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)]:

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.

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

not wedded to these examples

need to revise wording here

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 []. 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 [7], privacy [9], and convenience [2]), 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.

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 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 XXXand 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.

this is a rough tra
me. I think the se
needs to lead wit
shopping instead
with it to maintain
ity with the previo
graph, where we
specifically about
-EH

JRB: Agreed. Ma
stead of focusing
and online shopp
we use these exp
explore how desig
effectively derive
reality application
isting physical an
experiences."

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

JRB: "these" is a
think you might w
structing guidelin
based on existing
riences."

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

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

Related Work

Previous work applying augmented reality to the shopping experience has focused on how designers and system architects properly utilize this novel technology [1, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16]. Context-awareness is a useful affordance provided by augmented reality. Designers find that this ability to visually associate digital content with products increases customer empowerment, user efficiency in gathering information, and system influence. Other AR application domains focus on collaborative experiences and visualizations [6, 12, 15].

cite source?

Much of this previous work has focused on mobile augmented reality (MAR) as a display technology. However, with products such as Microsoft's Holo lens reaching the mainstream, head-mounted displays (HMD) are gaining attention as a potential platform for AR experiences. Use of a dedicated HMD overcomes MAR-specific limitations such as insufficient processing power, required use of hands and an intermediate screen, and a field of view constrained by screen size [5].

explain what mobile augmented reality is - probably as simple as just saying "augmented reality using a mobile phone"

Other work has been done to develop spatial augmented reality (SAR) systems and applications. SAR applications employ ubiquitous computing to project context-aware digital content into the user's physical environment [3, 4]. Technical advantages of a SAR system include removing the need for users to wear or carry often cumbersome equipment and a non-restricted field of view. Resolution could potentially improve, since computation and graphics processing hardware would not be constrained by form factor - a limitation for HMD which must not be too bulky to be worn on the user's head. However, one limitation of SAR systems is that they require a static, controlled environment to be used effectively due to the use of fixed displays.

is there a source that supports this? From your notes it seems that "Spatial Augmented Reality Merging Real and Virtual Worlds" might

In this paper, we take a user-centered design approach to testing how the theoretical grounding derived from this previous work on mobile and spatial augmented reality applies to HMD-based augmented reality. We also examine how HMD-based AR may combine some of the benefits of these approaches while removing some of their limitations.

Phase 1: Online Survey

Methodology

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 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. The survey consisted of both qualitative and quantitative questions. We aggregated qualitative responses to open-ended questions and found broad themes.

does this feel like able synopsis?

JRB: Yes, except to know if these ended questions

Can you add som about how you ar data here?

JRB: Amen! Etha talk about this on thematic analysis just see what peo saying? If you ca what you did to m english, I can hel ence it up.

MW: Okay, help m it.

add figure accord LBW format

Findings

We collected responses from 78 participants over social media. We found that participants appreciate the immediacy and physical interaction with products in a store. Cited drawbacks of shopping in-store were a lack of ability to comparison shop, inability to get the lowest price and/or feeling that they are paying too much, and store staff trying to influence purchase decisions. Participants said they appreciate the freedom from store location and hours, and time-to-completion of online shopping, but said they dislike the shipping charges and wait times associate with online shopping. Figure 1 details particpants' responses when prompted for their three most important factors in making shopping decisions. We also found that users are willing to spend more time researching more expensive products.

Phase 2: Low Fidelity Prototype

Methodology

We used the results from our preliminary survey to design two sketch-based low fidelity prototypes of an AR system containing aspects of in-store and online shopping experiences that participants identified as important. We can bring critical factors of online experiences, such as access to reviews and ease of comparison, into the store environment while preserving aspects of in-store decision making, such as being “hands-on with the product” and leaving the store with the product. We hypothesized that an augmented reality application 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.

replace the last bit of this sentence with what was actually tested

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 prototypes as a design prompt. The prototypes consisted of online content drawn as AR menus on transparency sheets and overlaid onto an image of an electronics store. Participants interacted with each of the two prototypes, in a random order, and were allowed to navigate through a electronics retail experience. We used to two prototypes to make a comparison between a menu-based, hierarchically structured user experience, and a context-aware virtual overlays of product information.

JRB: Formative design work and evaluation do not have to be hypothesis driven, and often aren’t. Instead they are exploratory. If you are feeling encumbered by the "hypothesis" language, we can reword. Just let me know.

figure of paper prototype

what specific AR components were tested here (e.g., reviews, product comparisons, specs, etc.)? What were your measures here (e.g., confidence in the decision, time to decision, etc.)

JRB: How did you analyze the data from this phase?

Findings

We recruited three participants from campus for this study. Generally, participants were more receptive to quick and less information than to a fuller, menu-based approach. Participants stated that the ability to see specifications of two different laptops in the same view is valuable in decision-making. Participants also expressed a desire to toggle display of content. One participant identified demos as a useful application of augmented reality in retail.

Phase 3: High Fidelity Prototype

Methodology

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 review and price information, depicted in Figure 2.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.

briefly describe th pieces informed b study

Add figure accord LBW format

We used a post-hoc survey to measure people’s responses 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. As

with the initial online survey, we aggregated the qualitative feedback provided by users.

Findings
We recruited 20 participants from a local research expo to complete this study. Participants said they envision using this platform for comparison shopping, quickly seeing reviews, prices, and product specifications, and visual demonstrations of product use. Lower depth of product information was provided as a tradeoff of the system. Participants expressed concern about digital content distracting them from the physical environment. Having presented them with laptops, we asked participants for what other products they think augmented reality could aid them in decision-making, with the results shown in Figure 3.

MW: Games, toys, furniture, and clothing. Honestly, this finding doesn't really line up with anything else, unless we start drawing conclusions about "They said furniture because of potential for visualizations" or something like that. We have a figure if we want to keep this point.

We prompted participants for additional features of a retail augmented reality system such as this one. Participants detailed several expected interactions with the static content provided. Aligning with feedback from the low-fidelity prototypes, participants wanted to keep information within a single view such that they could comparison shop. With the way content was provided in the high-fidelity prototype, users would need to turn around or walk toward another laptop to view its associated information. Participants expressed that they want to compare prices of the same product against other stores' prices. If presented with the option, participants said they would consider purchasing from another source.

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.

thinking of the fur
cation, is there ar
might help with th
place this with a l
ported example?

revise the wordin
last bit

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.

better section title

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 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 tradition 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 display 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 glace.

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.

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

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 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] Junho Ahn, James Williamson, Mike Gartrell, Richard Han, Qin Lv, and Shivakant Mishra. 2015. Supporting healthy grocery shopping via mobile augmented reality. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications (TOMM)* 12, 1s (2015), 16.

[2] MICHELLE BEDNARZ and N Ponder. 2010. Perceptions of retail convenience for in-store and online shoppers. *Marketing Management Journal* (2010), 49.

[3] Hrvoje Benko, Eyal Ofek, Feng Zheng, and Andrew D Wilson. 2015. Fovear: Combining an optically see-through near-eye display with projector-based spatial augmented reality. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software & Technology*. ACM, 129–135.

[4] Hrvoje Benko, Andrew D Wilson, and Federico Zannier. 2014. Dyadic projected spatial augmented reality. In *Proceedings of the 27th annual ACM symposium on User interface software and technology*. ACM, 645–655.

[5] Oliver Bimber and Ramesh Raskar. 2005. *Spatial augmented reality: merging real and virtual worlds*. CRC press.

[6] Ralf Esser and Leif Oppermann. 2016. Head-Mounted Displays in German Companies A Virtual, Augmented and Mixed Reality Check. *i-com* 15, 2 (2016), 211–217.

[7] 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.

[8] Panos E Kourouthanassis, George M Giaglis, and Adam P Vrechopoulos. 2007. Enhancing user experience through pervasive information systems: The case of pervasive retailing. *International Journal of Information Management* 27, 5 (2007), 319–335.

[9] 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.

[10] Thomas Olsson, Else Lagerstam, Tuula Kärkkäinen, and Kaisa Väänänen-Vainio-Mattila. 2013. Expected user experience of mobile augmented reality services: a user study in the context of shopping centres. *Personal and ubiquitous computing* 17, 2 (2013), 287–304.

[11] Claudio Pinhanez. 2001. The everywhere displays projector: A device to create ubiquitous graphical interfaces. In *International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing*. Springer, 315–331.

[12] Marc Ericson C Santos, Takafumi Taketomi, Goshiro Yamamoto, Ma Mercedes T Rodrigo, Christian Sandor, Hirokazu Kato, and others. 2016. Augmented reality as multimedia: the case for situated vocabulary learning. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning* 11, 1 (2016), 1.

[13] Philipp Spreer, Katrin Kallweit, and Klaus Gutknecht. 2012. Improving the In-Store Customer Information Process using Mobile Augmented Reality. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Research in Advertising (ICORIA)*.

[14] Jasmina Stoyanova, Pedro Quelhas Brito, Petia Georgieva, and Mariofanna Milanova. 2015. Comparison of consumer purchase intention between interactive and Augmented Reality shopping platforms through statistical analyses. In *Innovations in Intelligent SysTems and Applications (INISTA), 2015 International Symposium on*. IEEE, 1–8.

[15] A Truong. 2013. TodayâĂŹs Most Innovative Company: IKEA Uses Augmented Reality to Show How Furniture Fits in a Room. *Fast Company* 26 (2013).

[16] Wei Zhu, Charles B Owen, Hairong Li, and Joo-Hyun Lee. 2004. Personalized in-store e-commerce with the promopad: an augmented reality shopping assistant. *Electronic Journal for E-commerce Tools and Applications* 1, 3 (2004), 1–19.