

Pointing and Navigation

Michel Beaudouin-Lafon
Laboratoire de Recherche en Informatique
Université Paris-Sud / CNRS
mbf@lri.fr
<http://ex-situ.lri.fr>

Thanks to Yves Guiard for material on Fitts' law

Outline

Pointing

Fitts' law

Beating Fitts' law

Multiscale pointing

More laws of movement

The importance of pointing

The most frequent action in Graphical User Interfaces
(together with entering text)

Many targets, some very small
e.g., pointing between the two 'l' in the word "small" above

Screens are becoming larger ... and smaller

Pointing performance is limited by human capabilities,
not by the computer

If the computer knew where I want to point,
it could do it for me...

Fitts' pointing paradigm

Seminal work by Paul Fitts in 1954

Speed-precision trade-off in directed movements


Initial hypothesis

$$ID \text{ (bits)} = \log_2 (2D/W)$$

$$MT = k * ID$$

ID = Index of Difficulty

MT = Movement Time



If this proves true, ID/MT (bit/s) = constant

This constant is the capacity of the human motor system to transmit information (Shannon)


In practice... (Fitts' original data)

TABLE 1
TASK CONDITIONS AND PERFORMANCE DATA FOR 16 VARIATIONS OF A
RECIPROCAL TAPPING TASK
(N = the same 16 Ss at each condition)


Tolerance and Amplitude Conditions			1-oz. Stylus				1-lb. Stylus			
W_s	A	I_d	t	Errors (%)	I_p	Rank	t	Errors (%)	I_p	Rank
.25	2	4	.392	3.35	10.20	11	.406	3.80	9.85	7
.25	4	5	.484	3.41	10.33	9	.510	3.83	9.80	8
.25	8	6	.580	2.78	10.34	8	.649	4.04	9.24	13
.25	16	7	.731	3.65	9.58	14	.781	4.08	8.96	15
.50	2	3	.281	1.99	10.68	5	.281	0.88	10.68	4
.50	4	4	.372	2.72	10.75	3.5	.370	2.16	10.81	2
.50	8	5	.469	2.05	10.66	6	.485	2.32	10.31	6
.50	16	6	.595	2.73	10.08	12	.641	2.27	9.36	11
1.00	2	2	.212	0.44	9.43	15	.215	0.13	9.30	12
1.00	4	3	.260	1.09	11.54	1	.273	0.85	10.99	1
1.00	8	4	.357	2.38	11.20	2	.373	1.17	10.72	3
1.00	16	5	.481	1.30	10.40	7	.526	1.32	9.50	10
2.00	2	1	.180	0.00	5.56	16	.182	0.00	5.49	16
2.00	4	2	.203	0.08	9.85	13	.219	0.09	9.13	14
2.00	8	3	.279	0.87	10.75	3.5	.284	0.65	10.56	5
2.00	16	4	.388	0.65	10.31	10	.413	1.72	9.68	9

Note.— W_s is the width in inches of the target plate. A is the distance in inches between the centers of the two plates. t is the average time in seconds for a movement from one plate to the other. The performance index, I_p , is discussed in the text.

In practice... (plot of Fitts' original data by Mackenzie)



Typical velocity profile



Several versions of Fitts' law

Log version

Fitts (1954) $MT = a + b \log_2(2 \mathbf{D/W})$

Mackenzie (1992) $MT = a + b \log_2(\mathbf{D/W} + 1)$

Linear version

Schmidt et al. (1979) $MT = a * \mathbf{D/W}$

Power version

Meyer et al. (1988) $MT = a (\mathbf{D/W})^{1/2}$

In all cases, MT varies with the relative amplitude D/W

$$ID = f(\mathbf{D/W}) \quad MT = a + b * ID$$

Fitts' law can be seen as a scale-invariance law

Validity of Fitts' law

Fitts' law is only valid within fairly small limits

Absolute amplitude less than about one meter
otherwise, there is a speed plateau

Width larger than a fraction of a millimeter
otherwise motor control is not precise enough



Performance beyond those limits degrades quickly

D/W is therefore bounded by about 2000,
and so the ID (in the log formulation) is less than about 12

Pointing in the wild

Large collection of pointing data in the field

24 users, 2 million aimed movements, 1 billion pixels (352km)



Can we “beat” Fitts’ law?

The index of performance $IP = 1/b$ is about 10 bits/s in Fitts’ original experiment

Pointing using a device (mouse, joystick, touchscreen...) has been shown to generally have a lower IP

Research question:

Can we use the computer to help us point faster?


Other research question:

Can we expand the limits of validity of Fitts’ law?

Improving pointing performance


Idea 1: Reduce ID, i.e. decrease D and/or increase W

Reducing distance: “drag’n’pop” (Baudisch)



Reducing distance: “MAGIC pointing” (Zhai)

Track eye-gaze to teleport cursor close to the target



Drag-and-pop - Baudisch, 2003

Improving pointing performance


Increasing target size: auto-expansion (McGuffin)

Expand potential targets when the cursor approaches them




Performance predicted by expanded target size (not original size)

BUT: does not work in the Mac OS X dock because adjacent targets move -> expansion cannot work with dense targets





Improving pointing performance

Increasing size: semi-infinite targets
Pointing on the side of the screen





Edging is closest to
semi-infinite pointing (Appert)




Improving pointing performance

Idea 2: Increase maximal speed


Manipulate the “control-display gain”, i.e. the ratio between the motion of the device and the corresponding motion of the cursor
 “Mouse acceleration”



Effect of dynamic gain on pointing performance (Casiez)



(a) Constant Gain




(b) Pointer Acceleration

Improving pointing performance

Semantic pointing (Blanch)


Each target has a visual size and a motor size
Cursor moves faster between targets,
and slows down when approaching a target

Sample applications:




visual

motor



Object pointing (Guiard)

Skip empty space: pointing in constant time! (in theory...)





Semantic Pointing - Guiard, Blanch & Beaudouin-Lafon, 2004

Improving performance


Bubble cursor (Grossman): best technique known today

Combines area cursors, object pointing and target expansion


The cursor always designates the closest target



Dynaspot (Chapuis): combines bubble cursor with regular cursor to point in empty space



Bubble Cursor - Grossman & Balakrishnan, 2005



Improving pointing performance

Are we done yet?

NO!

Two categories of approaches:

- target-agnostic: do not need to know where targets are

- target-aware: needs to know potential targets

Target-aware techniques are more efficient,
but it is often difficult to know what the targets are

Probabilistic approaches: learn targets and user's habits

Breaking the limits of Fitts' law

Fitts' law is valid only for $ID < 12$ bits, $D < 1m$, $W > 0.5mm$







These physiological limits can be overcome in an information world that supports zooming


Zooming in: small targets become bigger

Zooming out: large amplitudes become smaller

What is the performance of pointing in a zoomable world?

Zoomable User Interfaces






Space-scale diagrams (Furnas & Bederson)

Represent scale as a vertical dimension

Zooming = moving the viewing window up and down



The size of the viewing window is fixed



Multiscale pointing (Guiard & Beaudouin-Lafon)

Pointing in a zoomable world requires navigation:


- Zoom out to get the target in view
- Pan to put the target in the center
- Zoom in to enlarge the target (pan to adjust)




Effect of view size on pointing performance

Effect of view size: $MT = k ID / V$


But only up to a certain threshold for V



Exp. 1




Exp. 2




Orthozoom (Appert & Fekete)

Extend scrollbar to pan and zoom 1D documents
Use orthogonal dimension to zoom



Navigating the plays of Shakespeare

Orthozoom is twice as fast as the best know technique: Speed-Dependent Automatic Zooming (SDAZ)




The Tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra	ACT I	
	ACT II	20
	ACT III	40
	ACT IV	60
	ACT V	80
All's Well That Ends Well	ACT I	100
	ACT II	120
	ACT III	140
	ACT IV	160
	ACT V	180
As You Like It	PROLOGUE	200
	ACT II	220
	ACT III	240
	ACT IV	260
	ACT V	280
The Comedy of Errors	PROLOGUE	300
	ACT II	320
	ACT III	340
	ACT IV	360
	ACT V	380
The Tragedy of Coriolanus	ACT I	400
	ACT II	420
	ACT III	440
	ACT IV	460
	ACT V	480
Cymbeline	ACT I	500

Zoom: 50

Other laws of movement

Generalizing Fitts' law to 2D pointing




$$ID_{W'} = \log_2 \left(\frac{D}{W'} + 1 \right)$$

$$ID_{min} = \log_2 \left(\frac{D}{\min(W, H)} + 1 \right)$$

$$ID_{az} = \log_2 \left(\left[\omega \left(\frac{D}{W} \right)^p + \eta \left(\frac{D}{H} \right)^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} + 1 \right)$$

Goal-passing / crossing (Accot & Zhai)




$$ID = \log_2 \left(\frac{D}{W} + 1 \right)$$

Steering law (Accot)


Tunnel:

$$MT = a + b \frac{A}{W}$$




General case:






$$T_c = a + b \int_c \frac{ds}{W(s)}$$




Crossy – a crossing-based interface (Apitz)



Crossy – a crossing-based interface (Aritz)





Conclusion

Basic interactions such as pointing are still far from optimal

Fitts' law is a surprisingly robust law

Information is key:

- Information available in the display

- Information perceived by the user

- Information produced by the motor system

- Information captured by the system