
- Small advantage for the magic lens

Conclusion & future work

Negligible difference between dynamic peephole and magic lens

- Compared to the improvement by an off-screen visualization
- At least for this concrete task

Investigation of more complex tasks needed

- If visual context is important
- Beyond 2D surfaces

Questions?