
SIGCHI Extended Abstracts Sample

File: Note Initial Caps

First Author

University of Author
Authortown, CA 94022, USA
author1@anotherco.edu

Second Author

VP, Authoring
Authorship Holdings, Ltd.
Awdur SA22 8PP, UK
author2@author.ac.uk

Third Author

Fourth Author
Lēkhaka Interaction Labs
Bengaluru 560 080, India
author3@anotherco.com
author4@hchi.anotherco.com

Fifth Author

YetAuthorCo, Inc.
Authortown, BC V6M 22P
Canada
author5@anotherco.com

Sixth Author

Université de Auteur-Sud
40222 Auteur France
author6@author.fr

Seventh Author

Department of Skrywer
University of Umbhali
Cape Town, South Africa
author7@umbhaliu.ac.za

Abstract

Augmented reality (AR) systems allow designers to blend aspects of physical and virtual experiences; however, existing work provides little guidance for effectively merging parallel experiences. We use retail shopping as a case study to understand how user-centered design practices might enable designers to craft novel AR applications from existing parallel in-store and online experiences. Through a series of surveys, prototypes, and design evaluations, we work directly with target users to identify trade-offs of in-store and online shopping and derive a set of design considerations for how augmented reality might support consumer decision making in traditional retail environments. Our findings suggest that users perceive AR as an effective means for contextualized, at-a-glance access to critical information such as price comparisons and reviews, while retaining the convenience and immediacy of in-store shopping. We also found preliminary evidence of how blending existing parallel experiences might inspire novel immersive interactions that transcend traditional retail experiences.

this is too long

Author Keywords

Authors' choice; of terms; separated; by semicolons; include commas, within terms only; required.

ACM Classification Keywords

H.5.m [Information interfaces and presentation (e.g., HCI)]:

Paste the appropriate copyright statement here. ACM now supports three different copyright statements:

- ACM copyright: ACM holds the copyright on the work. This is the historical approach.
- License: The author(s) retain copyright, but ACM receives an exclusive publication license.
- Open Access: The author(s) wish to pay for the work to be open access. The additional fee must be paid to ACM.

This text field is large enough to hold the appropriate release statement assuming it is single spaced in a sans-serif 7 point font.

Every submission will be assigned their own unique DOI string to be included here.

Miscellaneous; See [<http://acm.org/about/class/1998/>]: for full list of ACM classifiers. This section is required.

Introduction

Many real world tasks can also be accomplished using technology. For example, we shop both in stores and online, converse both face-to-face and over video chat, and learn in both physical and virtual classrooms. However, virtual and physical experiences have unique affordances: shoppers in the real world can see and feel a product, while virtual shoppers can access more product information, such as reviews or offers from other retailers. Augmented reality technologies allow designers to craft applications that combine aspects of virtual and physical experiences. However, to effectively combine multiple existing experiences into a single application, designers must identify the critical aspects of parallel experiences and how to leverage their respective trade-offs.

In this work, we use retail shopping as a case study for understanding how to effectively craft mixed physical/virtual experiences from existing practices. The retail industry has shifted more of its commerce online. Consumers have the option to do their shopping either through a physical store or the same store's online presence, and most consumers have experience with both methods [1]. Retail shopping also aligns well with theoretical guidelines for effective AR applications. While specific prior studies of online and in-store shopping have measured the importance of individual factors (e.g., price comparison [2], privacy [3], and convenience [1]), these studies generally model these factors with respect to consumer decision making rather than how they might inform new ways of supporting consumers in practice.

This work instead explores how designers might effectively derive new mixed reality applications from existing physical

and virtual experiences, such as in-store and online shopping. We take an iterative, user-centered design approach to constructing these guidelines from existing experiences. We first conducted a survey to understand perceived trade-offs in in-store and online experiences. We then designed two low fidelity prototypes based on these experiences and assessed their potential utility through a formative design evaluation using the think-aloud technique. The results of the evaluation informed the design of StoAR, a head-mounted virtual reality simulation of a traditional retail environment augmented with critical information synthesized from conventional online retail experiences. Our analysis of user responses to the StoAR prototype provides preliminary design considerations for effectively blending online and in-store shopping experiences to facilitate consumer decision making and how a design-based approach might inspire novel blended interactions unique to immersive applications.

The next paragraph needs reworking after the findings section is finished

Our results illustrate concrete trade-offs between online and in-store shopping experiences and how those trade-offs might inform the design of a mixed reality application. We found that the benefits of each experience generally mirror the drawbacks of the other. Specifically, we found XXX and identify preliminary evidence of the utility of head-mounted displays for these applications. Through the iterative development of StoAR, we provide preliminary an empirical groundwork for how designers might effectively merge norms of physical and virtual experiences into a hybrid mixed reality application.

Let's come up with a better opening sentence. = JRB

not wedded to these examples

need to revise wording here

cite
<http://www.wsj.com/articles/survey-shows-rapid-growth-in-online-shopping-1465358582>

Matt, did you have references in mind for this?

JRB: Either way, it would be good to give us an example or two in an e.g.

this is a rough timeline. I think the sequence of needs to lead with shopping instead with it to maintain continuity with the previous graph, where we specifically about -EH

JRB: Agreed. Maybe instead of focusing on and online shopping we use these experiences to explore how designers might effectively derive reality applications from existing physical and experiences."

JRB: I've given this on all papers this but you need to be about tense. Different styles prefer past tense. Figure out which should be stick to it.

JRB: "these" is a think you might want constructing guidelines based on existing experiences."

JRB: What were of the survey? Did form the design?

JRB: Add citation because it is Clay and we love him.

Related Work

Matt will take first crack at this one

Methodology

We explored how AR might leverage insights from existing physical and virtual shopping experiences through a combination of open-ended surveys and user responses to prototype StoAR platforms. We primarily focused on understanding differences in physical and virtual experiences for decision making (e.g., the choice to purchase a certain product). We completed this work across three iterations: an online survey, a low fidelity prototype, and a high-fidelity prototype.

Online Survey

We conducted a preliminary survey to identify important aspects of customers' in-store and online shopping experiences. We asked participants to identify the three most important pieces of information involved in their shopping decisions, what they did and did not like about existing in-store and online shopping experiences, and ways they currently use technology in shopping. We used the responses from our online survey to isolate factors of in-store and online shopping that were most important to our participants.

Low Fidelity Prototype

We used the results from our preliminary survey to design a sketch-based low fidelity prototype of an AR system containing aspects of in-store and online shopping experiences that participants identified as important. Several such aspects for in-store decision making, such as being "hands-on with the product" and leaving the store with the product, are not readily feasible in an online experience; however, critical factors of online experiences, such as access to reviews and ease of comparison, can be brought into the store environment. We hypothesized that an augmented reality ap-

plication that supplemented a traditional in-store experience with immediate access to core aspects of online shopping would improve consumer's confidence in their purchasing decisions.

JRB: The paragraph below talks about one prototype. I think you should say that you had two. One prototype for interaction concept.

We tested our hypothesis in a think-aloud study using our sketch-based prototype as a design prompt. The prototype consisted of online content drawn as AR menus on transparency sheets and overlaid onto an image of an electronics store. We used the low fidelity prototype to conduct a within-subjects A/B comparison of a menu-based, hierarchically structured user experience, and a context-aware virtual overlays of product information. We instructed participants to use each prototype to aid in making a laptop purchase decision.

figure of paper prototype

High Fidelity Prototype

We used the responses from the low fidelity prototype study to design a fully immersive StoAR prototype for use in head-mounted displays. Because we did not have access to a retail testing environment, we simulated a retail display in virtual reality based on configurations found in a local retail outlet. We then added an augmented reality interface to the simulation to provide XXX. While our use of a VR store simulation removes immediate access to real life product found in a real world store, the fully immersive environment allowed us to closely control the relationship between the prototype AR interfaces and simulated products.

We used a post-hoc survey to measure people's responses

JRB: word-choice. Phases?

does this feel like a reasonable synopsis?

JRB: Yes, except I would like to know if these were open-ended questions or not.

Can you add some details about how you analyzed this data here?

JRB: Amen! Ethan and Matt, talk about this one? Was it a thematic analysis? Did you just see what people were saying? If you can describe what you did to me in casual english, I can help you science it up.

JRB: Reword the previous

replace the last b sentence with wh actually tested

JRB: Formative d and evaluation do to be hypothesis often aren't. Inst exploratory. If you ing encumbered hypothesis" language reword. Just let m

any specific inform you randomize pr order?

JRB: The previous sounds really sm ever, it doesn't re what was happen pler language mig "Participants were with each of the t types, in a random and were allowed through a electron experience....

what specific AR nents were tested reviews, product isons, specs, etc. were your measu (e.g., confidence sion, time to deci

to the immersive prototype. Participants first freely navigated the virtual representation of a store augmented with static content containing information about each device. After navigating the scene, participants reported their perceptions of the prototype's usability, potential impact on decision-making, utility of individual design components, perceived trade-offs compared to existing technologies and potential limitations of the approach. They also provided feedback on additional applications where they envisioned using mixed reality experiences for decision making.

figure of the high fi prototype

Results

JRB: Structural comment: This paper might flow more easily if instead of having a "Methods" section and then a "Findings Section", you go with three sections – one for each phase. You would start the section with all the methods information, and the end it with the findings. Because the findings should directly inform the next phase of the study, this might streamline the paper. DS, thoughts?

we found x, which is supported by [theoretical finding about AR in some paper

Online Survey

We collected responses from 78 participants over social media.

- Participants appreciate the immediacy and physical interaction with products in a store.
- Participants dislike about shopping in-store:
 - Lack of ability to comparison shop in-store.
 - Not getting the lowest price or feeling like they are paying more.
 - Staff trying to influence purchase decisions.

- Participants appreciate about online shopping:
 - Convenience and efficiency.
 - Seeing reviews and comparison shopping.
- Participants dislike the shipping charges and subsequent wait times.
- When asked for their most important factors in making shopping decisions, 96% of users said "Price" and 76% said "Reviews" were in their top three factors out of six options.
- Participants spend more time researching and comparing more expensive products than cheaper ones.

add qualitative an
about how we exp
ber of people to s
factor on average
are the only two t
passed that numb

figure summarizin
results here

How many subject
where from?

Low Fidelity Prototype

We recruited XXX participants for this study.

- Participants expressed a desire to view specifications of two different laptops in the same view.
- Participants were more receptive to quick and less information than to a fuller, menu-based approach.
- Participants mentioned a desire to toggle display of content.
- A participant explained product demos as a useful application of augmented reality in retail.

High Fidelity Prototype

We recruited XXX participants from a local research expo to complete this study.

how many subject

- How participants envision use of this platform:

- Comparison shopping thinking of the furniture application, is there any data that might help with this or replace this with a better supported example?
- Quickly see reviews, p cations.
- Video or visual demon product is used.

- Tradeoffs of this system:
 - Less depth in the product information listed.
- Other useful features in augmented reality retail:
 - Several different expected interactions with the static content.
 - Keeping information within view to comparison shop.
 - To use this system to compare competitors' prices and would consider buying from another retailer if presented with a better price.
- Concerns about the system:
 - Participants expressed concern with digital content being distracting from the physical environment.
- Other types of products augmented reality could be used for: games, toys, furniture, and clothing.

Discussion

We explored how understanding the trade-offs of parallel physical and virtual experiences could inform mixed reality applications in the context of retail shopping. Participants perceived mixed reality experiences offer more rapid access to information about products while preserving the physical interactions offered by in-store experiences. Using a design-based methodology allowed participants to envision ways that AR technologies might enable new experiences beyond those offered by physical or virtual methods alone, such as mediating evaluative interactions with products,

such as guided demos or simulated placement. Our findings, gathered throughout the design process, highlight the potential for AR in retail environments and open new avenues for understanding how we might effectively derive new AR experiences from existing processes.

Merging Physical & Virtual Experiences

We found preliminary evidence that AR can merge online and in-store experiences to benefit the consumer, preserving aspects of in-store shopping that people enjoy, while adding preferred aspects of online experiences. While participants first identified the ability to find the best price and understand reviews as the most important aspects of using technology in shopping, participants reported that StoAR would allow them to better analyze product specs *in situ*, compare reviews and ratings against their own experiences, and mediate their interactions with physical products through virtual demos when compared to conventional retail shopping.

These findings align well with prior studies in e-commerce, which demonstrate the utility of price and product comparison in online shopping; however, our findings also show that blending benefits of online shopping with traditional retail outlets may provide additional benefits not accessible online. Our design-based approach did to identify confirm important aspects of online shopping. We also found that people's perceptions of how AR might benefit their decision making evolved as the prototypes grew more sophisticated. These shifting perceptions suggest that using prototypes as design prompts is beneficial for helping people envision how AR experiences might differ from conventional methods.

New Opportunities for Blended Experiences

We also found evidence that AR might enable unique kinds of decision support that neither physical nor virtual experiences alone can provide. For example, our high fidelity

revise the wording last bit

better section title

prototype provided static summaries of the product data identified as critical in the low fidelity study, similar to those accessible through a product specification sheet. However, in the high fidelity prototype, participants expressed an additional desire to interact with the system, such as the ability to virtually “pin” relevant information for ready access as you navigate the store or access to specific details on demand. Participants also reported a desire to use AR to simulate their own at-home context or use case for a particular product, particularly room design and game previews. They felt such features would allow them to “look at products without being at a brick and mortar store,” prioritizing the convenience of online shopping. The ability to explore these simulations to virtually unbox a product would provide additional information inaccessible in traditional experiences.

These findings collectively suggest that designing mixed reality applications is not as simple as blending the best aspects of both the virtual and physical experiences. AR technologies allow new methods for supporting decision making not afforded by purely physical or virtual methods. Instead, designers must critically reflect on how AR may effectively mediate novel kinds of interactions to transcend traditional approaches and provide consumers with new forms of decision support. Future work can explore how the capabilities of these technologies and properties of the target domain and task might inform novel AR experiences.

Designing for Effective Communication

In our final questionnaire, people frequently commented on the need for carefully limiting the amount of information provided by the interface. Participants want to be empowered with pertinent information, but it must be easily accessible and digestible to avoid interfering with the immediacy of the in-store experience. They expressed some concern about trying to process too much information and about dis-

play being too distracting, inhibiting their ability to navigate the physical store. Instead, participants preferred sparsely presented information in-context, allowing them to access relevant review and product information at a glance.

Future systems will benefit from better understanding the balance between information presented and visual space consumed. Our findings identify a need to understand how AR systems might balance communicative power with interaction to deliver necessary information at a glance. A lack of consensus amongst participants as to what information is “necessary” suggests opportunities for designing intelligent interfaces and customized experiences not available in real world environments in order to support individual decision making.

Limitations & Future Work

Our high fidelity prototype used a simulated store display rather than a real world environment. While this approach allowed us to conduct a preliminary evaluation of the prototype application without the added complexity of instrumentation or physical obstacles, it also limits our ability to fully characterize the affordances of our prototype in practice.

While we believe that the design guidance provided by our work can inform effective blended experiences, we also realize that further refining and implementing StoAR in full AR is a critical next step.

In our first survey, many participants reported that they use their mobile devices to engage in online shopping while in a physical store. While this approach allows for people to retrieve in-depth information *in situ*, it also generally requires significant effort to locate and compare relevant information on the fly. Participants reported that they “like the idea of hands-free/ambient information” offered by HMDs over mobile devices, but were also concerned about the legibility of consuming information in AR. Our future work will directly

are there other ex
can cite of prototy
vr we can cite?

compare traditional mobile devices to the StoAR approach to better understand the trade-offs of blended and parallel methods for decision making.

Conclusion

write this :-)

We did a thing, it was interesting, we learned from it.

References

- [1] MICHELLE BEDNARZ and N Ponder. 2010. Perceptions of retail convenience for in-store and online shoppers. *Marketing Management Journal* (2010), 49.
- [2] Ted Karlsson, Christer Kuttainen, Leyland Pitt, and Stavroula Spyropoulou. 2005. Price as a variable in online consumer trade-offs. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning* 23, 4 (2005), 350–358.
- [3] Anthony D Miyazaki and Ana Fernandez. 2001. Consumer perceptions of privacy and security risks for online shopping. *Journal of Consumer affairs* 35, 1 (2001), 27–44.