Sources of examples

The icon arrays shown in Figures 1.1, 1.2, 4.4, 4.6, and 4.8 are all taken from the Macintosh Finder, System 7.1.1.

The menu shown in Figure 3.9 is a (customised) version of one found in Microsoft Word 5.1a for Macintosh.

The representational and abstract icon sets shown in Figure 4.1 were first used by:
Arend, U., K-P. Muthig and J. Wandmacher (1987) 'Evidence for global feature superiority in menu selection by icons', *Behaviour and Information Technology, 6*, 411-426.

Other experiments carried out using these icons are reported in:
Green, A.J.K. and P.J. Barnard (1990) 'Icon Interfacing: The role of icon distinctiveness and fixed or variable screen location', in D. Diaper, D. Gilmore, G. Cockton and B. Shackel (Eds) *Proceedings of Interact '90*, Amsterdam: Elsevier Scientific Publishers B.V., pp 457-462

The analysis of the structure of the icons, and the graph shown in Figure 4.3, appeared in:
May, J., Barnard, P.J. and A. Blandford. (1993) 'Using Structural Descriptions of Interfaces to Automate the Modelling of User Cognition', *User Modelling and Adaptive User Interfaces, 3,* 27-64.

The 'cube' and 'empty box' objects shown in Figure 5.1 were first described by:
Enns, J.T. & Resnick, R.A. (1992) A model for the rapid interpetation of line drawings in early vision. In D. Brogan (Ed.), *Visuial Search II*, pp. 73-89. London: Taylor & Francis.

The hypertext database shown in Figure 5.4.was developed by researchers at the University of York, and is described in:
Myers, K.J. and N.V. Hammond (1991) 'Consolidated Report of workshop on scenario matrix analysis'. Esprit 3066 'Amodeus' Deliverable D9, Dept. of Psychology, Univ.of York, UK

The experimental study that used the 'ordering system' described in Section 6 and Figure 6.3 is reported in:
Barnard, P.J., MacLean, A., and Hammond, N. (1984) User representations of ordered sequences of command operations. In B. Shackel (ed), *Proceedings of INTERACT'84. London: IEE.*

The 'MATIS' system shown in Figure 6.9 is described in:
Nigay, L. & J. Coutaz, (1995). A generic platform for addressing the multimodal challenge. In *Proceedings of CHI'95*. ACM: New York (in press).

The 'shared drawing' experiment in Figure 7.7 is reported in:
Barnard, P.J., May, J., and Salber, D. (1995) Deixis and points of view in media spaces: an empirical gesture. *Behaviour and Information Technology* , 15, 37-50.

Takete and Uloomoo were first described by:
Davis, R. (1961) The fitness of names to drawings. *British Journal of Psychology, 52,* 259-268.

The faces in Figure 7.11 are taken from:
Walker, J.H. & Sproull, L & Subramani, R. (1994) Using a human face in an interface. *Proc. CHI'94*, pp.85-91. ACM: New York.

The 'face icons' of Figure 8.1 were described in:
Chernoff, H. (1973) The use of faces to represent points in k-dimensional space graphically. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *68*, 361-368.

The 'stick men' icons of Figure 8.3 were developed by:
Pickett, R.M. & Grinstein, G.G. (1988) Iconographic displays for visualising multidimensional data. *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*. Beijing and Shenyang, PRC: IEEE.

Index of Exercises

Exercise Set 1.....20

Exercise Set 2.....22

Exercise Set 3.....23

Exercise Set 4.....28

Exercise Set 5.....29

Exercise Set 6.....34

Exercise Set 7.....43

Acknowledgments

The authors of this guide would like to thank Anker Jørgensen and Annette Aboulafia of the Psychology Department of Copenhagen University, and their many HCI students for their help in the development and evaluation of earlier drafts.

This is the fourth distributed edition of the Guide.

The third edition was used by the Mennesks-Maskine Interaktion Course of the University of Copenhagen, In Autumn 1996.

The second edition was prepared for a tutorial at Eurographics'95 in Maastricht, and has been published as:
May, J., Scott, S. and Barnard, P. (1995) *Structuring Displays: a psychological guide*. Eurographics Tutorial Notes Series. EACG: Geneva

The first edition of this Guide was written as part of the AMODEUS project: ESPRIT basic research action 7040, supported by the Commission of the European Union.

Index of key points

The **structure** of the scene constrains the way people can search through it..... 9

The object that is being attended to is the **psychological subject.** Other objects in the same group form its **predicate**..... 9

Structure diagrams show the hierarchical relationships between objects. **Transition Path diagrams** show changes in the psychological subject and predicate in time..... 9

Sensory information from the eyes forms a **visual representation.**..... 12

Perceptual information is contained in an **object representation.**..... 12

The **visual-to-object** transformation process structures and groups the visual scene..... 12

The **object-to-propositional** transformation process identifies and relates objects..... 13

The **propositional-to-object** transformation process feeds back information about object structure 13

The object representation that is perceived is a **blend** of information from visual and propositional sources..... 13

Propositional representations can fill in gaps in object representations derived from incomplete visual representations..... 13

Propositional representations help the object representation settle on one interpretation of ambiguous figures..... 14

The perception of ambiguous figures depends on what the viewer knows, and what they expect to see..... 14

Each level of mental representation is processed by a different **cognitive subsystem**..... 17

All nine subsystems have a **common architecture**, including their own memory..... 17

The **content** of a memory depends upon the subsystem in which it is stored..... 17

All levels of representation can be described as having groups, subject-predicate and constituent structures. Structure diagrams and Transition Path diagrams can be used for all levels of representation..... 17

All perceptual and central subsystems receive representations from more than one source. 18

Visual information can affect the way that objects form groups..... 19

Objects that are spatially close to a group, but not part of it, seem to '**pop-out**'..... 21

The **pragmatic subject** is the object that will become the psychological subject when the structure of its group is attended to, because of its visual features.. 21

Objects or groups that are larger or brighter appear **nearer** and can be pragmatic subjects..... 22

The 'appearance' of an object is determined by its pragmatic subject..... 23

People can search for a target rapidly by looking for objects that have its pragmatic subject 25

Complex objects that do have a structure pop out from simple objects that do not have a structure..... 28

Simple objects can 'hide' amongst more complex ones, if they have the same pragmatic subject..... 28

Objects that are grouped together can come to share propositional meaning, with experience 32

Functionality is 'what the user does with a system', not 'what the system could do'..... 32

A coarse texture, like a larger size and increased brightness, makes an object look **close.**..... 34

In grouping objects, colour and shape ('difference') dominate closeness..... 34

Task structures are propositional representations, and can be analysed using structure diagrams and transition path diagrams. 36

An object representation that matches the task structure can help users form the appropriate propositional representation of the task 36

The **ambiguity** of a transition is a rough guide to the difficulty users will have in making it correctly 38

Transformations from sensory to perceptual levels **move up** a level in the structure of the information 44

Transformations from central to perceptual levels **move down** the structure of the information. 45

Representations from different sources can blend if their structures are **consistent**. 46

Sound cannot directly produce mental visual images 46

Visual perception can affect the way we interpret sound. 47

Implicational knowledge ensures that propositional blending is 'sensible' 48

Language is comprehended through **propositional blending** 48

Qualitative aspects of sound and sight are detected through **implicational blending** 50

Multimedia interfaces rely on either propositional or implicational blending. 51

If propositional representations can be used to group objects as well as to generate a target to search for, search is easier and quicker. 53

Objects that change over time can be perceived as the same object, if the changes can be propositionally blended. 54

Thematic continuity, through collocation of objects that are visually or propositionally related, helps users orient themselves over screen changes. 54