From Perception to Abstraction with Interaction and Visualization

Miguel A. Nacenta (nacenta@uvic.ca)
@ DFP, UBC – January 2021

Collaborators



Michael Mauderer



Gonzalo Mendez



Julian Petford



Xu Zhu



Simone Conte







Alexandra Lee







Guilherme Carneiro Constant Manteau Sheelagh Carpendale Joh



John Brosz





Uta Hinrichs



Alice Toniolo



Özgür Akgün



Christophe Hurter









Dhanraj Vishwanath Pete Nightingale Daniel Archambault Dave Flatla

Alice Lynch

Brief Personal Introduction





Victoria Interactive eXperiences with Information





Sowmya Somanath Charles Perin

Miguel Nacenta

Territorial acknowledgements

- I *acknowledge* with respect the Lekwungen peoples on whose traditional *territory* the *University of Victoria* stands, and the Songhees, Esquimalt and WSÁNEĆ peoples whose historical relationships with the *land* continue to this day.
- I feel grateful for working and living in this beautiful place full of history.
- I also acknowledge that the UBC Point Grey campus, from where this virtual seminary is being organized, sits on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territory of the Musqueam people.

Goals

- Show you something that you find useful
- Show you something that you find fun/entertaining
- Preview some of my research interests (with an eye on collaboration)

Deepview





Stereoscopic *≠* Two eyes (binocular)









mm

Photo by Thomas Gehrke License : CC BY-NC-ND 2.0

Simulating the eye's accommodation

































Experiment 1 - Results



- Significant distinction between conditions in non-catch trials (S1-S7)
- No distinction in catch trials (S8-S11)

Experiment 2 - Description







- Contributes to impression of depth and realism
- Contains *some* usable information about depth
- But information is limited and viewer dependant

GaZeR Application

- Open Source, downloadable
- Tobii EyeX
 - ╋
- Lytro Images

GAZER

Application to view gaze-contingent images, e.g., images with variable depth-of-field created from Lytro images.

Features

- support for Tobii EyeX eye tracker
- importer for Lytro ILLUM images.
- Saving and loading of optimised custom file format that allows easy sharing of images with gaze-contingent depth-of-field.
- · export and import of Image Stacks (combination of DOF slices and a depth map)

Usage

Running the UI from source requires the requirements described in the requirements.txt and the location of the Tobii.EyeX.Client.dll to be specified in the EYEX_LIB_PATH environment variable or be in the working dir the script is started from. We recommend setting it to '../lib' and putting the dll into the corresponding top level lib folder.

Example Images



Gaze-dependent Gamut Expansion







Can we use gaze-contingent simultaneous contrast ?

Can we use this to enhance the ability to discriminate colors?

Experiment 1 - Stimuli



Non-hardware enhancement of perceived Gamut









Can we use gaze-contingent simultaneous contrast ?

Can we use this to enhance the ability to discriminate colors?

But it is tricky...

FatFonts

Representation in Visualization

47	62	74	85	92	94
34	49	64	77	87	93
22	37	53	68	80	90
13	27	43	58	72	83
7	18	33	48	62	74
4	12	24	38	51	63
4	8	17	28	39	50
5	5	11	20	28	37
8	5	8	13	19	25
11	7	7	10	13	16
16	10	9	10	10	10
22	16	14	14	12	9
29	24	22	22	18	13








http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Same_color_illusion_proof2.png



http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Same_color_illusion_proof2.png



What are FatFonts?

(23456789)

FatFonts

DALS		(2332)	22233320))))555555
)))))))))) 5555))))) 665555555)	((((22) 22 (223) 32 2233	222333 333333 443344	33334444 4444444 55555555	4333332223 443343333 443344333
22233222344 22233333344 22233334445	333334 443344 554445	555555 5555555 555544	55555555 55555444 4444444	443334333 433333322 332222222
32223444544 333344444444 433444443333	454455 44444 334444	5544 33 444 33 3333333	3333433 33333333 33333344	3332222222 33333332222 444443322
333444332233 333333222323 3322222233222	333333 333333 3333332 3333322	3333333 223332 2223322	2233445	5666665433 6 78876 543 7899765 43
332233322222 333233322222 3332233322222			2233455 2233455 2233445	789975432 789875432 627765432
			(CC3344) (C22334) (C22334)	220024266 44444366(2333332226)
))))55)5555)))55)555555)))555555555				
222222222 522222222 52222222222		((Ç ((
				7 7

FatFonts: How They Work

Nesting



FatFonts: How They Work

Nesting

623456780



Transmogrifiers

Matthew Paris







To Transmogrify To transform in a magical way

-	the second	and and a state of the			A CONTRACTOR OF THE	
-	(PRORIS)	Pome:				
						And the second second
(
1.						
and the second						
111						

-	the second	and and a state of the			A CONTRACTOR OF THE	
-	(PRORIS)	Pome:				
						And the second second
(
1.						
and the second						
111						



D



D







iVolver

Submissions and Reviewing?

ow that the submission and review process is complete, is interesting to take a look at the numbers. This year, er the review process, we asked the ACs to characterize e papers as either a WiP, LBW, or Other (they could en add a comment as to why they deemed it an Other). ey could also choose more than one option. In total, Ws had 647 submissions. Of the 647 submitted, 281 %) were accepted. Table 1 is the breakdown of those missions by type and Table 2 is the breakdown of type Accept/Reject.

submissions we received clearly tended to favor k-in-progress, but we also had a substantial number of -breaking work as well. There does seem to be a clear id that work-in-progress were more likely to be reject



Submissions and Reviewing?

w that the submission and review process is complete, is interesting to take a look at the numbers. This year, or the review process, we asked the ACs to characterize or papers as either a WiP, LBW, or Other (they could on add a comment as to why they deemed it an Other). ey could also choose more than one option. In total, Ws had 647 submissions. Of the 647 submitted, 281 6%) were accepted. Table 1 is the breakdown of those sumsions by type and Table 2 is the breakdown of type Accept/Reject.

submissions we received clearly tended to favor in-progress, but we also had a substantial number of breaking work as well. There does seem to be a clear





Submissions and Reviewing?

w that the submission and review process is complete, is interesting to take a look at the numbers. This year, or the review process, we asked the ACs to characterize or papers as either a WiP, LBW, or Other (they could in add a comment as to why they deemed it an Other). ey could also choose more than one option. In total, Ws had 647 submissions. Of the 647 submitted, 281 e%) were accepted. Table 1 is the breakdown of those symissions by type and Table 2 is the breakdown of type Accept/Reject.

submissions we received clearly tended to favor to in-progress, but we also had a substantial number of breaking work as well. There does seem to be a clear







orth Col-North



1



orth Col-North



1

Final construction



Two aspects of note

• Capture data from where it is



• Support personal visual representations



Constructive Visualization (Huron et al., 2014) Understanding Data Manipulation and Comprehension



(Méndez et al., 2016)

Result of many small-scale decisions and manipulations

Visualization is incrementally generated

Lower level access: data points



Attribute-level operations

Overall mapping between attributes and visuals first

Customization later

Top-down



Grammel, L., Bennett, C., Tory, M., & Storey, M. A. (2013). A survey of visualization construction user interfaces. *EuroVis-Short Papers*, 19–23.

Bottom-up vs. Top-down: Trade-offs in Efficiency, Understanding, Freedom and Creativity with InfoVis Tools (CHI 2017)

Pilot

In-classroom study

11 students of an introductory InfoVis university course



Within subjects design with visualization non-experts Controlled environment with interviews

Data and Analysis



Qualitative analysis



Benefits

Limitations





More automated Rapid exploration

Tool-driven design Reduced transparency



User-driven Transparent Repetitive / Tedious Do not scale

Some interesting results

- Depth of understanding
 - Top-down is often "mindless"
- Authorship
 - What people said about their own designs "I did" vs "the system did"
- Variety
 - Bottom-up designs were less constrained and more varied


Important trade-offs

Bottom-up (constructive)

- Slow, effortful
- Sense of authorship
- More open
- More transparent

Top-bottom (currently dominant)

- Scalable
- Quick and agile
- Sometimes "mindless"

Research Question

How to design bottom-up visualization tools that are also scalable? (bringing together the best of both approaches)

Considering Agency and Data Granularity in the Design of Visualization Tools (CHI 2018)

How do you get from one to the other?





Automated Iteration

Collective Proxy Objects



Abstraction

Automated Principled Design



Automated Choices







Dimensions

Who carries out the process?





Designer



Selecting the visualization type Data transformations Visual mappings





Dimensions

Agency

Granularity

What do designers have access to?

Visualization







Attributes

Database

Tables



Small multiples

Visual representations

Mark

Design Space



Design Space



Research Directions

Going more cognitive

- How do people actually get to understanding from visuals?
- Applied to Constraint Programming (has lots of practical applications)
- What do people come up with visually when representing *problems* rather than data or solutions?

S E N D RΕ Μ + ΝΕΥ Μ

Word Crypto

9 8 Subsum Set

Set: 1, -3, 5, 6, -2, 5, -7



→15

→15

→15

Calendar





Magic Square





Understanding How People Graphically Model (Constraint) Problems

- Study of how people graphically represent problems (as opposed to data)
- Semiotic analysis of graphical elements and problem description constructs





★ 🖪 🐯 V 🗔 🗉 😂 👽 🌧 ி Incognito 🗄







Net migration to the UK from

countries autoide the European





Dynamic Network Plaid



References

- 1. Manteau, C., Nacenta, M. & Mauderer, M. Reading Small Scalar Data Fields: Color Scales vs. Detail on Demand vs. FatFonts. in *Proceedings of the 43rd Graphics Interface Conference* 50–56 (Canadian Human-Computer Communications Society, 2017).
- 2. Nacenta, M., Hinrichs, U. & Carpendale, S. FatFonts: combining the symbolic and visual aspects of numbers. in *Proceedings of the International Working Conference on Advanced Visual Interfaces* 407–414 (Association for Computing Machinery, 2012). doi:10.1145/2254556.2254636.
- 3. Carneiro, G., Nacenta, M., Toniolo, A., Mendez, G. & Quigley, A. J. Deb8: A Tool for Collaborative Analysis of Video. in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM International Conference on Interactive Experiences for TV and Online Video* 47–58 (Association for Computing Machinery, 2019). doi:10.1145/3317697.3323358.
- 4. Lee, A., Archambault, D. & Nacenta, M. Dynamic Network Plaid: A Tool for the Analysis of Dynamic Networks. in *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* 1–14 (Association for Computing Machinery, 2019). doi:10.1145/3290605.3300360.
- 5. Méndez, G. G., Nacenta, M. A. & Hinrichs, U. Considering Agency and Data Granularity in the Design of Visualization Tools. in *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* 1–14 (Association for Computing Machinery, 2018). doi:10.1145/3173574.3174212.
- 6. Méndez, G. G., Hinrichs, U. & Nacenta, M. A. Bottom-up vs. Top-down: Trade-offs in Efficiency, Understanding, Freedom and Creativity with InfoVis Tools. in *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* 841–852 (Association for Computing Machinery, 2017).
- 7. Méndez, G. G., Nacenta, M. A. & Vandenheste, S. iVoLVER: Interactive Visual Language for Visualization Extraction and Reconstruction. in *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* 4073–4085 (Association for Computing Machinery, 2016).
- 8. Mauderer, M., Flatla, D. R. & Nacenta, M. A. Gaze-Contingent Manipulation of Color Perception. in *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* 5191–5202 (Association for Computing Machinery, 2016).
- 9. Brosz, J., Nacenta, M. A., Pusch, R., Carpendale, S. & Hurter, C. Transmogrification: causal manipulation of visualizations. in *Proceedings of the 26th annual ACM symposium on User interface software and technology* 97–106 (Association for Computing Machinery, 2013). doi:10.1145/2501988.2502046.
- 10. Zhu, X., Nacenta, M. A., Akgün, Ö. & Nightingale, P. How People Visually Represent Discrete Constraint Problems. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* **26**, 2603–2619 (2020).



nacenta@uvic.ca