

Designing Usable Ubiquitous Computing

Tim Cederman-Haysom
School of Information Technology and Electrical
Engineering
University of Queensland
Brisbane, Queensland, 4072, Australia
+61 7 3365 1645
tch@itee.uq.edu.au

Margot Brereton
School of Information Technology and Electrical
Engineering
University of Queensland
Brisbane, Queensland, 4072, Australia
+61 7 3365 1634
margot@itee.uq.edu.au

ABSTRACT

This paper demonstrates that in order to design successful ubiquitous computing, designers must consider concurrently both the end user interactions in the context of use and the suitability of the technology and its underlying infrastructure. We describe methods used to create more useful collaboration and communication between users, designers and engineers in designing ubiquitous computing systems. We tested these methods in a real domain in an attempt to create a system that is affordable, minimally disrupts the end-user's workplace and improves human-computer interaction.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

H.5.2 [Information Interfaces and Presentation]: User Interfaces – *Evaluation/methodology, input devices and strategies, prototyping, user-centered design.*

General Terms

Design, Human Factors

Keywords

User-centered design, participatory design, interaction design, ubiquitous computing, multimodal interfaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

It has been more than a decade since Mark Weiser's seminal article "The Computer of the 21st Century" [6] defined a vision for the now familiar term "ubiquitous computing". Although computers have achieved ubiquity in the form of wired and wireless devices such as mobile phones, PDAs, screens, and embedded microprocessors, in many cases they have not blended into the background to seamlessly support human activity in the way envisioned by Weiser. Some users have successfully adopted stand alone items like PDAs, modifying their practices in order to take advantage of new technology and sometimes integrating them with other devices.

However, far too often, the leap from adoption of single machines to adoption of multiple machines operating as a ubiquitous computing environment has been less than ideal. As Weiser pointed out, the problem of designing ubiquitous computing is not due to technical challenges alone but demands the "very difficult

In PDC-04 Proceedings of the Participatory Design Conference, Vol 2, Toronto, Canada, July 27-31, 2004, under a Creative Commons license. CPSR, P.O. Box 717, Palo Alto, CA 94302. <http://www.cpsr.org> ISBN 0-9667818-3-X

integration of human factors, computer science, engineering, and social sciences." These problems are manifest in infrastructure costs, deployment difficulties, user training needs and uptake difficulties (due to systems being designed from a technical vision, rather than designed to meet the needs of particular work practices). In order to explore these issues for ubiquitous computing, it is necessary to consider both end-user interactions, practices and capabilities (such as the ability of end users to integrate devices into their practices) and the characteristics of technology and its underlying infrastructure. This suggests that rather than develop a complete concept for a ubiquitous computing environment and then build a decontextualised prototype, a participatory bootstrapping approach is needed. In such an approach designers reveal the capabilities and characteristics of technology and technical infrastructure to end users in intelligible ways (end users often find the details of infrastructure both mundane and baffling) and end users try out and explore the possibilities for such technologies to enhance their practices in the context of their work environments.

2. DESIGNING TECHNOLOGY

There are many examples of ubiquitous computing systems which seem to have an implicit assumption that usability and technical systems design are separate from one another. While these systems demonstrate useful technologies and potential scenarios for their use, they lack a sense of user involvement and have generally not explored how they will be embedded into practice.

2.1 Augmented offices

Work carried out by the Xerox Research Centre Europe imagined what a future office may be like [1]. Their aim was to create an "affordable enabling infrastructure", with a basic assumption that technology in their scenarios would be both inexpensive and readily available. While this assumption may hold true, it would be instructive to explore the scenario from the point of view of the end user through participatory design. An example scenario given by the researchers describes a user attempting to print a document. RFID tags embedded into the paper would allow the user to locate their document quickly and efficiently. If a user attempted to print a document when a large file was already being printed, the option to initiate a negotiation of printer priority would be available. The printer would initiate a phone call to the owner of the large print job to facilitate this.

A participatory design approach might explore business users impressions and experiences in locating a job by RFID tags, examine what expense was considered worthwhile, reveal what other things they might do with technology such as RFID tags, examine the logistics of tagging each piece of paper with an RFID

tag, examine user privacy issues, examine under what circumstances office workers would be happy to be interrupted from their work to negotiate time on the printer and so on.

2.2 Networked surfaces

A recurring theme in ubiquitous computing research is the idea of networked surfaces. Research into this field has investigated using the surface of everyday furniture such as desks, note-boards, etc, as a means of communicating between sensors and other machines. This allows the devices to both receive power and to communicate without requiring bulky components within their own package to facilitate this independently. Conceptually, this fits nicely with ubiquitous computing's ideals. However many examples given by the Pin&Play project [3] use the surface only as a source of power and not communication. Lifton and Paradiso's Pushpins [4] have a range of only approximately ten centimetres. Thus there are several factors that could be explored through participatory design. For example, by engaging participants one could examine the context in which such surfaces would be used, which items use the surface for communication, which simply need it for power, how other technologies such as wireless technologies compare, how communication range issues affect usability, other imagined use of the surfaces, costs, etc.

2.3 Interactive rooms

There have been a number of projects that aim to empower entire rooms with computing abilities. By embedding these computers into most of the furniture and walls, computing abilities are argued to be ready-at-hand. For example, the i-LAND project [4] makes use of tables as scanners, desks as collaborative spaces and walls as computer screens. While this technology has successfully made the transition to a commercial product, it comes at significant cost. Having been built as a specific technological platform and product for a generally perceived use, its users must either find specific problems that fit the technological product or adapt the technology to meet user practices and contexts.

3. CREATING COMMUNICATION

We have attempted to create effective communication channels between users, designers and engineers through a series of design activities. These activities have supported a better understanding of the context of use for the designers and engineers while the users acquire a knowledge of how new systems will impact their workplace. These activities are not 'one-off', but rather a part of an iterative cycle of learning. The basic concept behind these activities is to allow users to reveal details of their work practice in conjunction with the designers revealing technological potential.

3.1 The dental surgery

Our research has focussed on studying the domain of a dental surgery. This environment exhibits a rich combination of both human interaction and instrument use within a complex social environment. Dentists are turning to computers to help manage patient records, to assist during procedures, for patient education and to display digital x-rays and pictures taken by intra-oral cameras. The majority of dentists in Australia have a computer in the surgery. However, during a procedure, a dentist must adhere to infection control standards. Primarily, the dentist must remain clean by wearing gloves. These gloves are then removed in order

to use things like a keyboard and mouse which are not easy to disinfect or sterilise. This makes use of a traditional computer interface extremely disruptive.

During our research, we approached both dentists within private practice and students at a local dental school. These provided slightly different viewpoints on their interaction within the surgery. Dentists within a private practice are accustomed to 'four-handed dentistry', while the students are more independent as they share their assistant with other students.

3.2 The dental school

We undertook an ethnographic study at the dental school which lasted two months consisting of six visits. It was during this time that we gained an insight into how the school functioned and of the work practices of the students and staff. We used interviews as a springboard for organising design events and creating prototypes.

3.2.1 The digital pen

At the dental school there are a large number of students working concurrently. In addition to this, the chairs are shared across sessions, so a single chair may be used by up to four different people in a single day. Although the dental school plans to completely convert to digital records, the number of chairs and the sharing of equipment make this a slow transition. As an interim step in this process, we investigated the possibility of using a digital pen made by Logitech.

The pen is the size of a large ballpoint pen (see figure 1) and writes normally with ink. However, when used in conjunction with digital paper¹, all strokes of the pen are recorded individually, available for download to a computer. Instead of having an individual machine at each chair, having docking stations instead would allow a central computer to receive all records and catalogue them. This system solves several problems that we identified.



Figure 1: Logitech io digital pen.

Firstly, such a system would solve distribution and filing problems. Currently at the dental school, a record must be recorded on a cleanable laminate sheet or throwaway piece of paper. It is then transcribed by the student to the official record. This record then has the procedure transcribed to a computer by a receptionist. If a different department requires a copy of the

¹ The paper is obviously physical rather than digital; however it is imprinted with a fine grid of dots that reflect infrared light. The pen uses a camera to track its position using the dots.

current work practice) of collecting the data: they know the layout of the record and they know the order the procedure should run in. With this contextual information, all that may be required for collection is speech recognition and minor contextual clues from the dentist's speech or activities to confirm where the information is placed in the record.

From interviewing dentists in private practices we discovered that existing speech recognition programs relied on training and could only be used by a person who had trained with the program. This type of recognition was used entirely for converting raw speech to text. However, what was found through these activities was that many abbreviations were used. In addition, there was implied knowledge that whoever was filling out the form would know that something would need to be written. For example, "intra oral, nil sig" would mean to ignore all entries under intra oral as there were no problems in that area.

This may explain why comparatively few dentists currently use speech recognition. In addition, there is also a lack of understanding as to what speech recognition can actually offer as detailed in the following conversation:

Lecturer 1: "So presumably at some stage, I mean we'll end up with voice activated computers so you can actually dictate your treatment plan. But does it respond to any voice? I don't know much about this at all, or is it specific voice activated?"

Researcher 1: "The voice recognition we've been playing with works with anyone, but you can only say really specific phrases, you can't just talk regularly and have the computer understand you. If you want to do that you have to train for a particular person, so there's a trade off there, and the training takes pretty much a day."

Lecturer 1: "So the reality is to voice chart, is not to provide a whole series of charting as you heard the students do when they have a new patient and go through every tooth, that would be more complicated than just a phrase, like "examination" or "periochart"."

3.3 Private practice

After several ethnographic studies at a private practice, a fellow research member prototyped a 'sensing table'. This came out of discussions with the dentist regarding breaks in their concentration from driving an interface. It was envisioned the table could decide which chart was necessary given the instruments in use. An initial prototype using load sensors was demonstrated to the dentist. Immediately problems we had not considered were found. From watching the dentist at work, it appeared they always had unique instruments for different procedures. However, there is overlap we did not observe, and it is not possible to derive the context of the procedure simply by knowing the tools in use. Through further interviewing we discovered that by combining which tool was being used with the location of tools (through RFID technology) the ambiguity is reduced and thus our design was refined further.

4. FUTURE WORK

The activities we have completed so far have not told a full story. It is necessary to take what we have learned from these initial

design sessions and apply it towards exploring the methods of interaction and representation of information further.

While the first activity seemed to identify speech as the most essential modality, this may simply be because of the affordances of the paper patient record. Our next activity will allow the record to be completed by selecting written phrases through gesture. This is a technique used by some existing dental software, but so far there has been little research into the trade-offs of each method and their various combinations. During our activities, the students used minimal amounts of gesture which consisted only of pointing. We aim to identify whether this is because gestures are not a viable interface or if it is because they are not afforded by their current information representation.

It is hard to say where the design will proceed after this activity. Details that reveal themselves during these activities have the potential to completely change the course of our design. However, through undertaking a sufficient number of participatory activities and framing the design problem from several different perspectives, the better combination of modalities will emerge.

Workshops that explore the constraints and possibilities of specific interface technologies and infrastructure technologies are also planned. For example, if the interface is wireless, a spatial model of the surgery will be used to help map out 'hot' and 'cold' zones, range, privacy issues, etc, in order to illustrate issues in wireless design to the dentists and to reveal issues from the dentists' perspective.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank all of the participants from the dental school and the dentists in private practice that contributed to our study. We thank the members of the Phenomenal Interaction Group for their participation and feedback. This work was supported by ARC Discovery grant DP0210470.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Andreoli, J.-M., Castellani, S., Grasso, A., Meunier, J.-L., Muehlenbrock, M., O'Neill, J., Ragnet, F., Froulland, F. and Snowdon, D., *Augmenting Offices with Ubiquitous Sensing. In Smart Objects Conference* (Grenoble, France, 2003).
- [2] Campbell, B., Cederman-Haysom, T., Donovan, J. and Brereton, M.F., *Springboards into Design: Exploring Multiple Representations of Interaction in a Dental Surgery. In Proceedings of OZCHI 2003*, (Brisbane, Australia, 2003), University of Queensland, 14-23.
- [3] Laerhoven, K.V., Schmidt, A. and Gellersen, H.-W., *Pin&Play: Networking Objects through Pins. In Proceedings of UbiComp 2002*, (Göteborg, Sweden, 2002), Springer Verlag, 219-228.
- [4] Lifton, J., Seetharam, D., Broxton, M. and Paradiso, J., *Pushpin Computing System Overview: A Platform for Distributed, Embedded, Ubiquitous Sensor Networks. In Proceedings of the Pervasive Computing Conference*, (Zurich, Switzerland, 2002), Springer Verlag, 139-151.
- [5] Streitz, N.A., Geißler, J., Holmer, T., Konomi, S.i., Müller-Tomfelde, C., Reischl, W., Rexroth, P., Seitz, P. and Steinmetz, R., *i-LAND: An interactive Landscape for Creativity and Innovation. In Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, (Pennsylvania, USA, 1999), ACM Press, 120-127.
- [6] Weiser, M. *The Computer for the 21st Century. Scientific American*, 265, 3 (Dec. 1991), 94-104.