



RENATO ANDRÉ DA SILVA VIOLA
BSc in Computer Science and Engineering

ACCESSIBILITY IN MUSEUMS FOR THE BLIND OR VISUALLY IMPAIRED THROUGH SOUND

MASTER IN COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
NOVA University Lisbon
September, 2025



ACCESSIBILITY IN MUSEUMS FOR THE BLIND OR VISUALLY IMPAIRED THROUGH SOUND

RENATO ANDRÉ DA SILVA VIOLA

BSc in Computer Science and Engineering

Adviser: Sofia Carmen Faria Maia Cavaco

Assistant Professor, NOVA University Lisbon

Co-adviser: Maria Armandina Simenta Rodrigues Grueau

Associate Professor, NOVA University Lisbon

MASTER IN COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

NOVA University Lisbon

September, 2025

Accessibility in museums for the blind or visually impaired through sound

Copyright © Renato André da Silva Viola, NOVA School of Science and Technology, NOVA University Lisbon.

The NOVA School of Science and Technology and the NOVA University Lisbon have the right, perpetual and without geographical boundaries, to file and publish this dissertation through printed copies reproduced on paper or on digital form, or by any other means known or that may be invented, and to disseminate through scientific repositories and admit its copying and distribution for non-commercial, educational or research purposes, as long as credit is given to the author and editor.

For those who come after.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I will first thank my advisors for their guidance and supervision of this dissertation. Not to forget professor João Lourenço for the **novathesis** template in which it was written.

I must also express my sincere appreciation to the Raquel & Martin Sain Foundation for their invaluable cooperation from the preliminary phase of the study to its conclusion, from which I am particularly grateful to Cláudia Pires and Ana Inês Soares for their constructive feedback and making themselves available for both phases of the research.

My honest gratitude goes to all the BVI participants who took the time to validate the proposed mobile application, as well as the normovisual participants who evaluated the desktop editor.

Above all, I am immensely thankful to my family and friends for their support and encouragement throughout this stage in my life. I could not do what I do if it weren't for their love and understanding.

ABSTRACT

In their mission as inclusive spaces of cultural participation and celebration, museums have taken considerable strides in overcoming their historical reliance on sight to adequately accommodate the needs of the Blind and Visually Impaired (BVI).

However, accessibility tends to be an afterthought rather than a priority, and most exhibitions have mainly remained inaccessible to a BVI audience. Meritable as they are, the most common accessibility methods often fail to balance exposure to information and proper artwork engagement, if even available. Finding their independence, mobility, and interpretative access conditioned, in Europe, blind and low-vision people rarely attend these institutions despite enjoying and expressing the desire to experience visual art.

In this dissertation, a hybrid approach to BVI-accessible visual art interpretation is proposed to narrow current accessibility gaps by providing interaction with a painting's virtual sonic recreation through both sensorial and descriptive access to its contents. It is symbiotically divided into two components catering to unique audiences: BVI individuals and curators or art professionals.

The devised system comprises a mobile soundscape player, where BVI users autonomously explore auditory environments representative of paintings through assisted thumbstick movement, directional audio cues, and a vicinity scanning Spatial Awareness Tool (SAT), among other SATs. The application is supplemented by a desktop soundscape editor, with which curators without prior sound design expertise may quickly develop the immersive auditory scenes made available in the soundscape player for BVI visitors.

Ultimately, this proposal aims to fulfill BVI patrons' informational and aesthetic needs regarding visual art access, promoting their independence and tearing down barriers to accessibility. The system was evaluated via a distinct user study for each of its constituents, in which participants assessed the application's features and overall viability.

Keywords: Blind and Visually Impaired, Accessible Culture, Spatial Audio, Soundscape

RESUMO

Na sua missão como espaços inclusivos de participação e celebração cultural, os museus têm dado passadas consideráveis para ultrapassar a sua dependência histórica da visão e acomodar adequadamente as necessidades das pessoas cegas e com baixa visão.

No entanto, a acessibilidade tende a ser uma reflexão tardia e não uma prioridade, e a maioria das exposições tem permanecido inacessível a um público com deficiência visual. Por meritórios que sejam, os métodos de acessibilidade mais comuns não conseguem muitas vezes equilibrar a exposição à informação e o devido envolvimento com a obra de arte, se disponíveis sequer. Por verem a sua independência, mobilidade e acesso interpretativo condicionados, na Europa, as pessoas cegas e com baixa visão raramente frequentam estas instituições, apesar de apreciarem e manifestarem o desejo de experienciar a arte visual.

Nesta dissertação, é proposta uma abordagem híbrida quanto à interpretação acessível de arte visual para atenuar barreiras de acesso atuais, proporcionando interação com a recriação virtual sonora de uma pintura através do acesso sensorial e descriptivo ao seu conteúdo. Está dividida simbóticamente em dois componentes direcionados a públicos distintos: pessoas com deficiência visual e curadores ou profissionais de arte.

O sistema concebido inclui um reproduutor de paisagens sonoras móvel, onde os utilizadores invisuais exploram autonomamente ambientes auditivos representativos de pinturas, através de movimento assistido por um *thumbstick*, sinais direcionais de áudio e uma ferramenta de análise da vizinhança, entre outras ferramentas de noção espacial. A aplicação é complementada por um editor de paisagens sonoras para *desktop*, no qual curadores sem experiência prévia em *design* sonoro, podem hábilmente desenvolver as cenas auditivas imersivas disponibilizadas no reproduutor de paisagens sonoras para

Fundamentalmente, esta proposta visa satisfazer as necessidades informativas e estéticas dos visitantes cegos ou de baixa visão no que respeita ao acesso à arte visual, promovendo a sua independência e derrubando barreiras à acessibilidade. O sistema foi avaliado através de um estudo de utilizador distinto para cada um dos seus componentes, no qual os participantes avaliaram as funcionalidades e a viabilidade geral da aplicação.

Palavras-chave: Cegos e Baixa Visão, Cultura Acessível, Áudio Espacial, Paisagem Sonora

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-------------|
| List of Figures | x |
| Listings | xii |
| Acronyms | xiii |
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Motivation | 1 |
| 1.2 Problem Description & Objectives | 3 |
| 1.3 Solution Overview and Contributions | 3 |
| 1.4 Document Structure | 4 |
| 2 Background | 6 |
| 2.1 What Is Sound And How It Is Perceived | 6 |
| 2.2 Sound Propagation | 7 |
| 2.3 Sound Localization | 8 |
| 2.3.1 Interaural Differences | 9 |
| 2.3.2 The Cone Of Confusion | 10 |
| 2.3.3 Head Related Transfer Function | 11 |
| 2.4 Soundscape | 13 |
| 2.5 Discussion | 13 |
| 3 Related Work | 15 |
| 3.1 Immersive Audio Experiences in Cultural Environments | 15 |
| 3.1.1 Eyes-Free Art | 15 |
| 3.1.2 Audio-augmented museum experiences with gaze tracking . . . | 17 |
| 3.2 BVI Accessibility in Multisensory Experiences | 18 |
| 3.2.1 Navmol | 18 |
| 3.2.2 MusA | 19 |
| 3.3 Leisurely BVI Inclusive Applications | 20 |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|-----------|
| 3.3.1 | LEAP Tic-Tac-Toe | 21 |
| 3.3.2 | The Preferred Spatial Awareness Tools for BVI People In Video Games | 22 |
| 3.4 | Tools for Soundscape Creation | 24 |
| 3.4.1 | Immerscape | 25 |
| 4 | Proposed Solution | 27 |
| 4.1 | Proposal Overview | 27 |
| 4.1.1 | Mobile Soundscape Player | 29 |
| 4.1.2 | Soundscape Editor for Windows | 31 |
| 4.2 | System Limitations | 34 |
| 4.3 | Initial Research & Concept Refinement | 35 |
| 4.4 | Technological Stack | 36 |
| 4.5 | Implementation | 38 |
| 4.5.1 | Mobile BVI-Acessible Soundscape Player Prototype | 38 |
| 4.5.2 | Desktop Beginner-Friendly Soundscape Editor | 41 |
| 5 | Evaluation and Results | 45 |
| 5.1 | User Studies | 45 |
| 5.2 | Mobile Sonic Painting Exploration | 46 |
| 5.2.1 | User Characterization | 47 |
| 5.2.2 | Task Overview | 48 |
| 5.2.3 | Results Overview | 48 |
| 5.2.4 | The Perspective of a Returning User | 53 |
| 5.3 | Desktop Soundscape Creation | 54 |
| 5.3.1 | User Characterization | 54 |
| 5.3.2 | Task Overview | 55 |
| 5.3.3 | Results Overview | 56 |
| 5.4 | Summary | 61 |
| 6 | Conclusion | 62 |
| 6.1 | Future Work | 64 |
| Bibliography | | 66 |
| Appendices | | |
| A | Conceptual mockups | 72 |
| A.1 | Mobile Soundscape Player | 73 |
| A.2 | Desktop Soundscape Editor | 74 |
| B | User Studies | 76 |
| B.1 | Mobile Soundscape Player | 77 |

| | |
|---|----|
| B.2 Desktop Soundscape Editor | 83 |
|---|----|

LIST OF FIGURES

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 2.1 | Graphical representation of a simple sine wave (Adapted from [3]). © 2010 - Bill Ansell. | 6 |
| 2.2 | Representation of rarefaction and condensation zones (Adapted from [46]). | 7 |
| 2.3 | Polar coordinates used to locate a sound source in a 3-Dimensional (3D) space centered on the listener (Adapted from [39]). | 8 |
| 2.4 | Interaural Time Difference and Interaural Level Difference, respectively (Adapted from [57]). | 9 |
| 2.5 | Cone of confusion, in which Interaural Time Difference (ITD)s and Interaural Level Difference (ILD)s are indistinguishable (Adapted from [28]). | 11 |
| 2.6 | Head-Related-Transfer-Function (HRTF) measurements in an anechoic chamber (Adapted from [26]). | 12 |
| 3.1 | The four zones of the Eyes-Free Art proxemical interface. Image is <i>The Blue Rider</i> from Wassily Kandinsky (Reproduced from [38]). © 2017 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). | 16 |
| 3.2 | Two of the paintings used in the application. Blue audio icons represent virtual sounds accurately spatialized relative to the user (b). (Adapted from [54]). © 2019 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). | 17 |
| 3.3 | Navmol's clock system, where carbon-3 has neighbors at 6 o'clock and 10 o'clock, respectively carbon-4 and carbon-2 (Adapted from [16]). | 19 |
| 3.4 | Some screens of the MusA app. The first two screens respectively correspond to chapter navigation and selection in its first iteration. The third screen corresponds to the second iteration's virtual mode (Adapted from [1]). © 2021 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). | 20 |
| 3.5 | Part of the Tic-Tac-Toe game's graphical user interface (Adapted from [13]). © 2015 ACM. | 22 |
| 3.6 | The four spatial awareness tools implemented within Dungeon Escape [30]). © 2022 ACM. | 23 |

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 3.7 | Immerscape's environment, through the player view perspective. The red cube represents an audio object (Reproduced from [17]). © 2021 Carolina Ribeiro Dias Ferreira. | 26 |
| 4.1 | Representation of the proposed interaction. Background image is <i>O Bosque Sagrado</i> by Maria Benamor, 1975. Collection of Museu Nacional Grão Vasco. (Adapted from [36]). | 28 |
| 4.2 | Conceptual system architecture. <i>Disclaimer: The current editor prototype does not currently support exportation of the devised scenes, though it was initially intended.</i> | 28 |
| 4.3 | The three available display modes of the mobile prototype: Immersive, Accessible and Minimalist. | 29 |
| 4.4 | Directional scanner in use: on the left the scanner has not detected an element while on the right it has detected a spatial sound source and narrates it. | 30 |
| 4.5 | Development mode. Background image is <i>O Bosque Sagrado</i> by Maria Benamor, 1975. Collection of Museu Nacional Grão Vasco. (Adapted from [36]) | 32 |
| 4.6 | Editing popup windows for a ambient sound element on the left, and a spatial sound element on the right. | 33 |
| 4.7 | Editing popup of the player element on the left. The rightmost image allows the customization of the proximity sensor's reach and varying frequency areas. | 34 |
| 4.8 | Interactive mode. | 34 |
| 4.9 | State pattern incorporation within the application. | 42 |
| 4.10 | <i>SceneData</i> class holds the soundscape information passed between the application's two modes: Development and Interactive. | 44 |
| 5.1 | Participant responses regarding navigation comfort and orientation. | 49 |
| 5.2 | Participant responses regarding spatial awareness and related features. | 50 |
| 5.3 | Participant responses regarding sound environment regulation. | 51 |
| 5.4 | Participant responses regarding the two existing reproduction modes - simultaneous and sequential. | 51 |
| 5.5 | Participant responses regarding the available control schemes - physical gamepad and touch. | 52 |
| 5.6 | Participant responses regarding setting up the background painting, global narration and initial setup. | 57 |
| 5.7 | Participant responses regarding the current grid-like placement system. | 58 |
| 5.8 | Participant responses regarding the editing options for the existing element types. | 58 |
| 5.9 | Participant responses regarding the two existing modes of interaction. | 59 |
| 5.10 | Participant responses regarding the need for a help button. | 59 |
| 5.11 | Participant responses regarding the overall user experience. | 60 |

LISTINGS

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 4.1 | Main method for implementing the scanner functionality in C#. | 39 |
| 4.2 | The two main methods for implementing the proximity sensor in C#. | 40 |
| 4.3 | Methods for loading scene information into Interactive mode and asynchronous audio caching in C#. | 43 |

ACRONYMS

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 2D | 2-Dimensional (pp. 7, 15, 29–32, 36) |
| 3D | 3-Dimensional (pp. x, 3, 7, 8, 13–15, 17, 20–26, 30, 31, 36, 37, 72) |
| AR | Augmented Reality (pp. 2, 18, 19) |
| BVI | Blind and Visually Impaired (pp. iv, 2–5, 13–18, 20–22, 26, 27, 29, 31, 35, 36, 45, 46, 54, 60–64) |
| CC0 | Creative Commons Zero (pp. 38, 41) |
| HRTF | Head-Related-Transfer-Function (pp. x, 8, 10–15, 18–22, 26, 37) |
| ILD | Interaural Level Difference (pp. x, 10, 11) |
| IPD | Interaural Phase Difference (p. 10) |
| ITD | Interaural Time Difference (pp. x, 9–11) |
| QoL | Quality of Life (pp. 60, 61, 63, 65) |
| SAT | Spatial Awareness Tool (pp. iv, 3, 4, 14, 21–24, 27, 30, 62, 63) |
| UI | User Interface (pp. 38, 41, 64) |
| VR | Virtual Reality (pp. 2, 24) |

INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the problems this dissertation addresses and establishes the motivation for exploring spatial audio as a tool to improve accessibility in art museums. It outlines the objectives of the research and provides an overview of the proposed solution, alongside its contributions.

In a colorful world filled with life and the most varied shapes and patterns, each of our five senses is vital in obtaining information about our surroundings [18]. Out of these, vision is the most dominant, as about 80% of what we learn about the world and the impressions we perceive are through our sight [9]. It is so valued that not only do 77% of people state that it is their most important sense, but they would also rather live shorter lives than longer ones without their sight [15, 49].

Unfortunately, sight is not a universal given. According to the International Agency for the Prevention of Blindness Vision Atlas [34], as of 2020, approximately 1.1 billion people worldwide were living with some form of vision loss. Over the last few decades, there has been a decrease in vision loss prevalence in proportion across the population. However, the absolute numbers have increased and will not be dwindling anytime soon. On the contrary, vision loss is expected to grow across all categories, with projections indicating that by 2050, approximately 1.8 billion people worldwide will experience visual impairment [35], marking a 55% increase in vision loss.

If inclusivity and disability rights alone are not enough motivation to care for this community, the World Health Organization [33] states that everyone, if they live long enough, will experience some eye condition in their lifetime in need of proper care. As such, the concerns of the visually impaired community should in fact be everyone's concerns as well.

1.1 Motivation

Art is a universal form of human expression, whether cultural, creative, somewhere between, or something else entirely. From their very conception, museums have traditionally

been one of, if not the most prominent, ways to not only access such art but also celebrate and share it across generations. These institutions are mostly known for being the custodians of history, heritage, and artistic expression.

It is the very mission of a museum to be an inclusive and accessible space of cultural participation and a shared human experience. However, there are limitations to this statement. Exhibitions are historically visual, as most available art is specifically designed to be consumed that way. This poses a considerable barrier for blind and visually impaired people in terms of access to information and even hinders their mobility and independence within an exhibition [10, 24, 51, 52, 53].

Although the visually impaired are still not appropriately accommodated to this day, there have been strides in the right direction, one of which is in the form of legislation advocating for their right to participate in cultural life - article 30 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities [32].

In recent times, museums too have made considerable efforts in adapting to the needs of the visually impaired aside from mobility and navigation, gradually becoming more inclusive and participatory spaces [4, 20, 24, 27, 38].

Though institutions are now more accessible than they ever were, most museums are still largely inaccessible to a BVI audience, as accessibility is more of an afterthought than a priority [8, 38, 51]. As a result, low-vision people rarely attend these institutions - in Europe, only 5.5% of them do [52, 53]. The aforementioned visual centricity of exhibitions is a primary reason for this statistic, as it significantly limits not only their mobility but also their access to information, which in turn dramatically hinders their independence as well [10, 24].

Such a low percentage of museum attendance is particularly demoralizing, since BVI people enjoy and express the desire to visit galleries and experience visual art [8, 24]. However, they must be given the proper access to do so [20] and do not want to constantly rely on others [4, 22].

While the accessibility methods employed at museums are valuable, these tend to emphasize descriptive information over actual appreciation [22, 24, 27]. Good accessibility requires a fine-tuned balance of exposure to information and engagement with the artwork. Achieving this balance is especially important for visually impaired visitors, as it allows them to develop meaningful connections to art, going beyond the pure intellectual understanding of it [27]. Approaches combining music and soundscapes have shown promise but can be time and resource-intensive [22].

Spatial audio, haptics, Virtual Reality (VR), Augmented Reality (AR) and other technological advancements have produced increasingly immersive experiences, creating opportunities for remote artistic appreciation [11, 25, 45, 54]. People can experience art from the comfort of their homes or anyplace else thanks to digital platforms and virtual tours, which can dissolve physical constraints. This enables them to interact at their own pace and unshackle themselves from social tension despite the risk of less engagement than in person [12, 24].

The potential of virtual environments to provide a variety of interaction modalities and content has been thoroughly investigated, and sound-based approaches are especially important for blind and visually impaired people [45, 54]. By mimicking environmental cues, spatial audio improves spatial orientation and makes it easier for users to move freely and independently in virtual environments, helping them experience virtual worlds [45]. Frequently enhanced with 3D effects to improve spatial perception and experience, 3D audio improves navigation and immersive engagement in museum and gallery settings [54].

Primarily supporting the above-mentioned technologies, the smartphone is a suitable vehicle for accessibility as about 54% of the global population owns at least one [23], and it is rich in accessibility features among several others [5]. This study draws inspiration from several implementations of accessible technologies to develop a remote mobile and 3D sound-based solution that addresses BVI visitors' informational and aesthetic needs.

1.2 Problem Description & Objectives

As briefly alluded to in section 1.1, there are some limitations to the accessibility methods usually active at museums [8, 10, 20, 38]. Tours and workshops directed at a BVI audience are infrequent and inconsistent, usually must be reserved in advance and are only available on specific dates or time slots. Though more common in museums, audio descriptions are primarily designed with normovisual people in mind, mainly focusing on interpretation and historical context, not accessibility. Braille-based brochures leave much relevant information aside, and braille proficiency is generally low [10].

The preferred form of interaction with artworks for BVI individuals seems to be the tactile approach since it allows them to feel the artwork up close and personal and sense its various features at a low level [22, 24]. However, high-level information about the piece is quite limited, and preservation efforts, intellectual access barriers, and the still prevalent visual centricity of exhibitions make these types of programs a rare occurrence among museums [24].

Drawing inspiration from the use of spatial audio in other research and accessible games to convey space and emotion [17, 29, 30], this dissertation's primary objective is to address the accessibility gaps left by the methods currently in place at museums, namely in what concerns the literal interpretation and aesthetic appreciation of paintings. To meet this ambitious goal, the developed system looks to enable BVI visitors in autonomously engaging with visual art through an assortment of non-visual means, particularly 3D audio stimuli and an intuitive set of spatial awareness tools (SATs).

1.3 Solution Overview and Contributions

In pursuit of the objective delineated in section 1.2, the solution proposed in this dissertation comprises a bipartite system aiming to provide both BVI-inclusive soundscape interaction and intuitive creation of the auditory content to be interacted with.

The system's core component is a mobile application: an interactive and accessible soundscape player for BVI visitors, allowing them to navigate auditory representations of paintings and learn about them through various sound effects (ambient and localized), verbal descriptions, and customizable sound settings, assisted by carefully considered SATs.

Intended to supplement the mobile application, a desktop soundscape editor is also proposed, as the means by which content for the mobile application can be produced, supporting the end-to-end creation of auditory environments through a straightforward interface. This tool is targeted at curators or art professionals without prior experience in sound design or programming.

This dissertation's principal contributions are as follows:

- A mobile prototype enabling BVI users to explore highly interactive auditory recreations of artwork through immersive audio and several SATs, providing an experience that is both aesthetic and informational while promoting independence with simple controls;
- A desktop editor prototype for creating auditory environments representing paintings, intuitive to curators or art professionals with no prior computer science or sound design expertise;
- A widely available approach to BVI accessibility through the use of smartphones and headphones, allowing for both remote and on-site interaction with art.

1.4 Document Structure

There are six main chapters to this document:

- **Chapter 1 - Introduction:** Introduces the problems this dissertation addresses and establishes the motivation for exploring spatial audio as a tool to improve accessibility in art museums. It outlines the objectives of the research and provides an overview of the proposed solution, alongside its contributions.
- **Chapter 2 - Background:** Presents the foundational concepts most relevant to understanding the work to be developed. It covers sound principles from its definition, perception, transmission, and spatial localization. Additionally, the definition and purpose of soundscapes are addressed, and most importantly, the role these play in accessibility for the blind and visually impaired.
- **Chapter 3 - Related Work:** Reviews relevant research and applications mainly related to immersive spatial audio and BVI accessibility, including technologies and approaches to address said accessibility. It is divided into sections, each focusing on a specific topic related to the dissertation's theme. Each section starts with a brief overview of related studies and projects displaying the current state of the

art. It is then followed by subsections where projects of particular relevance to this dissertation are explored in detail, from implementation to findings, and finally, how they relate to the current solution and what is to be learned from them.

- **Chapter 4 - Proposed Solution:** Provides a detailed overview of the proposed system, introducing the BVI-inclusive mobile soundscape player and the soundscape editor for Windows, as well as the system's limitations. An exploration of the initial research and refinement of the proposed concept then follows and the technological stack chosen for the solution's implementation is addressed. A discussion on the implementation of both prototypes composing the system concludes the chapter.
- **Chapter 5 - Evaluation and Results:** Presents the evaluation of the two developed prototypes as their own distinct study and starts by outlining the methodology common to both. It then details the assessment of the mobile soundscape player with BVI participants, followed by the desktop soundscape editor with users inexperienced in sound design. Each study is generally described in terms of participant characterization, the tasks undertaken, and the main findings drawn from survey responses. A summary of the results of both studies concludes the chapter, discussing the extent to which the prototypes achieved their intended objectives.
- **Chapter 6 - Conclusion:** Concludes the dissertation with a summary of the work developed throughout its course, revisiting the motivation, objectives and a synopsis of the proposed solution, outlining the features inspired by related work. Additionally, the system's shortcomings as well as its strengths are acknowledged via a discussion of the results of its two constituents. The chapter closes by envisioning the future of the developed system, contemplating further improvements and essential features.

BACKGROUND

This chapter presents the foundational concepts most relevant to understanding the work to be developed. It covers sound principles from its definition, perception, transmission, and spatial localization. Additionally, the definition and purpose of soundscapes are addressed, and most importantly, the role these play in accessibility for the blind and visually impaired.

2.1 What Is Sound And How It Is Perceived

As a physical phenomenon, sound is enabled by the vibration of a body with the properties of inertia and elasticity (which are attributes of nearly every object). Any vibration can produce sound if it meets the requirements for moving a body back and forth. The simplest of vibrations can be characterized by a sinusoid (Figure 2.1) and is the elementary unit for all possible vibrations.




Figure 2.1: Graphical representation of a simple sine wave (Adapted from [3]). © 2010 - Bill Ansell.

Any vibration can be broken down into a composition of sine waves - a Fourier series, each uniquely identified by frequency, amplitude, and starting phase. Describing a complex vibration by deriving the characteristics of its composing simple vibrations is named a Fourier analysis [55].

Without delving into the anatomical details, hearing starts once a sound wave vibrates our eardrum. After passing through the outer, middle, and inner ear, what reaches our auditory nervous system is no longer a mechanical vibration but a nervous impulse, which our brain now interprets. Perceptually, the changes in amplitude of a sine wave tend to be experienced as loudness, while changes in frequency are labeled as pitch [55].

2.2 Sound Propagation

As mentioned in section 2.1, for a sound to reach our ears or any other point, it must first travel through a medium with the properties of elasticity and inertia. That is to say that, for example, it can travel through solids, liquids, and gases but not through a vacuum [55]. The speed at which it propagates may vary with the temperature and density of the medium, which in air is around 343 meters per second (at 20° C) [40].

In the air, the very presence of its randomly moving molecules originates a static pressure, which, when disturbed by the vibrations of a sound source, leads to zones of alternating pressure (Figure 2.2 illustrates this) – where the molecules cluster more tightly is called an area of condensation. In contrast, a significant spread in molecule placement designates an area of rarefaction.




Figure 2.2: Representation of rarefaction and condensation zones (Adapted from [46]).

Sound waves propagate in all directions from a source (circularly in 2-Dimensional (2D), spherically in 3-Dimensional (3D)) and, while traveling, may come across several forms of interference, such as reflection, absorption, diffraction, and refraction. For example, an obstacle with a size similar to that of the sound's wavelength may produce an area past the object where wave magnitude is significantly reduced or even completely

absent – a sound shadow. In addition, the intensity of a sound decreases quadratically with the distance to its source - the inverse square law [55].

2.3 Sound Localization

As sound has no intrinsic spatial dimensions, how we perceive spatial cues is a product of our auditory system's capability to process the physical properties of sound that correspond to spatial position [55]. There exist three spatial dimensions in which one can localize sound: the horizontal plane, commonly referred to as the azimuth, the vertical plane (elevation), and the distance (range) [40, 55]. These are properly illustrated in Figure 2.3.




Figure 2.3: Polar coordinates used to locate a sound source in a 3D space centered on the listener (Adapted from [39]).

Our spatial perception relies heavily on binaural hearing - the ability to interpret and locate what we hear from both ears. While monaural cues also contribute to spatial hearing, namely for vertical localization and depth perception, mechanisms for perceiving directional sound depend to a large extent on binaural cues - used for localization in the horizontal plane, consisting of the interaural differences of time and intensity [43].

Via these differences in signal reception between both ears, time and level are key physical measurements that enable sound localization along the azimuthal plane and will be further addressed in section 2.3.1. Another important property is the sound's spectral shape relevant for vertical localization, and it is impacted by interference phenomena such as reflection, diffraction, and absorption caused by a listener's physical features [40]. These alterations are captured by a Head-Related-Transfer-Function (HRTF), which will be addressed in section 2.3.3. On the other hand, the perception of distance to a sound

source is mainly influenced by the sound's loudness and early reflections from nearby surfaces [55].

2.3.1 Interaural Differences

The differences between the signals our two ears receive are coined as interaural differences. As briefly mentioned in section 2.3, they are our auditory system's primary mechanisms for localizing sound along the azimuthal plane. Figure 2.4 illustrates them clearly.




Figure 2.4: Interaural Time Difference and Interaural Level Difference, respectively (Adapted from [57]).

These mechanisms depend on the sound signal's nature and can be influenced by environmental cues that introduce conflicting information [43]. One may classify interaural differences into two primary categories:

- **Interaural Time Difference:** The Interaural Time Difference (ITD) refers to the delay in sound arriving in one ear compared to the other.

Binaural delay is the designation of the maximum time delay between the ears, and it enables the resolution of a source in the direction of the ear that first heard it – the precedence effect. The sound source's angle of incidence affects the additional distance that the wave must travel to the farthest ear, thus impacting the binaural delay. The brain usually localizes the sound towards the earliest source for similar sound sources in different locations.

When considering sinusoidal signals, ITDs may be expressed as Interaural Phase Differences and are fundamental for locating low-frequency sounds where the wavelength is large enough for phase differences to be noticeable. For higher

frequency sounds, the interpretation for both ITD and Interaural Phase Difference (IPD) becomes ambiguous [55], and one can no longer tell which ear is leading or lagging [40, 43].

- **Interaural Level Difference:** The Interaural Level Difference (ILD) pertains to the difference in intensity of the same sound between the two ears.

The intensity of the stimulus at the ear closer to the source is slightly more significant due to proximity (as explained by the inverse square law, mentioned at the end of section 2.2) [43, 55]. However, the extra distance the wave travels to the farther ear is negligible and the intensity differences minimal [43].

The primary contributor to ILDs is not proximity but the attenuation caused by the head's sound shadow for high-frequency sounds. A higher frequency implies a shorter wavelength and a greater sound shadow, thus a more noticeable difference in level [55]. The same cannot be said for low frequencies, at which the head is not a decent barrier to sound [43].

These mechanisms complement each other in providing fundamental cues for localizing sound sources in the azimuthal plane. However, these are not without limitations, some of which will be addressed in subsection 2.3.2.

2.3.2 The Cone Of Confusion

Though the interaural differences are crucial and effective in locating sound along the horizontal plane, one exception is the cone of confusion [40, 55]. When a listener's head is stationary, detecting whether a sound is coming from the front or behind, or even its elevation, is far from obvious. The difficulty arises because some locations are producing the same interaural differences [40, 55]. The plane in which these ambiguous points lie is dubbed the mid-sagittal plane [55], and it forms the so-called cone of confusion (see Figure 2.5), its axis being the interauricular line [40].

Any sound deriving from this cone's circumference produces neither time nor level differences, while any sound coming from elsewhere inside the cone has at least one other point mirroring its interaural differences [40]. Every sound source location has its cone of confusion describing the other possible locations producing the same interaural differences [55]. The most intuitive way to reduce this ambiguity is our natural head movements [40, 43, 55]. Simply leaning our head or rotating it tears down the original cone of confusion by altering the ITD and ILD values, introducing additional binaural and spectral cues – enhancing localization.

If head movement is not an option, our auditory system relies on the spectral cues derived from the HRTFs [40, 55] (will be addressed in some detail in section 2.3.3), which are not only critical in determining the vertical direction of sound but also in distinguishing between the ambiguous sounds along the azimuthal plane [40].




Figure 2.5: Cone of confusion, in which ITDs and ILDs are indistinguishable (Adapted from [28]).

2.3.3 Head Related Transfer Function

As explained in section 2.3.2, due to the cone of confusion, interaural differences alone are not enough to adequately determine the direction of a sound, especially along the vertical plane. The path of a sound to our ears is rarely uneventful, as our very anatomy induces significant changes in its spectrum. Our head, torso, and, more importantly, the structure of the pinna act as sound shadows in the sound's trajectory, which are particularly accentuated for high-frequency sounds (since the wavelength is closer to the small size of the pinna) [55]. Furthermore, the listed physical features interfere with an incoming sound wave through reflection, diffraction, and absorption, attenuating or delaying specific frequencies composing it [40, 43].

These effects, caused by the filtering action of the pinna and body, are known as spectral cues [55] and are determined monaurally [43]. Depending on both the position of the sound's source as well as its angle of incidence [43, 55], such cues uniquely shape a sound's spectrum at the eardrum level. They are captured by what is called a Head Related Transfer Function (HRTF) [55].

An HRTF is a descriptor for the transformations a sound undertakes on its route to a listener's tympanum due to the hearer's physical features. For complex and high-frequency sounds, it is a highly competent mechanism for estimating the vertical position of a sound. However, it performs poorly for non-complex and low-frequency sounds (likely due to the wavelength exceeding the size of the pinna) [40]. Figure 2.6 shows how it may be measured.

Vertical localization is generally less accurate than its horizontal counterpart. However, coupling spectral cues with the previously mentioned interaural differences is a good



Figure 2.6: HRTF measurements in an anechoic chamber (Adapted from [26]).

approach for resolving the ambiguities within the cone of confusion without the need for head movement [55].

Just as individuals greatly vary in their morphology, so does the shape and size of their pinna and thus, the filtering effect their ears impose on incoming soundwaves. Consequently, each person has a unique set of HRTFs learned throughout their lives [40, 43]. Additionally, research has found that amplifications or attenuations in particular regions of the frequency spectrum seem to correspond to specific sound source positions [43].

From a practical perspective, generalizing the spectral characteristics that compose HRTFs across a vast demographic simplifies their implementation process while ensuring reasonable accuracy for many listeners. However, to no surprise, an individual's best HRTFs are their own [43], providing the most accurate spatial perception. Nonetheless, there have been studies in which subjects are fed audio signals through HRTFs other than their own [40, 43] – to find their ability to localize sound significantly hampered [43]. After some time, the participants appear to begin learning the HRTFs they have been given and eventually regain normal vertical localization [40]. Some people are known to localize audio better than others, so their HRTFs tend to be considered more applicable for general use [43].

Delivering audio stimuli over headphones is convenient and establishes a controlled environment [55]. However, certain headphone types induce a feeling of the sound emanating from inside the head, rather than the natural tridimensional externalization (azimuth, elevation, and range) we are accustomed to [43, 55]. In short, headphones fail to deliver on the nuances captured by HRTFs since they emit sound directly to our ear, while a real outside source would first be affected by our physical features. Fortunately, simulating externalization is relatively intuitive: recreate a sound with all the spectral complexity of a real-world one by applying HRTF-based filtering and only then transmit it [55].

2.4 Soundscape

By R.M. Schafer's [47] definition, a soundscape englobes the various acoustic elements within an auditory environment in its totality and mainly focuses on how this environment is humanly interpreted [2, 7, 14]. While a soundscape can be a physical phenomenon such as an acoustic environment, the emphasis on human perception distinguishes this term from being just that, as it can also be thought of as a perceptual concept [2, 7]. Its perceptual quality allows listeners to attribute meaning to their surroundings, immersing themselves personally.

Interacting with a soundscape yields distinct results for different individuals, as people's preferences and expectations greatly vary [14], especially according to the space and context of the environment [7]. Among other socially relevant values, soundscapes provide a sense of place and atmosphere, express cultural and historical values, and promote human connection to nature by enhancing the aestheticism of the experience.

The fidelity of a soundscape is mainly evaluated on how different sound sources are perceived and the level of noise present [14]. So, too, is its general quality evaluated on several descriptors, some of which being noise annoyance, pleasantness, and quietness [2].

In the context of this dissertation, the role of the soundscape as an accessibility tool for Blind and Visually Impaired (BVI) individuals is of particular interest. Since their reliance on vision is limited, if any, they are not only more sensitive to auditory cues but can also draw more information from acoustic signals than sighted people [44]. For these individuals, a high-fidelity soundscape is as functional as it is aesthetic since, from its acoustical information, they can derive information regarding the morphology and movement of objects. A fine example is rainfall, as it contours environmental elements, enhancing spatial awareness and connection to the environment [44].

2.5 Discussion

This chapter aims to provide a structured understanding of sound by building up to sound localization, the most critical aspect of this dissertation. It starts by laying the groundwork through concise overviews of the most fundamental concepts regarding sound, such as what it is and how humans perceive it (section 2.1), and how it travels (section 2.2).

Sound localization is then detailed in section 2.3, introducing the three spatial dimensions where sound may be localized and exploring two techniques on which spatial audio heavily relies. Section 2.3.1 covers the interaural differences of time and level, which are essential for the binaural determination of a sound source's direction in the horizontal plane. Additionally, section 2.3.3 explains the notion of HRTF, its relevance for the monaural perception of 3D sound through spectral cues, and how it complements the interaural differences by resolving the cone of confusion (addressed in section 2.3.2).

The chapter closes on a less technical note. Section 2.4 focuses on the soundscape as a means to evoke meaning and a sense of atmosphere within an auditory environment,

briefly touching on how it is useful for BVI individuals.

Chapter 3 presents some studies related to the current work where most, if not all, of the principles addressed were put into practice. In the research, the vast applications of sound within cultural settings and elsewhere are explored, mainly studying its effectiveness in enhancing accessibility and engagement. 3D audio, interactive soundscapes and sound-based Spatial Awareness Tool (SAT)s are examples of such uses.

Informed by the implementation and findings of related studies, the presented concepts are incorporated into this thesis, with spatial audio standing at the core of the proposal. Employing the concepts of interaural differences and HRTFs, the system is intended to non-visually convey the spatial characteristics of artworks through BVI-accessible interaction and exploration, and ultimately evoke emotional and aesthetic engagement beyond factual description.

RELATED WORK

This chapter reviews relevant research and applications mainly related to immersive spatial audio and BVI accessibility, including technologies and approaches to address said accessibility. It is divided into sections, each focusing on a specific topic related to the dissertation's theme. Each section starts with a brief overview of related studies and projects displaying the current state of the art. It is then followed by subsections where projects of particular relevance to this dissertation are explored in detail, from implementation to findings, and finally, how they relate to the current solution and what is to be learned from them.

3.1 Immersive Audio Experiences in Cultural Environments

Audio is a widely used vehicle for delivering immersive experiences in cultural environments. The following two studies exemplify this statement and are centered around spatial audio since it is a central theme of this dissertation.

Focused on recreating the city of Évora's culturally rich historical soundscapes, Ferreira [17] created Immerscape, a tool aimed at non-expert users for generating 3D audio scenes, utilizing HRTFs to spatialize sound. Immerscape is covered in further detail in subsection 3.4.1. Kabisch et al. [21] used motion tracking, image analysis, and sonification alongside real-time directional sound to integrate panoramic visual landscapes with spatialized audio, presenting such research in an interactive art exhibit. Besides just sound, Ramogida and Kenderdine [37] incorporated olfactory augmentation into multisensorial art access by combining digital twins with interactive smellscapes.

3.1.1 Eyes-Free Art

Looking to enhance the accessibility of visual art to BVI individuals and go beyond the shortcomings of the typical audio descriptions or guides, Rector et al. [38] designed Eyes-Free Art. Eyes-Free Art was a novel approach to sonically interacting with 2D art, aiming to be both aesthetically stimulating and engaging.

It is a carefully crafted proxemic audio interface that, mirroring the conventional intuition of visual proxemic interfaces, renders more detail as proximity to the piece increases. In order to define such proximity, a Microsoft Kinect device was used to track the user's position and movements to determine the distance to the painting and if it is facing toward it. The audio interpretation a user hears varies according to the proxemic zone in which it finds itself, of which there are four distinct and equally sized ones (Figure 3.1). Upon entering any zone, the user is verbally alerted to where it is and may continue moving between zones, spending as much time as he/she wants in each.




Figure 3.1: The four zones of the Eyes-Free Art proxemical interface. Image is *The Blue Rider* from Wassily Kandinsky (Reproduced from [38]). © 2017 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

The furthest zone consists only of background music that sets the piece's mood. It is followed by a sonification area that communicates the painting's chromatic diversity through musical features. The second-closest zone, sound effects, highlights the painting's literal aspects, such as the type of objects and their spatial correlation. The final and most detailed zone consists of a manually curated verbal description.

Some initial interviews were conducted, from which Rector et al. noted the importance of using commodity technology (promoting control and independence) and including both the literal and subjective aspects of a painting. A final evaluation with 13 BVI participants attested to the success of this implementation, as patrons felt immersed and had a rich experience interpreting the artwork.

Eyes-Free Art resonates with the current dissertation in several ways. Most importantly, it integrates zones of differing detail according to proximity, allowing users to explore at their own pace and at their desired level of detail. This closely aligns with this dissertation's

goal of promoting independence and interactivity. Furthermore, it also addresses mapping visual elements to sound, though the current work focuses on spatial audio rather than sonification.

3.1.2 Audio-augmented museum experiences with gaze tracking

Aiming to enrich the perception of landscape and genre paintings, Yang et al. [54] track a visitor's gaze and spatialize sounds for drawn objects and scenes within the paintings. The system personalizes the audio output based on the user's gaze; the system amplifies the sounds directed at the viewer's focal point, attenuating the rest.

Gaze and pose tracking required an eye tracker and a laptop connected to a backpack. Additionally, headphones were used for spatial audio playback (Figure 3.2). Sound propagation was dynamically simulated according to a user's gaze and pose via the Google Resonance Audio SDK¹. At the same time, the Unity² game engine was employed to model the room and map the various sound sources.




Figure 3.2: Two of the paintings used in the application. Blue audio icons represent virtual sounds accurately spatialized relative to the user (b). (Adapted from [54]). © 2019 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

A user study with 14 young adults revealed some challenges regarding the consistency of eye-tracking and differences in preference across individuals, such as the amplification of sound and the smoothness of its adjustment. Overall, the experience was still positively received, as it helped most users focus on areas of interest, some even feeling guided by their gaze.

While gaze tracking is a mostly intuitive approach to dynamic audio spatialization and interactivity with artwork, it is not the most appropriate technique for this work, which focuses on BVI users. Nonetheless, this study provides valuable insights to the current research. Akin to the proposal's proximity-based 3D audio, it narrates a painting's

¹<https://resonance-audio.github.io/resonance-audio/>

²<https://unity.com/>

visual elements by spatially assigning sounds to specific points of interest and dynamically adjusting their intensities. Finally, there is relevance in learning from the challenges faced by Yang et al., especially in accommodating for personal preference through customization.

3.2 BVI Accessibility in Multisensory Experiences

Multisensory experiences have been shown to have the potential to improve accessibility and independence for the blind and visually impaired by providing alternative ways of perceiving essentially visual content.

Li [25] developed an audio-only inclusive prototype for navigating Augmented Reality (AR) content without relying on visual cues, incorporating spatialized audio to provide intuitive feedback on object proximity and spatial relationships. Meanwhile, Cavazos Quero et al. [10] implemented a touch-sensitive multimodal guide providing localized audio descriptions based on touch, which promoted independence in both the exploration and interpretation of artworks. Banf and Blanz [6] presented a system using touchscreens that allow a visually impaired user to explore an image and receive audio feedback corresponding to its local content. This procedure employed computer vision and machine learning algorithms to sonify image features from low levels, such as color and texture, to high-level object recognition.

3.2.1 Navmol

Navmol [16] is a molecular browser and editor specifically designed for blind and visually impaired users, aiming to provide BVI accessibility in higher chemistry education. Via a speech synthesizer, it provides an auditory portrayal of the atomic composition of complex molecular structures. Such configurations are bidimensionally depicted using the analog clock metaphor, consisting of mapping directions to the positions of a clock, and are well known among the BVI community. As some users retain some degree of sight, the program has a simple graphical interface (Figure 3.3) with them in mind, visually displaying the selected atoms and some molecular contours.

Rodrigues et al. [41, 42] merged the simple clock analogy with the application of HRTFs on the auditory signal generated by the existing Navmol program at the time (version 2.0) in order to create realistic directional sound cues, perceived to derive from where the atom is positioned. Usability tests demonstrated the efficacy of this integration, with users achieving an average task accuracy of 95.7% in identifying and navigating molecular structures.

Knowing that HRTF performance may greatly vary across users due to inter-individual morphological differences, Rodrigues et al. conducted a study on the performance of 53 distinct HRTF measurements. It confirmed a significant variation in performance across different HRTF datasets for individual users. The five most consistently well-performing measurements – KEMAR, CIAIR, IRC05, IRC25, and IRC44, were then selected for use




Figure 3.3: Navmol's clock system, where carbon-3 has neighbors at 6 o'clock and 10 o'clock, respectively carbon-4 and carbon-2 (Adapted from [16]).

in one additional study, motivated by the significant variation in performance across different HRTF datasets for individual users. The necessity of allowing users to select their preferred HRTF dataset was apparent, and Navmol was updated accordingly.

Rodrigues' work very much aligns with the goals of this dissertation, as it highlights not only the efficacy of spatial audio (integrated through HRTFs) in the perception of spatial and structural information but also addresses the suitability (or lack thereof) of specific HRTFs to distinct users, allowing them to tailor their own experience to a degree.

3.2.2 MusA

Ahmetovic et al. [1] proposed MusA intending to address the limitations of traditional artwork accessibility methods, such as audio guides. MusA is a mobile application that leverages AR to provide interactive and accessible descriptions of paintings to low-vision visitors. These descriptions are structured into chapters, each representing a specific artwork area. They are linked to an image overlaid on the artwork with a contour highlighting the described section.

The application features artwork recognition via the mobile's camera, interactive navigation across chapters, and touch-based overlays. It was designed for users with some residual sight, presenting a clutter-free and to-the-point interface (Figure 3.4) compatible with system magnifiers, enlarged fonts, and adjustable contrast filters.

After an initial user testing with low-vision participants identifying some challenges, a second and final iteration of the app incorporated audio and haptic feedback, higher contrast contours, and a zoom-supporting virtual mode designed to replace AR if the user




Figure 3.4: Some screens of the MusA app. The first two screens respectively correspond to chapter navigation and selection in its first iteration. The third screen corresponds to the second iteration’s virtual mode (Adapted from [1]). © 2021 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

cannot frame the painting continuously. User studies revealed MusA to be a significantly more engaging and user-friendly experience than a traditional audio guide, promoting freedom in exploration. Despite some issues in overlay clarity, MusA was effective in supporting the needs of low-vision people, and they were pleased by the ability to use the app at home and on their own devices.

The work of Ahmetovic et al. parallels that of this dissertation in certain aspects, like the chapter navigation available in MusA. The proposed interactive soundscape offers users control over what details they wish to explore and focus on specific artwork features only with proximity-based interactions. Their findings show that visual feedback through properly contrasting overlays enriches the perception of a painting’s structure and details, even for low-vision users. They also show that there exists an appreciation for remote artistic experiences. From Ahmetovic et al.’s research, it was derived that visual cues should not be undervalued, and that the current solution should ensure low visual clutter alongside proper visibility settings, such as contrast and font size.

3.3 Leisurely BVI Inclusive Applications

Leisurely applications such as games designed for BVI individuals aim to merge entertainment with accessibility by integrating multisensory technologies such as spatial audio and haptics. Their goal is to provide experiences as unique as they are inclusive.

Nair et al. [29] introduced a spatial audio-based navigation tool for 3D games, enabling BVI players to explore and create their mental maps of virtual worlds independently. Navstick uses HRTFs for spatialized sound and allows users to scan the contents of their vicinity in specific directions using a thumbstick. Furthermore, Navstick is the directional

scanner SAT employed in subsection 3.3.2, and yielded positive feedback. Sánchez and Sáenz [45] designed and evaluated the usability of three distinct interactive 3D virtual environments for visually impaired learners: AudioMUD, AudioVida, and AudioChile. Such environments were navigable and interacted with through sound, their spatiality conveyed by spatialized audio and described by voiced narration. Simão [48] proposed *BLIND ADVENTURE*, a mobile audio game aimed at training the orientation and mobility skills of visually impaired children by presenting several challenges requiring physical movement, tracked through the device's sensors. The game's virtual environments were built with the Unity game engine and featured localizable sound cues implemented through HRTFs derived from the SADIE database.

3.3.1 LEAP Tic-Tac-Toe

Drossos et al. [13] adapted an audio-only version of Tic-Tac-Toe to be made appealing and accessible to visually impaired children by empowering it with sonic displays. Simple as it is, Tic-Tac-Toe is a visually reliant game, and spatial perception, game state, positioning, and rules all posed a significant challenge when designing it to be BVI accessible. Additionally, people with residual vision must be accounted for, enabling them to complement their auditory experience with their remaining vision.

To this end, they designed and implemented not only the game itself but also a custom game engine and audio engine specifically intended for the effective development of audio games accessible to the visually impaired. Within the game world represented by the game engine, static objects are the most common type of game object, and sound objects are included.

Carefully ensuring that BVI auditory needs were met, Drossos et al. categorized sound objects into three types that, when collectively employed, enable the development of any stage, be it simple or complex. These are classified as Standard (no interaction with the game; ambient soundtrack is an example), Interruptible (sounds that provide little more than redundant or aesthetic information), and Blocking (sounds carrying important information requiring special attention; interruptible sounds are discarded).

The audio engine functions as the API serving the audio to these objects and handles the sound settings and sonic display implementation. Auditory icons (recognizable real-world sounds) and earcons (synthetic sounds) are used for game state awareness, while binaural processing (utilizing the KEMAR HRTF library) conveys spatial details.

The game's GUI is simple and employs intense contrast alongside significant optical elements (Figure 3.5), accommodating users with residual sight. The auditory interface provides constant feedback on the effects of every action, and players sense direction and three-dimensionality through the localized sound cues. In addition, there are pre-recorded audio instructions for each game component.

In user studies, visually impaired children received the game very positively, though many were experiencing an accessible game for the first time. Drossos et al.'s findings




Figure 3.5: Part of the Tic-Tac-Toe game’s graphical user interface (Adapted from [13]). © 2015 ACM.

are valuable for this dissertation as they address challenges this solution inevitably encountered, such as the need for constant, concurrent, and discernible audio feedback and conveying localization information through the sounds for users to navigate the soundscape. They also address relevant limitations, as not all sounds are equally effective for spatial localization and varying spatial awareness among users.

3.3.2 The Preferred Spatial Awareness Tools for BVI People In Video Games

While the minimap is one of the most employed SATs in video games, crucial even for sighted players in learning the layout of their surroundings, it still has no successful equivalent regarding BVI accessibility. Attempting to bridge this gap, Nair et al. [31] took it upon themselves to tackle the creation of a universal and acoustic BVI-friendly minimap, or more concretely, uncovering the most relevant design factors as well as the merits and limitations of the best acoustic techniques to do so.

Two main questions were at the center of their study, the first regarding the key aspects of spatial awareness valued by visually impaired players in games and the second focusing on the effectiveness of current SATs in supporting said aspects. Intending to delve into both, Nair et al. [30] investigated the design of the four leading SATs (Figure 3.6) in enhancing spatial perception for the visually impaired in a 3D game world, vastly different approaches developed in previous research. These are the:

- *Smartphone Map* - A touchscreen map working in tandem with the game to provide spatial information through sound effects and text-to-speech
- *Whole-Room Shockwave* – When triggered, emits 3D sounds from certain objects based on their distance, simulating a refined and customizable echolocation (using Steam Audio³’s built-in HRTF)

³<https://valvesoftware.github.io/steam-audio/>

- *Directional Scanner* – Allows players to survey a surrounding direction by tilting the right thumbstick towards it, announcing the first object in line-of-sight with directional sound
- *Simple Audio Menu* – Lists the points of interest in a room through their corresponding sounds effects and text-to-speech, in alphabetical order




Figure 3.6: The four spatial awareness tools implemented within Dungeon Escape [30].
© 2022 ACM.

To evaluate the effectiveness of each approach in conveying essential aspects of spatial awareness and address the two main questions of the research, Nair et al. implemented them all into Dungeon Escape. Dungeon Escape is an original third-person 3D game in which the players were required to use the given SATs to gain enough spatial awareness to succeed. Implemented in the Unity game engine, it is an adventure game specifically designed for the study. Players navigate dungeons in search of objects that allow them to overcome obstacles and thus escape.

Despite its focus on studying the performance of the SATs within the differing dungeon layouts, it is more than a simple playground for the different SATs, portraying itself as an accessible game in other ways. As in well-known 3D games, the left thumbstick is used for movement and rotation, and in this case, aided by a utility mimicking snap rotation. Collisions have a unique sound effect, and relevant sound is played from any object within a 2-meter radius of the player. Furthermore, players can lock onto objects of interest by placing a looping audio beacon.

Following a user study with nine participants, eight of whom were completely blind, the most critical aspect of spatial awareness was found to be position and orientation. Presence, arrangement, and adjacent areas tied for second place, while shape and scale overwhelmingly came last. One of the key findings was that despite the importance of position and orientation, none of the approaches were entirely satisfactory, though the directional scanner performed the best. Another relevant takeaway was the effectiveness

of combining some of the SATs with the most significant spatial awareness provided by the directional scanner and simple audio menu combination. Finally, visually impaired individuals greatly value customizable SATs, as the combination of the directional scanner and whole-room shockwave closely followed the aforementioned SAT combination. This is despite the whole-room shockwave having been considered overwhelming in several instances (yet customizable) and the simple audio menu a great way to communicate presence (yet disliked by half the participants for being “spoilers”).

Nair et al.’s research provides several insights into the current dissertation, primarily by exposing the strengths and weaknesses of the different SATs and the accessible design of Dungeon Escape. Most importantly, it highlights the importance of position and orientation for proper spatial understanding and exploration, which was prioritized conveying in the current solution, possibly by incorporating combinations of the most synergetic SATs as was done in their study. Additionally, it touches on how users may be overwhelmed by too much detail, inspiring this research to focus on providing cues qualitatively rather than quantitatively.

3.4 Tools for Soundscape Creation

The current market is home to advanced soundscape creation software, enabling creators to design highly detailed and expressive auditory environments tailored to the most diverse applications. Different tools have different purposes, with some focusing on professional sound design, where the spatial accuracy of sound environments is the priority, whilst others aim for dynamism and adaptability.

Regarding sound design and immersive spatial audio, Dolby Atmos⁴ stands out as the industry’s standard in delivering 3D audio experiences, be it in entertainment, gaming, or Virtual Reality (VR). In Dolby Atmos, environment creation is object-based, meaning that sounds may be placed and moved as discrete objects in a 3D space. Sound Particles⁵ is another tool meriting a mention, as it also delivers immersive, high-quality audio for films, gaming, and virtual environments, excelling on large-scale 3D audio effects by simulating spatialized sound with particle systems.

Though not exclusively centered around sound design and production, game engines such as Unity⁶ and Unreal Engine⁷ have proven effective platforms for soundscape creation, offering robust audio capabilities and integrations. Unity, for instance, provides built-in spatial sound support through its default audio system, with more advanced spatial audio capabilities being made available through integration with third-party tools like

⁴<https://www.dolby.com/technologies/dolby-atmos/>

⁵<https://www.soundparticles.com/>

⁶<https://unity.com/>

⁷<https://www.unrealengine.com/en-US>

FMOD⁸, Google’s Resonance Audio⁹ and Steam Audio¹⁰. Unreal Engine features a built-in audio engine supporting 3D spatialization, reverberation effects, and audio triggers, more advanced than Unity’s default audio system but not accounting for its third-party augmentations.

As expressive and competent as the tools mentioned so far are, they have a significant learning curve, a tradeoff for such feature richness and customization ability. In the context of this dissertation, where soundscape creation should not require prior experience in sound design, an adequate balance between expressiveness and complexity is a must. Additionally, there are specific design considerations which should be adhered to or at least considered regarding the visually impaired, addressed in specific research.

Guerreiro et al. [19] proposed a theoretical framework to support BVI-inclusive auditory representations of object location, behavior, and interaction in virtual environments, utilizing spatialized sound and sonification in Unity. Their proposed design space explored nine distinct categories, such as the audio field, cardinality, concurrency, and spatialization. A user study they conducted showed that sound spatialization was not always preferred, mainly when dealing with moving objects, and that fully concurrent auditory feedback could be mentally overwhelming [19]. Meanwhile, Krol et al. [22] investigated the use of automated musical soundscapes in visual art accessibility for the visually impaired. From their study, several design considerations were highlighted: enhancing narrative comprehension by integrating storytelling elements; soundscape customization options; integration with other accessibility methods such as audio descriptions; contextual and historical accuracy/adequacy; inclusion of ambient sound effects; effective audio reproduction such as spatial sound and reverb to convey location, movement, and atmosphere.

3.4.1 Immerscape

The PASEV¹¹ project focuses on retaining and promoting the city of Évora’s cultural patrimony, namely the rich soundscapes correspondent to the various historical events which took place between 1540 and 1910. As part of this initiative, Ferreira [17] proposed Immerscape.

Intended to provide the PASEV project’s team with the means to reconstruct the city’s auditory history from current sound recordings, Immerscape is a soundscape editing tool accessible even to those without prior experience in programming or sound composition software. It allows for the creation of historical soundscapes out of previously collected recordings and the generation of immersive 3D audio files representing such soundscapes, while abstracting away the technical details behind spatial audio generation. The editor itself was implemented within the Unity game engine. The acoustic immersion leveraged

⁸<https://www.fmod.com/>

⁹<https://resonance-audio.github.io/resonance-audio/>

¹⁰<https://valvesoftware.github.io/steam-audio/>

¹¹<https://www.uevora.pt/investigar/projetos?id=3776>

the Google Resonance Audio SDK to spatialize sound by applying HRTF filters, requiring headphones to be adequately evaluated.

Besides an accessible interface with minimal complexity (Figure 3.7), Ferreira defined some fundamental requirements for Immerscape, such as the ability to select predefined 3D sound environments (with unique resonance and reverb properties), immersive environmental navigation, creation of editable sound sources (audio properties, movement and triggering events) and real-time playback/recording of the soundscape. Additionally, there are two available camera angles during development, the default being the player view and the alternative an up-view.




Figure 3.7: Immerscape's environment, through the player view perspective. The red cube represents an audio object (Reproduced from [17]). © 2021 Carolina Ribeiro Dias Ferreira.

An evaluation with 10 developers and 7 non-developer participants highlighted Immerscape's high usability and immersive quality, proven to be an effective way of providing engaging sonic experiences, in this case, by conveying historical soundscapes.

While Ferreira's work targets general audiences rather than the BVI demographic, there is much to take away from it in the context of this dissertation. Immerscape's design and implementation of the HRTF filters inspired what transpired throughout the current work, particularly regarding spatial audio simulation and ease of use for non-experienced users. Furthermore, some of the requirements defined by Ferreira, including editable audio sources and real-time playback of the scene, were imported into this dissertation's proposed editor, aligning with the goal of creating an intuitive yet expressive soundscape editor.

PROPOSED SOLUTION

This chapter provides a detailed overview of the proposed system, introducing the BVI-inclusive mobile soundscape player and the soundscape editor for Windows, as well as the system's limitations. An exploration of the initial research and refinement of the proposed concept then follows and the technological stack chosen for the solution's implementation is addressed. A discussion on the implementation of both prototypes composing the system concludes the chapter.

4.1 Proposal Overview

The solution proposed in this dissertation is a bipartite system intended to, above all, facilitate BVI-inclusive interpretation of visual paintings, via immersive and highly interactive soundscapes based on museum paintings. While clearly distinct in purpose and also in the audience they serve, these two allied parts provide both soundscape interaction and intuitive creation. Figure 4.1 attempts to illustrate the intended approach from a purely conceptual standpoint, while figure 4.2 displays a high-level view of the system's architecture. The solution's most relevant shortcomings are addressed in section 4.2.

The first and ultimately core component is a mobile application, which serves as an interactive and accessible soundscape player for BVI visitors. Through its available SATs, the application serves as a vehicle for users to autonomously navigate the artwork and learn about it or even feel it, via various sound effects (be it ambience or spatialized sound), verbal descriptions and customizable sound settings, among other considerations.

The second component is a desktop soundscape editor that enables intuitive creation of these auditory environments, from design to testing, and eventually refinement. This tool targets curators whom are not required to have any prior experience in sound design or programming, abstracting the complexities of spatializing sound sources and optimizing for accessibility, by way of a straightforward interface. While the editor plays a essential role in the system, it fundamentally serves as a supplement to the mobile application - as the means to produce the content available within it.




Figure 4.1: Representation of the proposed interaction. Background image is *O Bosque Sagrado* by Maria Benamor, 1975. Collection of Museu Nacional Grão Vasco. (Adapted from [36]).




Figure 4.2: Conceptual system architecture. *Disclaimer: The current editor prototype does not currently support exportation of the devised scenes, though it was initially intended.*

The following two sections detail these components further, starting by the mobile constituent (section 4.1.1) and concluding with the desktop editor (section 4.1.2).

4.1.1 Mobile Soundscape Player

The mobile application's interface (portrayed in figure 4.3) displays a 2D representation of a soundscape, with large and high-contrasting icons representing directional sound sources, making them easier to distinguish within the environment. This approach makes use of standard BVI accessibility practices for visual interfaces in other research [1, 13, 48] with spatial sounds assigned to points of interest in the painting [54]. Ambient sound sources are also present but their icons are permanently hidden to prevent users with partial sight from misinterpreting them for localized sound sources associated to elements of the actual painting. The user's head and ears are represented in the scene by a small arrow that always faces upwards on the screen, regardless of the user's orientation within the virtual space, as in a typical videogame minimap.




Figure 4.3: The three available display modes of the mobile prototype: Immersive, Accessible and Minimalist.

Still concerning the visual interface, the application offers three different display modes for users with residual vision (refer to figure 4.3), and since these are purely visual, alternating between them is executed via a visual button in the upper left corner of the screen:

- **Immersive mode (default)** Displays the background painting and the sound sources.
- **Accessible mode:** A pure white background with further contrasting sound sources, where virtual joysticks are darker for better contrast.
- **Minimalist mode:** Displays the background painting but hides the sound sources, with the virtual joysticks made more transparent for minimal distraction.

So that users can properly detect the directionality and proximity of sound sources through binaural cues, the use of headphones is required for an accurate perception of spatialized sounds.

Navigation through the virtual space is enabled via a joystick control scheme, inspired by Nair et al.'s [30] Dungeon Escape game and other classic 3D games such as the early Resident Evil¹ titles. The application supports both gamepad and touch controls, with these two schemes resembling each other as much as possible. For example, most directional buttons on the gamepad trigger the same actions as swipe gestures on the touch interface. When a gamepad controller is connected to the smartphone, the virtual joysticks are automatically hidden and disabled, returning to active if the controller is disconnected.

The left joystick controls the user's movement within the painting: vertical tilts move the user forward or backward, and horizontal tilts execute snap rotations in fixed increments of 30 degrees, complemented by distinct audio cues. If the user reaches the border of the painting, movement is halted in the direction of the boundary. In addition, all sounds are muted and the smartphone emits a strong vibration. Upon returning to the in-bounds area by moving away from the boundary, the sounds resume and so does normal movement.

The right joystick acts as a directional scanner akin to Nair et al.'s [29] NavStick, though in 2D rather than in 3D. By tilting the joystick in a particular direction, the user can hear a localized narration of the first object in their line of sight, through a predefined speech output. Figure 4.4 exemplifies this scanner in practical use. To assist with a more literal interpretation of the environment, a global verbal description of the entire scene can be triggered, during which all spatial sounds pause and then resume once the narration finishes. The idea of using blocking sounds (narrations) and interruptible sounds (spatial sounds in this particular case) was inspired by Drossos et al.'s [13] research on a BVI-accessible Tic-Tac-Toe game.



Figure 4.4: Directional scanner in use: on the left the scanner has not detected an element while on the right it has detected a spatial sound source and narrates it.

An additional, no less important SAT is available: a proximity detection tool, inspired by the rear sensors in modern vehicles, which signal for nearby collidable obstacles. Much in the same manner, this toggleable proximity sensor emits an intermittent sound that increases in frequency as the user approaches an object (a spatial sound source in this context). Contrasting that of the rear of a car, the implemented sensor uses a forward

¹<https://game.capcom.com/residentevil/en/>

cone of detection, identifying the closest spatial sound source within range. There are three range levels: far, intermediate, and close. Each corresponds to progressively more frequent and louder localized beeps, as the user approaches the detected sound source.

To regulate sensory and cognitive overload, a significant concern for BVI individuals [19, 30], users may control the density of sensory inputs to a degree. One such example is the ability to toggle ambient sound on or off. Additionally, influenced by Guerreiro et al.'s [19] framework to support BVI-inclusive auditory representations, users can control the number of active spatial sound sources at any given moment. To further mitigate cognitive overload and since Guerreiro et al.'s research stated that fully concurrent auditory feedback could be mentally overwhelming for BVI individuals, the application offers two spatial sound reproduction modes: simultaneous and sequential. As the name implies, in simultaneous mode, all spatial sounds play concurrently. In sequential mode, sounds are consecutively played by order of proximity, lasting for a fixed amount of time. Once they have all played, the reproduction cycle starts over, with the order updated based on the user's position at the time.

4.1.2 Soundscape Editor for Windows

Drawing inspiration from Ferreira's [17] Immerscape, this editor aims to serve as an intuitive soundscape creation tool for curators or artists without prior expertise in sound design or programming, enabling them to translate visual paintings into the BVI-inclusive auditory environments present in the mobile application discussed in section 4.1.1.

The editor is designed to minimize complexity for curators by enabling interaction primarily through the mouse. All file management, such as choosing a painting image and selecting audio files is handled by means of a versatile file browser which allows users to organize and fetch media resources from wherever in the desktop they see fit.

Initially, the application was meant to be much more similar to Immerscape than it currently is, featuring a 3D development environment with predefined acoustic properties like reverberation and resonance, alongside a block-based placement system similar to Minecraft²'s creative mode. However, during the mockup elaboration stage (mockups can be viewed in section A.2), it was conjectured that in the context of BVI accessibility, introducing additional complexity to the scene in the form of acoustic properties, like reverberation and resonance, could bring about unnecessary complexity and cognitive overload. Most importantly, enforcing a 3D development environment could be cumbersome and time-consuming for curators, who would be required to interpret and translate a 2D painting into a 3D auditory environment faithfully embodying the artwork. As a result, the decision was made to simplify the development system and have it be in 2D with a grid-based placement system in place, reducing cognitive strain while retaining the two-dimensional essence of the original painting.

²<https://www.minecraft.net/en-us>

The workflow within the application is divided into two main modes: Development mode and Interactive mode. As a quick introduction, it is in Development mode that curators may design the soundscape, while Interactive Mode provides a built-in interactive preview of the devised soundscape, simulating how it would be experienced by the end user in the mobile application.

In Development mode (exposed in figure 4.5), users begin by selecting a painting (via the file browser), which is displayed as a background image in the scene. Zoom level is automatically adjusted to ensure the image appropriately fits the screen, and the user may further zoom in or out to taste. Setting a global narration to represent the artwork is executed identically to defining the background image. Placement, editing and removal of elements in the scene is done via a simple grid-based building system reminiscent of city builder games, but in 2D. This rectangular grid layout dynamically fits to the painting's dimensions and is customizable in both the size of its cells and the thickness of its lines, overlaying the painting when enabled. With the painting set, curators may place elements




Figure 4.5: Development mode. Background image is *O Bosque Sagrado* by Maria Benamor, 1975. Collection of Museu Nacional Grão Vasco. (Adapted from [36])

in the grid, of which there are three clearly distinct types, selectable from the panel at the bottom center of the screen:

- **Ambient Sound:** Represents general background noise and ambience whose effect is independent of spatial placement within the grid. Its editable attributes are: *name, audio file & volume, looping, fade-in and fade-out*;
- **Spatial Sound:** Represents a fully localized sound effect, playing only from the specific position in which it was placed. Attributes include: *all attributes from ambient sound, narration audio file & correspondent volume and volume rolloff settings, to simulate how sound intensity decreases with distance*;

- **Player:** Represents the person exploring the scene and acts as the controller for movement and hearing within it. This element's position in the grid determines the end user's initial position. Its customizable attributes are: *initial clockhour orientation, movement speed and proximity sensor settings, in which the amplitude of the detection cone is included.*

The grid remains visible only when adjusting its properties or when active for placing, editing, or removing elements and can be closed via a button in the lower left corner, which only appears when the grid is enabled. Placing an element consists only on having it actively selected and clicking on an empty grid cell to place it, and no cell can have more than one element assigned to it. Editing and removing elements work function identically except that a cell must already have an element to be valid to act upon. When editing an element (see figure 4.6), changes are persisted automatically rather than via an explicit submit button. Additionally, the radiiuses of volume rolloff in spatial sound elements and proximity definition in the player element's sensor can be viewed in the grid layout via overlapping circles of decreasing opacity, as can be seen in figure 4.7.



Figure 4.6: Editing popup windows for a ambient sound element on the left, and a spatial sound element on the right.

When users want to preview the soundscape they devised as it will be made available to the visitor audience, they should use headphones for accurate spatial sound perception and enter Interactive mode (figure 4.8). This mode effectively emulates the mobile application covered in section 4.1.1: they may move around and scan the scene with the virtual joysticks in the lower corners of the screen and use every functionality available in the mobile application, but trigger them through buttons rather than touch gestures. At any time, users may return to Development mode, easily alternating between the two.




Figure 4.7: Editing popup of the player element on the left. The rightmost image allows the customization of the proximity sensor's reach and varying frequency areas.




Figure 4.8: Interactive mode.

4.2 System Limitations

Due to time constraints, some initially planned features were not implemented in the desktop editor's prototype. More specifically, the editor lacks the ability to export the devised scenes to the mobile soundscape player and is thus incapable of providing content to the mobile application as was intended.

Additionally, although there is a simple local save system in place, there was not enough time to build the appropriate interface elements to expose it to an end user. As such, the editor does not currently support a proper save or load feature for the generated environments. To account for the possibility of users testing the application remotely on their desktops, scene data generated and persisted during the application's runtime is automatically deleted when it closes to avoid leaving residual files on the user's system.

The mobile soundscape player shares its parser with the editor's Interactive mode,

working exclusively with local files (fetching media resources by file path), limiting the potential for future integration with available online scenes generated by the editor.

As it stands, both prototypes fall short of a fully functional soundscape player or editor, as initially envisioned. Despite these limitations, they are competent and useful tools for validating the core concepts of the proposed system. Section 6.1 delves into how these features may be addressed in a future iteration of the system.

4.3 Initial Research & Concept Refinement

Prior to the system's technical implementation, conceptual designs of the mobile soundscape player and the desktop editor were produced in Figma³, illustrating the key functionalities envisioned for each application (these mockups are available in appendix A). At this stage, the mobile application was identified as the main component to prove the concept, since it would directly serve BVI users.

The first implementation efforts therefore focused on an early version of the mobile prototype, already including most of the features described in section 4.1.1. This build was sufficient to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed concept for accessible and interactive interpretation of a painting, as was ultimately intended. However, compared to the final application it lacked ambient sound regulation, the proximity sensor, and haptic feedback, among several other adjustments - as these hadn't yet been planned at the time. Along with the mockups of the desktop editor, some of the mobile functionalities were presented in a remote meeting with researchers from the Department of Conservation and Restoration of NOVA School of Science and Technology. The researchers saw potential in the idea and expressed interest in its evolution.

The most important stage of this early phase came in late May, when the mobile prototype was tested on-site at the Raquel e Martin Sain Foundation⁴ - a social solidarity institution dedicated to the professional education and social integration of BVI individuals. Two blind participants volunteered their time: Cláudia Pires, a student at the foundation, and Ana Inês Colares, one of its instructors. Both of these interviews followed a simplified protocol with similarities to that of the final study but with less specific tasks and more open-ended questions, for the goal was refinement rather than evaluation. The painting "O Bosque Sagrado" [36] by Maria Benamor was used as the painting for the test scenario, also being used in the final study of the application (section 5.2).

The first interviewee, Cláudia Pires, pointed to several areas for improvement in the experience. She felt that ambient sound should be lower and that the sound effects used for movement and rotation were too similar, sometimes hard to distinguish. Though she could discern sound direction clearly, perceiving proximity to the sound sources was more difficult. While she found the directional scanner useful, she noted that it required alignment that was much too precise, with narrations cutting off if not perfectly targeted.

³<https://www.figma.com/>

⁴<https://www.fundacao-sain.pt/>

Cláudia also reported little difference between sequential and simultaneous reproduction modes and sometimes had difficulty tracking how many sounds were active. The clock hour orientation feature was very helpful to her but she stated that it should have been introduced earlier in the protocol. Finally, she strongly preferred the console scheme over the touch gestures, suggesting haptic feedback and larger virtual joysticks as possible improvements to touch usability.

Many of the points brought up by Cláudia were echoed by the second interviewee, Ana Inês Colares, who also provided further insights. Accentuating the importance of the clock hour orientation system, she too felt that this feature should be introduced in an earlier task. Ana Inês suggested that sound sources should increase in volume more noticeably when approached and that ambient sound should be toggleable, as it could distract from the other elements at times. Like Cláudia, she noticed little difference between the two reproduction modes and found sound source direction easier to perceive than proximity, occasionally struggling to locate specific sounds in the environment. She also preferred the console controls and noted the difficulty of touch gestures and especially virtual joysticks without haptic feedback. Lastly, she proposed the addition of a menu to allow switching between different soundscapes, if the application were to support several painting representations. Most importantly, from the conversation with Ana Inês and her emphasis on the amplification of sound according to proximity, derived the idea for the currently implemented proximity sensor.

The purpose of this early study was to garner real input from the individuals to whom the application was intended, and in this way assess whether the proposed features were indeed adequate for BVI needs, rather than only in theory. These preliminary interviews were fundamental in shaping the application into what it eventually became, as both participants provided detailed feedback which revealed not only the prototype's shortcomings but also some of its strengths. As much as possible, their suggestions were incorporated into the application's final design and in the later evaluation (section 5.2.3) these proved both practical and meaningful.

4.4 Technological Stack

The Unity⁵ game engine, namely Unity 6, was selected as the primary development environment for the desktop soundscape editor and mobile application prototype. The main factor that solidified this choice was its adoption among some of the most relevant related work [17, 19, 29, 30, 48, 54] analyzed in chapter 3.

While Unity is mainly known for its role in game development, its versatility has led to widespread use in all sorts of interactive 2D and 3D experiences across various industries [50, 56]. Most importantly, it provides extensive cross-platform build support,

⁵<https://unity.com/>

including the hardware this dissertation concerns itself with: Windows (for the editor application) and Android (for the mobile interaction).

Aside from its powerful rendering capabilities, Unity has a friendlier learning curve than other mainstream 3D game engines like Unreal Engine⁶ and features a convenient package manager extending its functionality with third-party libraries.

Unity's built-in audio system already provides sturdy audio management, featuring distance attenuation, spatial blend, and adjustable volume rolloff, among other settings. However, while this system suffices for rudimentary 3D audio, it is limited for the purposes of this work, lacking binaural rendering and other relevant capabilities. There are however specialized plugins for advanced spatial audio that address the vanilla system's limitations by adding some of the essential and advanced spatialization functionalities it lacks.

The Steam Audio⁷ framework was selected to address this base engine limitation and has been actively maintained, well-documented, and compatible with Unity engine updates. Furthermore, this toolkit was also used in NavStick [29] and Dungeon Escape [30], two of the most influential works for this proposal, motivating its adoption. Steam Audio supports high-fidelity HRTF-based binaural rendering and geometry-based occlusion, reflection, and reverberation effects, among other spatial features contributing to natural sounding immersion. Though out of these features, only binaural nearest interpolation rendering and curve drive distance attenuation were employed (with the built-in Steam Audio HRTF) and other properties retained their default values. While the specific library to which its default HRTF dataset belongs is not explicitly stated in official documentation, some online discussions suggest it may be based on Phonon⁸, however this remains an assumption.

Aside from Steam Audio, several external packages were integrated within the Unity environment in order to agilize development. One such example is DOTween⁹, an animation engine employed in both the mobile and desktop components of the system, for smooth transitions visually and also in sound (namely the fade effects). For haptic feedback on the smartphone, the HapticFeedback¹⁰ library was used, supporting vibration patterns of varying intensities. File system interactions in the desktop editor such as opening a file from a local desktop directory via a file dialog were supported by the UnityStandalone-FileBrowser¹¹, a third-party tool alongside the above mentioned HapticFeedback library. Lastly and also the most essential, the Input System Package¹² was incorporated to handle all input, from keyboard bindings, to gamepad controls and even the full implementation of the touch interface, effectively replacing the entirety of Unity's built-in input system.

Apart from Unity and the C# programming language in which its scripts are written,

⁶<https://www.unrealengine.com/>

⁷<https://valvesoftware.github.io/steam-audio/>

⁸<https://www.impulsonic.com/what-is-trueaudio-phonon/>

⁹<https://assetstore.unity.com/packages/tools/animation/dotween-dotween-v2-27676>

¹⁰<https://github.com/CandyCoded/HapticFeedback>

¹¹<https://github.com/gkngkc/UnityStandaloneFileBrowser>

¹²<https://docs.unity3d.com/Packages/com.unity.inputsystem@1.14/manual/index.html>

the Python language was used for a single script (outside of the system itself) which interacted with the Google Cloud Text-to-Speech API¹³. The intent of this script was to generate narrations for functionalities such as clock hours for the orientation feature and activation/deactivation sound effects. Conveniently, it was also used to generate the consistent verbal descriptions utilized in the prototypes presented to end users.

4.5 Implementation

4.5.1 Mobile BVI-Acessible Soundscape Player Prototype

The system's logic is mostly separated into multiple MonoBehaviour services and manager classes, which generally communicate by event propagation rather than relying on synchronous calls, facilitating adjustments to individual components without interfering with the rest of the system. Immutable configurations of the game objects responsible for the player controller, ambient sound sources and spatial sound sources are predefined as prefabs and stored in scriptable objects. Also stored in scriptable objects are the audio clips associated with fixed functionality descriptions and cues, such as clock hour indicators and functionality activation/deactivation messages.

The few User Interface (UI) elements making up the application's simple interface - the virtual joysticks and display change button - are placed within Unity Canvas elements, and all used assets are Creative Commons Zero (CC0) licensed for free and legally compliant use. The icons used for the display button and the sound sources were sourced from UXWing¹⁴, and the joystick visuals from Kenney's Mobile Control assets pack¹⁵.

Essentially acting as the user's head and ears within the auditory environment, the player game object is the sole audio listener in scene and has the Steam Audio Listener component attached to it, required to perceive the effects rendered by the Steam Audio plugin. The player object is visually represented by a forward-facing arrow centered on the screen at all times, implemented with a Cinemachine camera targeting it. Triggered by horizontal tilts of the left joystick, rotation of the player occurs in fixed increments of 30 degrees (equivalent to one hour on a clock) with a small cooldown. For simplified locomotion, movement is activated by vertical input in the left joystick and manifests itself only along that same axis of the player's current orientation, translating to directly forward or backward motion.

The prefabs of both ambient and spatial sound sources have attached audio source components to play their respective sound effects. While ambient sounds are not localized at all, the effects produced by spatial sources are fully directional and binaurally rendered with a Steam Audio Source component. Each spatial sound object also contains a separate

¹³<https://console.cloud.google.com/marketplace/product/google/texttospeech.googleapis.com>

¹⁴<https://uxwing.com/>

¹⁵<https://kenney.nl/assets/mobile-controls>

Steam Audio localized audio source to play its corresponding verbal description when detected by the directional scanner.

The directional scanner functions by casting a ray in the direction of the right joystick's input and checking for a collision with a spatial sound source, triggering a localized narration from a detected source and blocking the sound effects from all other spatial elements while the narration is ongoing. Detections are also visually indicated in the scanner's cone, whose color becomes more intense through increased opaqueness. Listing 4.1 presents the method in charge of this functionality.

Listing 4.1: Main method for implementing the scanner functionality in C#.

```

1  private void HandleScanner(Vector2 scannerInput)
2  {
3      // Determine the direction in which to scan, relative to the player's
4      // orientation
5      Vector2 scanDirection = scannerInput.x * transform.right + scannerInput.y *
6          transform.up;
7      // Rotate visual to match scan direction
8      float angle = Mathf.Atan2(scanDirection.y, scanDirection.x) * Mathf.Rad2Deg;
9      // Visual sprite is pointing to Y+, Atan gives angle from X+ to the vector
10     // Sprite is rotated 90 degrees from the right, compensate by rotating back
11     // 90 degrees
12     scannerVisual.rotation = Quaternion.Euler(0, 0, angle - 90f);
13
14     // Cast a ray in the scanned direction
15     RaycastHit2D raycastHit2D = Physics2D.Raycast(transform.position,
16         scanDirection, _raycastDistance, layerMask);
17     if (raycastHit2D.collider != null)
18     {
19         // Hit something
20         if (_lastCollider == null || _lastCollider != raycastHit2D.collider)
21         {
22             // Check if the collider is a SpatialSoundSource
23             if (raycastHit2D.collider.TryGetComponent(out SpatialSoundSource
24                 spatialSoundSource))
25             {
26                 // Set lastCollider to the new collider
27                 _lastCollider = raycastHit2D.collider;
28                 // Set lastSpatialSoundSource to the new spatial sound source
29                 _lastSpatialSoundSource = spatialSoundSource;
30                 // Trigger the source's narration
31                 spatialSoundSource.StartNarration();
32             }
33         }
34     }
35     else
36     {
37         // Set lastCollider to null if we are not hitting anything
38         _lastCollider = null;
39     }
40 }
```

```
34     }
35 }
```

When activated and if there are active spatial sound sources in range, the proximity sensor monitors in real time the closest spatial element within a forward-facing cone with a default amplitude of 90 degrees. The sensor estimates the frequency at which source-localized beeps are emitted according to the distance between the player and the detected source. The lesser this distance, the higher the beeping frequency - indicating frontal proximity to a point of interest, as intended. Listing 4.2 presents the implementation of the two most relevant methods handling this feature.

Listing 4.2: The two main methods for implementing the proximity sensor in C#.

```
1  private void HandleProximitySensor()
2  {
3      // Find the nearest sound source within the cone
4      SetCurrentTargetWithinCone();
5      // Only proceed if there is a current target
6      if (_currentTarget is null) return;
7      // Determine the beep interval based on distance
8      DetermineBeepInterval();
9      // Handle the beep timer
10     HandleBeepTimer();
11 }
12
13 private void SetCurrentTargetWithinCone()
14 {
15     // Get the closest active spatial sound source within the forward cone
16     SpatialSoundSource nearestInCone = SoundSourceManager.Instance.
17         GetSpatialSoundSourcesSortedByDistance(transform.position)
18         .Where(source =>
19     {
20         // Check if the source is not null and is currently playing
21         if (source == null || !source.isPlaying()) return false;
22         // Check if the source is within the maximum distance (this transform
23         // shares the player's position)
24         float distance = Vector3.Distance(transform.position, source.transform.
25             position);
26         if (distance > _farThreshold) return false;
27         // Calculate the angle between the player's forward direction and the
28         // direction to the sound source
29         Vector3 directionToSource = source.transform.position - transform.
30             position;
31         float angle = Vector3.Angle(transform.up, directionToSource);
32         // Check if the angle is within the forward half-angle
33         return angle <= _forwardHalfAngle;
34     })
35         .FirstOrDefault();
36
37     if (nearestInCone is not null)
```

```

33  {
34      // If a target is found within the cone, set it as the current target
35      _currentTarget = nearestInCone.transform;
36  }
37  else
38  {
39      // If no target is found within the cone, set the current target to null
40      // and reset the timer
41      _currentTarget = null;
42      _timer = 0f;
43 }

```

Touch gesture detection was explicitly programmed from the ground up using the EnhancedTouch library (from Unity's Input System package) which provided essential data such as the number of fingers touching the screen, their screen position and even phase of touch, among other attributes. Such information facilitated a proper implementation of the single and multi-fingered motions available in the application. The same Input System Package was utilized to easily support gamepad controls.

Using the aforementioned HapticFeedback library (in section 4.4), different intensities of haptic feedback were incorporated into virtual joystick touch and release actions as well as when colliding with the boundaries of the painting, defined by an edge collider.

4.5.2 Desktop Beginner-Friendly Soundscape Editor

The desktop editor mostly shares the mobile application's separation of responsibilities into manager classes and MonoBehaviour services, also inheriting its primarily event-driven design to avoid unnecessary interdependencies between components. As in the mobile solution, prefabs for the player, ambient and spatial sound sources are stored in scriptable objects. However, unlike the mobile version, these prefab elements are merely visual in development mode. Information regarding a placed element is mapped to the grid cell it resides in, rather than being tied to the game object itself, making it so that the grid is fully responsible for storing the content of its elements and providing it to other parts of the system.

The editor's UI was developed in its entirety with Unity's UI Toolkit, from the buttons to the popup windows, including the various UI elements housed within them. Exceptionally, the background texture consists of a sprite in a Canvas game object so that it remains behind all other UI elements built with UI Toolkit. Assets are sourced from CC0-licensed repositories: UXWing for icons and free-images.com¹⁶ for the background texture image.

In development mode, the editor capitalizes on Unity's built-in grid component as the structural foundation for its grid-based placement system. Its implementation draws heavily from an online grid system video course¹⁷, adapting from this tutorial a custom

¹⁶<https://free-images.com/>

¹⁷https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLcRSafycjWFepsLiAHxxi8D_5GGvu6arf

shader for visualization of the grid and also the application of the State pattern to handle the grid's behavior in different modes: placement, edit and removal. Employing this design pattern, the logic for each mode is fully encapsulated in a dedicated class exposing its own implementation of required state actions. Visualizable in figure 4.9, the placement system holds only a reference to a general state object, whose internal state changes and delegates responsibilities accordingly, triggering the appropriate actions.




Figure 4.9: State pattern incorporation within the application.

Since the very purpose of the editor's Interactive mode is to emulate the soundscape as it would be presented in the mobile application, it repurposes essentially all of the mobile player's core logic, sharing nearly all of its assets, including media resources, prefabs and scripts. Where the editor's Interactive mode differs from the mobile version is in input control, as it uses toggleable buttons for interacting with the auditory environment instead of touch gestures or gamepad controls. It also does not feature haptic feedback, since it does not support a touch interface.

To transfer data between Development mode and Interactive mode, implemented as separate Unity scenes, scene information of the devised environment in Development mode is locally persisted as a JSON file in Unity's persistent data path. The structure of the persisted information is defined in the *SceneData* class, which is exposed in figure 4.10. When Interactive mode is enabled, this file is parsed and translated into a fully functional preview of the soundscape. So that the audio files, as the heaviest media resources to be loaded into Interactive mode, do not bottleneck the application and significantly delay loading the remaining scene information, these are cached in parallel into a dictionary. Listing 4.5.2 exposes the implementation of the method which loads and sets the information pertaining to a devised scene into Interactive mode, as well as the ancillary function for asynchronously caching the existing audio files. As mentioned in section 4.2, the current editor prototype is explicitly programmed to delete the file upon closing, effectively acting as a one-shot creative environment that leaves no residual files. This decision was

made in light of the possibility that some user study participants would undertake the system evaluation remotely, using the application on their desktops.

Listing 4.3: Methods for loading scene information into Interactive mode and asynchronous audio caching in C#.

```

1  public async Task LoadSceneData()
2  {
3      // Load the generated scene's data
4      SceneData sceneData = SaveSystem.LoadSceneData();
5      // Set cell size based on scene data
6      _cellSize = sceneData.cellSize;
7      // Set background image
8      BackgroundImageController.Instance.SetBackgroundImage(sceneData.
9          pathToBackgroundImage);
10     // Spawn player first, to give time to load audio listener and camera
11     controller
12     await PlaceWorldPlayerObject(sceneData);
13     // Load all audio files asynchronously and await for completion
14     await LoadAllAudioFiles(sceneData);
15     // Set global narration
16     LoadGlobalNarration(sceneData);
17     // Place ambient and spatial sound objects
18     PlaceWorldSoundObjects(sceneData);
19 }
20
21 private async Task LoadAllAudioFiles(SceneData sceneData)
22 {
23     // Get all unique audio file paths from the scene data
24     HashSet<string> audioFilePaths = GetAllAudioFilePaths(sceneData);
25     // Use a dictionary to map file paths to loading tasks
26     Dictionary<string, Task<AudioClip>> loadingTasks = audioFilePaths
27         .ToDictionary(path => path, AudioLoaderAsync.LoadClip);
28     // Await all loading tasks to complete in parallel
29     await Task.WhenAll(loadingTasks.Values);
30     // Populate the audio clips cache with the loaded clips
31     foreach (var kvp in loadingTasks)
32     {
33         AudioClip clip = await kvp.Value;
34         _audioClipsCache[kvp.Key] = clip;
35     }
36 }
```

As outlined in section 4.4, file system interactions in the editor, such as selecting the painting or audio files from a local desktop directory via a file dialog, were incorporated into the application using the UnityStandaloneFileBrowser.




Figure 4.10: *SceneData* class holds the soundscape information passed between the application's two modes: Development and Interactive.

EVALUATION AND RESULTS

This chapter presents the evaluation of the two developed prototypes as their own distinct study and starts by outlining the methodology common to both. It then details the assessment of the mobile soundscape player with BVI participants, followed by the desktop soundscape editor with users inexperienced in sound design. Each study is generally described in terms of participant characterization, the tasks undertaken, and the main findings drawn from survey responses. A summary of the results of both studies concludes the chapter, discussing the extent to which the prototypes achieved their intended objectives.

5.1 User Studies

To evaluate the proposed system in its entirety, two final user studies were conducted, each corresponding to one of the two developed prototypes: the mobile soundscape player designed for BVI users, and the Windows-based soundscape editor intended for museum curators without prior experience in sound design. The objective of these studies was to assess not only the technical functionality of each application but also their usability, accessibility, and the overall adequacy of the implemented features for their respective target audiences.

Despite addressing distinct user groups, both studies shared a common methodological structure. Each followed a predefined protocol specifying the study's general objectives, the equipment to be used (all provided by the researcher) and the usage scenario. In both cases, the researcher's assistance was deliberately minimal, limited to clarifying questions about controls or task instructions.

Participants first completed a sequence of predefined tasks designed to cover the core functionalities of the respective application. Some tasks were highly specific, while others allowed for more freedom in execution. The focus of the tasks was not evaluation in and of itself, but rather a practical introduction to the system's features and controls. This structured segment was followed by free-use optional sessions, during which participants

could continue to interact with the system without constraints. These sessions aimed to familiarize the user further with the system, independently and at their own pace.

At the end of each session, participants filled out a survey consisting mainly of Likert-scale items supplemented by open-ended qualitative questions. The closed questions gauged ease of use and functionality intuitiveness and adequacy. The open-ended questions allowed participants to share their general impressions, report difficulties, and suggest improvements. Comments and notable observations made during the testing sessions were also considered as part of the feedback.

The focus of the two protocols diverged according to the nature of the application. For the mobile soundscape player, emphasis was placed on accessibility, immersion, and the ability to meaningfully interpret a painting through sound. For the desktop soundscape editor, the main focus was on comprehensibility and intuitiveness, specifically whether users could construct an expressive auditory representation of a painting without prior technical training. Both protocols and their corresponding surveys can be seen in appendix B.

To guarantee anonymity, each participant was assigned a numerical identifier, which is how they will be referenced in the subsequent analysis. Participation in both studies was voluntary and there was no monetary compensation.

5.2 Mobile Sonic Painting Exploration

The first study focused on the evaluation of the mobile soundscape player, which enables BVI users to autonomously explore a painting through auditory cues and several spatial awareness features. As outlined in section 5.1, this study assessed the application for accessibility, immersion, and interpretability. The protocol may be accessed in section B.1.

All user testing sessions were conducted on-site at the Raquel e Martin Sain Foundation, as in the preliminary interview discussed in section 4.3. Ana Inês Colares, an instructor at the foundation and also a former interviewee, provided the participants for this study and also the same fairly quiet room for all sessions. All tests took place in comparable conditions, with the same equipment and research protocol.

The setup comprised a smartphone running the application, headphones, and a PlayStation 4 controller. This configuration supported the two distinct modes of interaction: a physical control scheme through the gamepad and touch-based controls on the device itself. The headphones were required for the perception of spatial sound. After a quick overview of the application, participants were first introduced to the system through a series of structured tasks using the PS4 controller. As they were not yet acclimated to the application or its controls, the tactile nature of the physical joystick and buttons was intended to give them an initial sense of stability, as they are yet learning the functionalities.

The operational scenario consisted of navigating a sonic representation of "O Bosque Sagrado", a painting by Maria Benamor, guiding participants to locate specific sound sources, regulate sounds and reproduction settings, and make use of several orientation

aids. Following this exposure to the prototype's main features, the participants were encouraged to explore the soundscape more freely, initially continuing with the controller, and then transitioning to touch controls, so they could compare both input types.

The presented soundscape's content was developed by the research team (in this case, the author), rather than by art professionals, using sound clips available online for the scene elements and Google Cloud's text-to-speech for narrations. Participants were made aware of this ahead of the tasks, and were also informed that the soundscape itself was not being evaluated — only the application was.

5.2.1 User Characterization

A total of eight participants took part in the main evaluation of the mobile soundscape player. None of them had been previously exposed to the application or its functionalities, ensuring that their feedback reflected first-time user impressions instead of familiarity. Table 5.1 characterizes the participants.

Participants' ages were relatively balanced across middle adulthood, ranging from 28 to 56 years old, for an average of 42.5 years.

Table 5.1: User characterization by identifier.

| ID | Age | Gender | Degree of Vision |
|----|-----|--------|------------------|
| 1 | 54 | Male | Low Vision |
| 2 | 41 | Male | Blind |
| 3 | 56 | Female | Blind |
| 4 | 37 | Female | Low Vision |
| 5 | 37 | Male | Blind |
| 6 | 36 | Female | Blind |
| 7 | 51 | Male | Blind |
| 8 | 28 | Male | Blind |

The group consisted of five male participants (62.5%) and three female participants (37.5%). In terms of visual condition, six participants (75%) were blind and two participants (25%) were classified as having low vision. Among the blind participants, some reported having lost their sight later in life rather than being blind from birth, which in some cases may have influenced the way they described their perception and interaction with auditory cues.

When asked about their prior familiarity with joystick interfaces and gamepad controllers, most participants indicated that they were not accustomed to such devices. However, several noted that they had used them occasionally, most in the context of other user studies and a minority for gaming. This background might have influenced their degree of comfort with the PlayStation 4 controller used in the evaluation, as all participants were able to complete the required tasks with minimal guidance.

5.2.2 Task Overview

Participants were guided through a set of six tasks designed to gradually introduce the main features of the mobile soundscape player. As previously discussed in section 5.1, these tasks were not conceived as a strict evaluation in themselves, but rather as a structured way of teaching participants how to use the system. These ensured that each participant could get comfortable with the core functionalities before moving on to the optional free exploration sessions.

The set of tasks was intentionally varied: while some were highly specific (such as finding a particular sound source), others left some room for interpretation and exploration, allowing participants to interact with the environment at their own pace. During subsequent tasks, participants were encouraged to use previously learned functionalities, but were free to ignore them as well.

Standing out from all six other tasks, Task 0 was exclusively intended for low-vision subjects, as it required a certain degree of residual vision to adjust the zoom level and toggle between different visual display modes. It was not presented to blind participants and actually carried little relevance even for those with low vision. Due to its optional character, it did not interfere with the main evaluation flow.

Task 1 focused on basic movement and spatial perception, introducing participants to the joystick-based control of direction and rotation, while Task 2 expanded on this by training orientation with respect to the original alignment of the painting, using the clock-based narration system. Task 3 introduced the directional scanner and the global narration feature, allowing users to hear localized descriptions of individual elements or a full scene overview. Task 4 presented the proximity sensor, which mimicked a car parking sensor by giving intermittent auditory feedback as the user approached a sound source. Task 5 allowed participants to regulate the number of active sound sources and toggle ambient sound, introducing the idea of controlling auditory complexity. Finally, Task 6 exposed participants to the two available playback modes — simultaneous and sequential — focusing on how these modes altered the listening experience.

These tasks served as a walkthrough of the application's feature set, that prepared them for the optional free exploration sessions that followed.

5.2.3 Results Overview

The evaluation of the mobile soundscape player yielded encouraging results overall, with participants rating most of the features positively. It is important to note that the Likert items in the survey were phrased as declarative sentences, and scores reflect participants' level of agreement with them (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). A higher score indicates only strong agreement with the statement, which may or may not correspond to a direct quality judgment depending on the item in question. The structured tasks served their purpose as a guided introduction to the system, while the subsequent exploration phases revealed both strengths and points for refinement.

Task 0, which involved zoom and visual mode adjustments, was only presented to low-vision participants and, as anticipated, had little overall impact on the evaluation.

In terms of navigation, participants generally felt quite able using the left joystick to move through the scene and orientating themselves via the clock system, as can be seen in figure 5.1. Only participant 8 found himself neutral to the orientation feature's usefulness, with 38% of participants scoring it highly and 50% very highly. As for the movement and rotation via the left joystick, half of the participants were comfortable with these controls while the other half stated to be very comfortable. These results could in part be due to their experience with gamepads in other user studies, but even participants who had less previous exposure to such interfaces learned the movement controls very quickly.




Figure 5.1: Participant responses regarding navigation comfort and orientation.

In what pertains to spatial awareness, the vast majority of users reported that they could clearly identify both the direction and proximity of sound sources. Figure 5.2 displays the perceived efficacy of the implemented spatial awareness tools, as well as the overall perception of sound source direction and proximity. On average, clearness in direction and proximity were rated the same value - 4.1 out of 5. Aside from positive, this result is particularly interesting as in the early prototype's refinement study (section 4.3), sound source direction had been considered significantly clearer than proximity. In the current application, that gap has apparently been bridged, likely due to the inclusion of the proximity sensor and adjustments to the sound elements in the scene. The said proximity sensor, which emitted increasingly frequent signals as users approached a sound source, was frequently classified as useful and intuitive. Similarly, the directional scanner allowed participants to identify specific objects in the painting with relative ease, by leaning their finger in the direction they want to listen in. Both functionalities were well received and close in ratings.

Opinions were more divided regarding sound environment regulation, namely in




Figure 5.2: Participant responses regarding spatial awareness and related features.

whether ambient sound distracted from the localized elements of the painting. As can be seen in figure 5.3, half of the participants thought that it did, while the other half thought the opposite. Independent of their stance on ambient sound, all participants considered the ability to toggle it on or off indispensable, unanimously rating its usefulness a 5 out of 5. In addition, participants appreciated being able to adjust the number of active sound sources, indicating that the ability to manage the auditory scene's complexity was highly valued.

Regarding the two available playback modes - simultaneous and sequential, participants felt both modes were distinct and impactful in their own way, but favored simultaneous reproduction by a fair margin, as illustrated in figure 5.4. While sequential playback allowed some participants to focus more closely on the painting's individual elements, most felt that the simultaneous mode provided a greater sense of immersion. Participant 7, in particular, saw no purpose in the sequential reproduction mode, stating that a similar experience could be accomplished in the simultaneous mode by decreasing the number of active spatial sounds to one, and also felt that each sound source would play for too long sequentially. In contrast, participant 3 had no preference in mode, having enjoyed both equally. As preferences appear to depend on personal strategies for exploring the painting, offering both modes is valuable, even if one is considered the "better" one.

As for the application's control schema (results illustrated in figure 5.5), console controls were rated very positively, with an average agreement of 4.6 out of 5 on their

5.2. MOBILE SONIC PAINTING EXPLORATION




Figure 5.3: Participant responses regarding sound environment regulation.




Figure 5.4: Participant responses regarding the two existing reproduction modes - simultaneous and sequential.

intuitiveness and ease of use. While the touch controls were also described as intuitive by the majority, the responses were less consistent, with an average score of 4.1 out of 5. Participant 2 rated the touch controls' intuitiveness a 2 out of 5, due to some difficulty with the swipe gestures and especially the position and size of the virtual joysticks. While the rest of the participants did not experience difficulties to this extent, they generally reported greater comfort and confidence with the physical controller, thus preferring this interface when asked to compare both input modes (3.75/5). However, the console scheme was not one-sidedly favored in this case, as 25% of subjects actually preferred the touch controls and participant 1 appreciated both control schemes equally. The moderate success of the touch controls can in part be explained with the positive reception of the haptic feedback present in this schema, which may have compensated for the lack of tangible button-based physical interaction. The smartphone vibrations, triggered by collisions with the painting's borders or virtual joystick interactions, received an average score of 4 out of 5 in effectiveness. Though some users did point out that they would prefer these vibrations to be more intense.




Figure 5.5: Participant responses regarding the available control schemes - physical gamepad and touch.

The general reception of the application was highly positive, with participants strongly agreeing that the system provided an immersive and engaging with the painting (average score 4.4/5). Even more notably, they agreed that the set of available features allowed them to form a somewhat complete idea of the painting's content and essence (4.6/5).

Responses to open-ended questions reinforced the quantitative findings of the study, as several participants highlighted the immersion and stimulation of the experience, some also suggesting improvements. Out of the suggestions, that of participant 5 was a particularly interesting one - incorporating clock hour narration alongside the directional scanner's narrations, for further awareness assistance. As expected, most users commented on initial difficulties in orienting themselves within the scene but reported that these lessened with practice and with new spatial awareness tools being introduced. When asked about usage context, most felt the application would be most meaningful in a museum setting alongside the artwork, others couldn't choose between using it at a museum or remotely, and one participant preferred a fully remote interaction.

The results of this study suggest that the application succeeded in delivering both an enjoyable and meaningful interpretation of the artwork, beyond the usability of individual functionalities - its potential acknowledged as both an independent exploration tool and a complement to in-person museum visits.

5.2.4 The Perspective of a Returning User

One of the two blind individuals who had previously taken part in the early prototype's concept refinement sessions (addressed in section 4.3), Cláudia Pires, returned to test the application in its final state. With her participation came a unique perspective, as she was the only person in this evaluation with any prior exposure to the application, though this occurred a month and a half earlier and under a different protocol. For this reason, her results are considered separately from those of the other participants in section 5.2.3, who all experienced the system for the first time.

The early prototype that Cláudia had tested already included most of the core functionalities, but lacked features such as the proximity sensor, toggleable ambient sound, and haptic feedback. Additionally, between versions the sensitivity of the directional scanner was adjusted, and the sound attributes of the test soundscape were slightly refined. The protocol of the earlier study was similar in structure to the final one, using the same painting and a comparable sequence of tasks, though these were less specific and accompanied only by qualitative questions. Consequently, some of the tasks in the final evaluation were familiar to her, while others introduced entirely new elements.

Cláudia performed these final tasks with relative ease, quickly adapting to both the revised button bindings and touch gestures. She highlighted the improvements in the directional scanner's usability and especially the mobile touch controls, which she found more reactive and supported by proper haptic feedback. Cláudia's responses to the survey aligned with the positive trends observed in section 5.2.3, and emphasized the importance of iterative improvements, especially when coming from someone able to compare versions of the system.

It is also important to acknowledge Ana Inês Colares, the other blind participant who had taken part in the early prototype study and also volunteered for the final

study. Ultimately, she was unable to attend the final evaluation due to the researcher's time constraints. Nonetheless, her role was indispensable in supporting this stage of the research by greatly facilitating the recruitment of the BVI participants, essentially managing this process in its entirety.

5.3 Desktop Soundscape Creation

The second user study focused on the Windows-based soundscape editor, intended for museum curators without prior experience in sound design to build auditory representations of paintings in an intuitive manner. As stated in section 5.1, the objective of this evaluation was to assess the tool's usability and comprehensibility, but also to determine whether participants could successfully construct an immersive soundscape capable of conveying the essence of an artwork to BVI visitors. The protocol may be accessed in section B.2.

The evaluation followed a similar structured methodology to the one applied in the mobile prototype study (section 5.2), with a sequence of tasks introducing participants to the editor's main features, followed by a short free-use period and a survey. The utilization scenario paralleled that of the mobile application's study. Participants were tasked with creating a auditory environment of "O Bosque Sagrado" by Maria Benamor, essentially reconstructing the very same soundscape that BVI participants had explored within the mobile application.

Most tests were carried out in person under similar controlled conditions, using the researcher's equipment. Participant 13 was one single exception, who took part remotely while closely adhering to the established methodology. For this case, the application executable, media folder, and protocol were provided in advance, and the evaluation was conducted on the participant's own computer via a Discord screen-sharing session.

All participants used a computer running the application and headphones for reliable spatial sound reproduction when testing the created soundscape. For the convenience of the participants, all media files were prepared in advance and placed in a dedicated folder within the application's directory. Though not required for the tool's use, this allowed participants to concentrate on evaluating the editor itself rather than creating or searching for external media resources.

5.3.1 User Characterization

Twenty participants took part in the evaluation of the desktop soundscape editor, none of whom had any previous exposure to the tool. Ideally, this study would have involved museum curators or professionals with backgrounds in art interpretation, the editor's target audience. However, due to time constraints and limited connections to such professionals, the participant pool consisted instead of volunteers without formal ties to

the museum sector. Despite this limitation, the study provided valuable insights into the tool's usability and comprehensibility from the perspective of novice users.

The group, characterized in table 5.2, was composed of fifteen male participants (75%) and five female participants (25%). The age distribution was quite narrow: 35% participants were 22 years old and the remaining 65% were 23 years old, resulting in an average age of 22.7 years.

Table 5.2: User characterization by identifier.

| ID | Age | Gender | Experience in sound design |
|----|-----|--------|----------------------------|
| 1 | 22 | Male | None |
| 2 | 22 | Male | Intermediate |
| 3 | 23 | Male | None |
| 4 | 23 | Male | None |
| 5 | 23 | Female | None |
| 6 | 23 | Male | None |
| 7 | 23 | Female | None |
| 8 | 22 | Male | Beginner |
| 9 | 23 | Male | Beginner |
| 10 | 22 | Female | None |
| 11 | 23 | Female | None |
| 12 | 23 | Male | None |
| 13 | 23 | Male | None |
| 14 | 23 | Male | None |
| 15 | 22 | Male | None |
| 16 | 22 | Male | None |
| 17 | 23 | Male | Beginner |
| 18 | 23 | Male | None |
| 19 | 23 | Male | None |
| 20 | 22 | Female | None |

Regarding experience in sound design, 80% of participants reported no prior background at all. 15% of individuals identified themselves as beginners, and only participant 2 described their experience as intermediate - the most experienced user. Thus, the participant group was predominantly representative of non-specialist users, aligning with the audience for whom the editor was conceived.

5.3.2 Task Overview

Similar to the mobile study in section 5.2.2, participants were guided through six tasks that introduced the core functionalities of the desktop soundscape editor. Reinforcing what was stated in section 5.1, these tasks acted as a structured tutorial to familiarize participants

with the system's interface and feature set, rather than strict evaluation measures in themselves. While tasks were highly specific in general and had clearly defined steps to follow, some allowed for a small degree of freedom, such as experimenting with sound attributes or engaging with the interactive mode.

Task 1 consisted in importing the background painting into the scene, followed by adjusting the grid system used to place, remove and edit scene elements (Task 2). In Task 3, participants used the grid to place the main components of the soundscape: ambient sounds, spatial sounds, and a player starting point. In the most laborious task, Task 4, users edited all existing elements by assigning audio files, adjusting several audio attributes, defining volume attenuation ranges, and setting player properties such as initial orientation and movement speed. Task 5 consisted only in defining a global narration track for the scene, while Task 6 transitioned participants into the interactive mode, allowing them to simulate and test the soundscape they had just created.

This set of tasks exposed participants to a complete workflow of the editor: from constructing and refining a soundscape to finally experiencing it in an interactive preview. With this, participants developed a reasonable and functional understanding of the system in preparation for the optional free-use session that followed.

5.3.3 Results Overview

The evaluation of the soundscape editor produced encouraging results, with participants generally finding the tool intuitive and effective for creating detailed auditory scenes. As with the mobile study's survey (addressed in section 5.2.3), the survey's Likert-scale items were phrased as statements, scored by level of endorsement (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

As shown in figure 5.6, in terms of basic operations, such as importing the background painting and setting a global narration, participants strongly agreed that these were straightforward, with average agreeability scores nearing 5 for both of these functionalities. Comfortability adjusting the grid's cell size and line thickness was similarly rated, a 4.8. In addition, with an average score of 4.6 out of 5, the available element types (ambient sounds, spatial sounds, and player entity) were generally considered sufficient to adequately represent the painting.

As can be seen in figure 5.7, participants expressed confidence in the clarity and intuitiveness of the implemented placement system, with an average score of 4.1 and editing operations generally perceived as simple and comprehensible. However, participant 12 rated the statement a 2, possibly due to his reported difficulties in choosing audio and narration files when editing the elements. The grid system was considered extremely easy to use by 85% of participants, with an average score of 4.8. Well received as it was, 40% of participants were undecided on whether the system in place was more intuitive and suitable for soundscape creation than alternatives such as drag-and-drop and point-and-click. 10% of users had a preference for these alternative interaction models, while the




Figure 5.6: Participant responses regarding setting up the background painting, global narration and initial setup.

remaining 50% preferred the current grid system.

When asked about the adequacy of editing options (responses shown in figure 5.8), participants agreed that the configurable properties of ambient sounds, spatial sounds, and player attributes were sufficient to represent the desired soundscape, all with an average agreeability score equal to or over 4.5/5. Additionally, the available sound editing options were considered very comprehensible, also with a rating of 4.5, suggesting an appropriate balance between simplicity and expressiveness.

Participants responded very positively to the editor's two modes - development and interactive - as one can observe in figure 5.9. With an average score of 5, alternating between modes was classified as extremely quick and intuitive by every participant. Furthermore, their distinct purposes were clearly understood and participants felt capable of effectively emulating and testing the soundscape in interactive mode, having created it within the development mode. Both previous statements were similarly rated and nearing an agreement score of 5, confirming the application's suitability for both soundscape construction and its validation.

According to figure 5.10, only 35% of participants did not feel the absence of a help button. While 20% of users were indifferent, the remaining 45% stated a need for a help button, claiming that it would have been useful to clarify doubts on demand, despite generally completing the tasks successfully without it.




Figure 5.7: Participant responses regarding the current grid-like placement system.




Figure 5.8: Participant responses regarding the editing options for the existing element types.




Figure 5.9: Participant responses regarding the two existing modes of interaction.




Figure 5.10: Participant responses regarding the need for a help button.

Lastly, as displayed in figure 5.11, participants strongly considered the editor to be expressive, allowing for the creation of a detailed and immersive representation of "O Bosque Sagrado" (average score 4.6/5). They also described the experience of creation itself as both intuitive and pleasant, rating it an average of 4.8 out of 5.




Figure 5.11: Participant responses regarding the overall user experience.

From the responses to the open-ended questions, derived the most common points for improvement, which included:

- clearer button tooltips, since not all functionalities were implicitly self-explanatory;
- a visible submit/OK button in editing popups, as some participants were uncertain whether changes had been applied;
- an audio preview option within editing popups, to immediately hear the effect of adjustments;
- the ability for most buttons to function as toggles (activating and deactivating features with the same control);
- support for moving already placed elements rather than having to delete and recreate them;
- Quality of Life (QoL) enhancements, such as a visual indication of edited elements, preventing spatial sound popups from closing after adjusting volume rolloff and support for editing multiple elements simultaneously.

The findings of this study confirm that the desktop editor meets its central goals of simplicity and effectiveness for users without former sound design experience, producing an interactive and immersive soundscape equivalent to the one presented to BVI individuals

in section 5.2. Most importantly, these results shed light on a clear set of refinements that could further improve the experience for all of its users.

5.4 Summary

Taking together the results of both sections 5.2.3 and 5.3.3, the two prototypes achieved their intended goals, with clear potential for further improvement. The mobile soundscape player effectively enabled BVI participants to autonomously explore and interpret a painting through audio stimuli - be it sound effects or narrations, movement within the painting and SATs. Besides valuing the accessibility features and sound regulation options, the participants reported a strong sense of immersion, also feeling a solid grasp over the painting's content and essence. Although the console controls were generally preferred over touch gestures, the mobile interface was also considered broadly accessible, likely due to the inclusion of haptic feedback and some gestures somewhat resembling the physical gamepad's bindings.

In turn, the desktop soundscape editor was found intuitive and comprehensible for users with little or no prior experience in sound design. Users were able to construct a complete and immersive soundscape of "O Bosque Sagrado" with ease, mostly appreciating the editor's grid system, editing options, and dual development and interactive modes. The absence of a help feature was the most common limitation identified, along with several smaller usability and QoL improvements.

These studies confirmed the viability of both components of the proposed system. While the editor empowers users to create expressive auditory representations of artworks, the mobile application allowed BVI individuals to engage with these representations in a manner that was both immersive and accessible.

CONCLUSION

This chapter concludes the dissertation with a summary of the work developed throughout its course, revisiting the motivation, objectives and a synopsis of the proposed solution, outlining the features inspired by related work. Additionally, the system's shortcomings as well as its strengths are acknowledged via a discussion of the results of its two constituents. The chapter closes by envisioning the future of the developed system, contemplating further improvements and essential features.

Despite ongoing efforts by museums in promoting inclusivity, many showcases are yet predominantly visual, at the compromise of BVI visitors' independence and access to art. While competent, current accessibility methods are employed in exhibitions to differing degrees of success and often struggle to balance informational access and artistic engagement. In light of these limitations, the main objective of this research is to narrow the accessibility gaps persisted by the methods currently in place at museums, namely in what concerns the literal interpretation and aesthetic appreciation of paintings.

Informed by related work in the field of immersive audio systems applied in cultural settings and accessible virtual navigation tools, the solution proposed in this dissertation strives to meet the aforementioned purpose by way of a bipartite system.

Its core constituent is a mobile soundscape player in which BVI users may autonomously navigate auditory painting recreations through several SATs, customizable sound effects (ambience and spatialized) and verbal descriptions. By combining sound stimuli and narrations, this hybrid approach merges both informational and aesthetic access to an artwork while remaining highly interactive and immersive.

Complementing this mobile solution by supplying it with content is a desktop editor targeted at curators without prior sound design or programming experience. Via a simple grid-based system and interactive soundscape preview emulating the mobile application, it enables intuitive development of the auditory environments available in the soundscape player.

The preliminary interview with two blind individuals was essential in shaping what the mobile application's final iteration came to be, ensuring it addressed real BVI practical needs and preferences. Their feedback assisted in not only refining the directional scanner

and other existing features but also devising new ones such as the proximity sensor, ambience regulation and haptic feedback. The impact of this concept refinement phase was felt in the final user study's promising results, as BVI participants responded very positively to the features and refinements derived from those early interviews.

In the mobile soundscape player, tested solely by BVI individuals, most participants reported feeling immersed within the artwork and that they had a solid grasp on its content and essence. Valuing the existing audio cues, SATs and sound regulation options, they also felt capable of independent interaction with the application. Though some users commented on initial difficulties situating themselves within the scene, these were to be expected, lessening with practice and as SATs were subsequently introduced. Some users also called for more intense haptic feedback.

Similarly, the desktop editor was well regarded in its own separate study, tested by individuals of differing backgrounds in place of curators or art professionals, due to time constraints and limited connections. Nonetheless, the participants successfully recreated a painting as an auditory environment, strongly considering the editor to be expressive and intuitive to work with. Though the implemented grid-based placement system was positively received and regarded as adequate, some users preferred alternatives such as drag-and-drop or point-and-click, while others mentioned augmentations to the current grid system. Furthermore, participants found the editor practical and functional yet somewhat unembellished in what pertained to common QoL features.

Despite its general success, the proposed system has two major limitations, specifically in the desktop prototype, though fortunately these are neither conceptual nor did they interfere with any of the user tests. One such deficiency manifests in the lack of an export capability from the editor to the mobile application, which was left unimplemented due to time constraints. While this feature is not critical to the dissertation's proof of concept, it does prevent the desktop application from effectively supporting the mobile player as the provider of its content. As such, it should be the first point to be addressed in a future iteration of the editor. The second point to be addressed should be the lack of a proper save/load feature for the generated auditory environments, ultimately holding the application back from being more than a concept demonstration tool.

More than a simple amalgamation of proven SATs and audio techniques, the mobile soundscape player provided BVI users with an engaging and meaningful way to access visual art. Analogously, the editor empowered non-expert users to easily create immersive soundscapes of equivalent quality to the one present in the mobile prototype. While in the dissertation's current state, barriers to accessibility still prevail in various forms, the work developed is a worthwhile step towards dismantling or at least attenuating them, presenting a strong foundation for what could eventually evolve into a widespread real-world solution.

6.1 Future Work

While it was warmly received by its target audiences, there remains potential in the developed system for further augmentation and even expansion, not to mention some limitations that should not be left unaddressed.

As previously mentioned, one of the current solution's most significant shortcomings lies in the lack of an export feature from the desktop soundscape editor to the mobile application, though it was initially planned. Thus, while the editor supports the effective recreation of interactive soundscapes equivalent to those present in the mobile player, it cannot in fact supply them to the application - ultimately falling short of the supplement to the mobile soundscape player it is intended to be. Implementing this capability would likely require integrating the desktop editor with an online database hosting service to store and retrieve scene data along with its associated media resources. If the soundscape data is available online, the mobile application could then fetch a specific recreation and convert it into a functional environment. There is some groundwork laid out in this regard, however it currently takes the form of a parser that only supports local files and would require adaptation for remote file retrieval.

The other most relevant limitation is the lack of a save/load functionality in the editor's interface. As there is already a simple save system implemented, which locally persists a JSON file with the scene's information, a first approach could be to use the already existing system and develop the adequate UI elements and logic to interact with it. However, in further iterations of the application, it could prove more beneficial and robust to use an established database service instead.

From the soundscape player's user study with BVI participants, several possible refinements emerged, which may facilitate meeting the needs of BVI users. Some users found the fixed duration of each sound source in sequential mode to be too long, suggesting that allowing customization of the sound durations in this mode could enhance the experience. Additionally, according to some participants, haptic feedback should be more intense, particularly in the joysticks. Another adjustment based on user feedback is further improvement of the touch controls, namely the current gesture for toggling a global narration (a two-finger hold) should possibly be considered for a more intuitive rebinding. One participant proposed an extension to the existing directional scanner for added spatial awareness: upon scanner detection, a clock hour narration would signal the direction of the identified source before the reproduction of its verbal description.

Similarly to the mobile study, the soundscape editor's user study with non-expert users resulted in several usability suggestions. As not all functionalities were implicitly self-explanatory to some users, the most commonly mentioned enhancement was the addition of a help feature and button tooltips. Nearly as requested was the addition of an explicit submit button in the editing popups, as some participants were uncertain whether their changes had been applied. Some also felt the need to move already placed grid elements in a drag-and-drop manner, a capability that would greatly benefit the

placement system, since currently "moving" an element requires it to be deleted and replicated elsewhere. Other recommended QoL features include a confirmation popup before the 'reset' button takes effect, audio samples within editing popups so users may hear the impact of their adjustments and the visual indication of edited elements, among other relevant capabilities.

With the aforementioned adjustments implemented and limitations addressed, the system's dual constituents should once again be evaluated separately by their intended end users to assess whether they adequately meet their needs. Ideally, individuals with an artistic background should validate the editor to better align it with the target audience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] D. Ahmetovic, C. Bernareggi, K. Keller, and S. Mascetti. "MusA: artwork accessibility through augmented reality for people with low vision". In: *Proceedings of the 18th International Web for All Conference*. 2021, pp. 1–9 (cit. on pp. 19, 20, 29).
- [2] F. Aletta, J. Kang, and Ö. Axelsson. "Soundscape descriptors and a conceptual framework for developing predictive soundscape models". In: *Landscape and Urban Planning* 149 (2016), pp. 65–74 (cit. on p. 13).
- [3] B. Ansel. *Two-way Radio Basic Theory - By Bill "Billavista" Ansell*. URL: http://www.billavista.com/atv/Articles/Offroad_Radios_and_Comms/index.html (visited on 2025-01-04) (cit. on p. 6).
- [4] S. Asakawa, J. Guerreiro, D. Sato, H. Takagi, D. Ahmetovic, D. Gonzalez, K. M. Kitani, and C. Asakawa. "An independent and interactive museum experience for blind people". In: *Proceedings of the 16th International Web for All Conference*. 2019, pp. 1–9 (cit. on p. 2).
- [5] E. C. Baig. *Accessibility Settings, Tools on Your Smartphone Can Make Life Easier*. URL: <https://www.aarp.org/home-family/personal-technology/info-2020/smartphone-accessibility.html> (visited on 2024-12-23) (cit. on p. 3).
- [6] M. Banf and V. Blanz. "Sonification of images for the visually impaired using a multi-level approach". In: *Proceedings of the 4th Augmented Human International Conference*. 2013, pp. 162–169 (cit. on p. 18).
- [7] A. L. Brown, J. Kang, and T. Gjestland. "Towards standardization in soundscape preference assessment". In: *Applied acoustics* 72.6 (2011), pp. 387–392 (cit. on p. 13).
- [8] F. Candlin. "Blindness, art and exclusion in museums and galleries". In: *International Journal of Art & Design Education* 22.1 (2003), pp. 100–110 (cit. on pp. 2, 3).
- [9] F. E. Care. *Vision: Our dominant Sense*. URL: <https://www.newjerseyeyesite.com/vision-therapy-optometrist/the-17-visual-skills-assessed-during-your-childs-functional-eye-exam/vision-our-dominant-sense/#:~:text=Vision%20is%20our%20dominant%20sense&text=It%20is%20a%20complex%2>

- C%20learned, activities%20are%20mediated%20through%20vision (visited on 2024-12-23) (cit. on p. 1).
- [10] L. Cavazos Quero, J. Iranzo Bartolomé, and J. Cho. "Accessible visual artworks for blind and visually impaired people: comparing a multimodal approach with tactile graphics". In: *Electronics* 10.3 (2021), p. 297 (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 18).
 - [11] R.-C. Chang, C.-S. Hung, B.-Y. Chen, D. Jain, and A. Guo. "Sound Unblending: Exploring Sound Manipulations for Accessible Mixed-Reality Awareness". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.11095* (2024) (cit. on p. 2).
 - [12] T. Deakin. *How museums can remove barriers to access for blind and partially sighted people*. URL: <https://www.museumnext.com/article/how-museums-can-remove-barriers-to-access-for-blind-and-partially-sighted-people/> (visited on 2024-12-23) (cit. on p. 2).
 - [13] K. Drossos, N. Zormpas, G. Giannakopoulos, and A. Floros. "Accessible games for blind children, empowered by binaural sound". In: *Proceedings of the 8th ACM international conference on pervasive technologies related to assistive environments*. 2015, pp. 1–8 (cit. on pp. 21, 22, 29, 30).
 - [14] S. L. Dumyahn and B. C. Pijanowski. "Soundscape conservation". In: *Landscape ecology* 26 (2011), pp. 1327–1344 (cit. on p. 13).
 - [15] J. Enoch, L. McDonald, L. Jones, P. R. Jones, and D. P. Crabb. "Evaluating Whether Sight Is the Most Valued Sense". In: *JAMA Ophthalmology* 137.11 (2019-11), pp. 1317–1320. ISSN: 2168-6165. doi: [10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2019.3537](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2019.3537). eprint: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamaophthalmology/articlepdf/2752217/jamaophthalmology_enoch_2019_br_190017.pdf. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2019.3537> (cit. on p. 1).
 - [16] R. P. Fartaria, F. Pereira, V. D. Bonifácio, P. Mata, J. Aires-de-Sousa, and A. M. Lobo. "NavMol 2.0—a molecular structure navigator/editor for blind and visually impaired users". In: *European journal of organic chemistry* 2013.8 (2013), pp. 1415–1419 (cit. on pp. 18, 19).
 - [17] C. R. D. Ferreira. "Creating immersive audio in a historical soundscape context". MA thesis. Universidade NOVA de Lisboa (Portugal), 2021 (cit. on pp. 3, 15, 25, 26, 31, 36, 72).
 - [18] D. Foundation. *The Senses: Vision*. URL: <https://dana.org/resources/the-senses-vision/> (visited on 2024-12-23) (cit. on p. 1).
 - [19] J. Guerreiro, Y. Kim, R. Nogueira, S. Chung, A. Rodrigues, and U. Oh. "The design space of the auditory representation of objects and their behaviours in virtual reality for blind people". In: *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 29.5 (2023), pp. 2763–2773 (cit. on pp. 25, 31, 36).

- [20] L. Holloway, K. Marriott, M. Butler, and A. Borning. "Making sense of art: Access for gallery visitors with vision impairments". In: *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 2019, pp. 1–12 (cit. on pp. 2, 3).
- [21] E. Kabisch, F. Kuester, and S. Penny. "Sonic panoramas: experiments with interactive landscape image sonification". In: *Proceedings of the 2005 international conference on Augmented tele-existence*. 2005, pp. 156–163 (cit. on p. 15).
- [22] S. J. Krol, M. T. Llano, M. Butler, and C. Goncu. "Design Considerations for Automatic Musical Soundscapes of Visual Art for People with Blindness or Low Vision". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14188* (2024) (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 25).
- [23] N. Kumar. *How Many People Own Smartphones* (2024): Worldwide Data. url: <https://www.demandsage.com/smartphone-users/> (visited on 2024-12-23) (cit. on p. 3).
- [24] F. M. Li, L. Zhang, M. Bandukda, A. Stangl, K. Shinohara, L. Findlater, and P. Carrington. "Understanding visual arts experiences of blind people". In: *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 2023, pp. 1–21 (cit. on pp. 2, 3).
- [25] J. Li. "Beyond Sight: Enhancing Augmented Reality Interactivity with Audio-Based and Non-Visual Interfaces". In: *Applied Sciences* 14.11 (2024), p. 4881 (cit. on pp. 2, 18).
- [26] J. J. Lopez, P. Gutierrez-Parera, and M. Cobos. "Compensating first reflections in non-anechoic head-related transfer function measurements". In: *Applied Acoustics* 188 (2022), p. 108523. issn: 0003-682X. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apacoust.2021.108523>. url: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003682X21006174> (cit. on p. 12).
- [27] P. R. Martins. "Blindness in art museums: A Portuguese case study". In: *Journal of museum education* 45.3 (2020), pp. 340–349 (cit. on p. 2).
- [28] K. McMullen. "Interface Design Implications for Recalling the Spatial Configuration of Virtual Auditory Environments." In: (2012-01) (cit. on p. 11).
- [29] V. Nair, J. L. Karp, S. Silverman, M. Kalra, H. Lehv, F. Jamil, and B. A. Smith. "Navstick: Making video games blind-accessible via the ability to look around". In: *The 34th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. 2021, pp. 538–551 (cit. on pp. 3, 20, 30, 36, 37).
- [30] V. Nair, S.-e. Ma, R. E. Gonzalez Penuela, Y. He, K. Lin, M. Hayes, H. Huddleston, M. Donnelly, and B. A. Smith. "Uncovering visually impaired gamers' preferences for spatial awareness tools within video games". In: *Proceedings of the 24th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*. 2022, pp. 1–16 (cit. on pp. 3, 22, 23, 30, 31, 36, 37).

- [31] V. Nair, S.-e. Ma, H. Huddleston, K. Lin, M. Hayes, M. Donnelly, R. E. Gonzalez, Y. He, and B. A. Smith. "Towards a Generalized Acoustic Minimap for Visually Impaired Gamers". In: *Adjunct Proceedings of the 34th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. 2021, pp. 89–91 (cit. on p. 22).
- [32] U. Nations. *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)*. URL: <https://social.desa.un.org/issues/disability/crpd/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities-crpd> (visited on 2024-12-23) (cit. on p. 2).
- [33] W. H. Organization. *Blindness and vision impairment*. URL: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/blindness-and-visual-impairment> (visited on 2024-12-23) (cit. on p. 1).
- [34] I. A. for the Prevention of Blindness Vision Atlas. *Global Estimates of Vision Loss*. URL: <https://www.iapb.org/learn/vision-atlas/magnitude-and-projections/global/> (visited on 2024-12-23) (cit. on p. 1).
- [35] I. A. for the Prevention of Blindness Vision Atlas. *Projected Change in Vision Loss 2020 to 2050*. URL: <https://www.iapb.org/learn/vision-atlas/magnitude-and-projections/projected-change/> (visited on 2024-12-23) (cit. on p. 1).
- [36] RAIZ. *O Bosque Sagrado*. URL: <http://raiz.museusemonumentos.pt/DetalhesObra?id=208578&tipo=OBJ> (visited on 2025-02-11) (cit. on pp. 28, 32, 35).
- [37] T. Ramogida and S. Kenderdine. "Scenting Heritage: Real-Time Olfactory Augmentation". In: *Digital Heritage*. Ed. by S. Campana, D. Ferdani, H. Graf, G. Guidi, Z. Hegarty, S. Pescarin, and F. Remondino. The Eurographics Association, 2025. ISBN: 978-3-03868-277-6. doi: [10.2312/dh.20253086](https://doi.org/10.2312/dh.20253086) (cit. on p. 15).
- [38] K. Rector, K. Salmon, D. Thornton, N. Joshi, and M. R. Morris. "Eyes-free art: Exploring proxemic audio interfaces for blind and low vision art engagement". In: *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 1.3 (2017), pp. 1–21 (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 15, 16).
- [39] M. Risoud, J.-N. Hanson, F. Gauvrit, C. Renard, P.-E. Lemesre, N.-X. Bonne, and C. Vincent. "Sound source localization". In: *European Annals of Otorhinolaryngology, Head and Neck Diseases* 135.4 (2018), pp. 259–264. ISSN: 1879-7296. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anorl.2018.04.009>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S187972961830067X> (cit. on p. 8).
- [40] M. Risoud, J.-N. Hanson, F. Gauvrit, C. Renard, P.-E. Lemesre, N.-X. Bonne, and C. Vincent. "Sound source localization". In: *European annals of otorhinolaryngology, head and neck diseases* 135.4 (2018), pp. 259–264 (cit. on pp. 7, 8, 10–12).
- [41] I. Rodrigues, R. Teixeira, S. Cavaco, N. Lincs, V. Bonifácio, D. Peixoto, Y. Binev, F. Pereira, A. Lobo, and J. Aires-de-Sousa. "2D SPATIAL AUDIO IN A MOLECULAR NAVIGATOR/EDITOR FOR BLIND AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED USERS". In: 2017-12 (cit. on p. 18).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [42] I. N. Rodrigues. *Espacialização de Som no Navegador e Editor Molecular Navmol Dissertação para obtenção do Grau de Mestre em Engenharia Informática*. URL: <https://github.com/joaomlourenco/unlthesis> (cit. on p. 18).
- [43] F. Rumsey. *Spatial Audio*. 2001-01. ISBN: 9780080498195. DOI: [10.4324/9780080498195](https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080498195) (cit. on pp. 8-12).
- [44] M. Rychtáriková, J. Herssens, and A. Heylighen. "Towards more inclusive approaches in soundscape research: The soundscape of blind people". In: *Inter-noise and noise-con congress and conference proceedings*. Institute of Noise Control Engineering New York. 2012 (cit. on p. 13).
- [45] J. Sánchez and M. Sáenz. "Usability of Audio-Based Virtual Environments for Users with Visual Disabilities". In: *Virtual Reality and Human Behavior Symposium, LAVAL Virtual*. 2007, pp. 18-22 (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 21).
- [46] R. Saville. *Audio, Image and Video Processing*. URL: <https://beccasaville.blogspot.com/2012/09/compression-and-rarefaction.html> (visited on 2025-01-04) (cit. on p. 7).
- [47] R. M. Schafer. *The soundscape: Our sonic environment and the tuning of the world*. Simon and Schuster, 1993 (cit. on p. 13).
- [48] A. R. L. Simão. "Jogo sério para treino de orientação e mobilidade de crianças cegas e amblíopes". PhD thesis. Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 2018 (cit. on pp. 21, 29, 36).
- [49] A. E. Team. 77% of People Say Sight is Their Most Important Sense. URL: <https://assileye.com/blog/is-sight-the-most-important-sense/> (visited on 2024-12-23) (cit. on p. 1).
- [50] D. R. Team. *Technical Overview of Unity Game Engine*. URL: <https://www.pubnub.com/guides/unity/> (visited on 2025-02-01) (cit. on p. 36).
- [51] P. Vasilakou, S. Mineiko, T. M. Hasioti, Z. Gavriilidou, and A. Drigas. "The accessibility of visually impaired people to museums and art through ICTs". In: *Technium Soc. Sci. J.* 35 (2022), p. 263 (cit. on p. 2).
- [52] R. Vaz, D. Freitas, and A. Coelho. "Blind and visually impaired visitors' experiences in museums: increasing accessibility through assistive technologies". In: *The International Journal of the Inclusive Museum* 13.2 (2020), p. 57 (cit. on p. 2).
- [53] R. Vaz, D. Freitas, and A. Coelho. "Perspectives of visually impaired visitors on museums: towards an integrative and multisensory framework to enhance the museum experience". In: *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Software Development and Technologies for Enhancing Accessibility and Fighting Info-exclusion*. 2020, pp. 17-21 (cit. on p. 2).


- [54] J. Yang and C. Y. Chan. "Audio-augmented museum experiences with gaze tracking". In: *Proceedings of the 18th international conference on mobile and ubiquitous multimedia*. 2019, pp. 1–5 (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 17, 29, 36).
- [55] W. Yost and R. Schlauch. "Fundamentals of Hearing: An Introduction (4th edition)". In: *Journal of The Acoustical Society of America - J ACOUST SOC AMER* 110 (2001-10). doi: [10.1121/1.1398047](https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1398047) (cit. on pp. 7–12).
- [56] Zenva. *What is Unity? – A Top Game Engine for Video Games*. URL: <https://gamedevacademy.org/what-is-unity/> (visited on 2025-02-01) (cit. on p. 36).
- [57] X. Zhong, W. Yost, and L. Sun. "Dynamic binaural sound source localization with ITD cues: Human listeners". In: *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 137 (2015-04), pp. 2376–2376. doi: [10.1121/1.4920636](https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4920636) (cit. on p. 9).

A



CONCEPTUAL MOCKUPS



This appendix displays the Figma mockups devised early on in the research, starting by the mobile application and then with the desktop editor, including a 3D version of its development mode (an idea which was later abandoned, as explained in section 4.1.2), reminiscent of Ferreira's [17] Immerscape.

A.1 Mobile Soundscape Player



A.2 Desktop Soundscape Editor





B

USER STUDIES

This appendix displays the protocols utilized in the solution's final evaluation sessions as well as their correspondent surveys. The first section pertains to the mobile application while the second pertains to the desktop editor.

B.1 Mobile Soundscape Player

PROTOCOLO DE AVALIAÇÃO DA APLICAÇÃO MÓVEL

OBJETIVO

O objetivo deste protocolo é avaliar o sistema final da aplicação móvel desenvolvida para permitir a exploração autónoma e interativa de pinturas por pessoas cegas e com baixa visão. Pretende-se avaliar a eficácia das funcionalidades implementadas, a sua usabilidade e o nível de imersão proporcionado.

EQUIPAMENTO NECESSÁRIO (fornecido pelo investigador)

- Smartphone com a aplicação instalada
- Headphones
- Comando de consola (PS4)

CENÁRIO DE UTILIZAÇÃO

Utilizando um smartphone e headphones, irá explorar autonomamente uma representação sonora interativa da pintura "O Bosque Sagrado" de Maria Benamor. É de notar que a paisagem sonora que lhe será apresentada não foi elaborada por um profissional de arte, mas pelo desenvolvedor da aplicação. O seu objetivo será navegar pelo espaço virtual, identificar elementos específicos da pintura e personalizar a sua experiência ajustando as definições de reprodução sonora e visual conforme a sua preferência.

Após completar algumas tarefas estruturadas com o comando de consola de modo a ficar a conhecer todas as funcionalidades da aplicação, terá duas sessões de exploração livre. Ambas as sessões têm uma duração de até 3 minutos, uma sendo com os controlos de comando de consola e a outra com os controlos de toque. Não tem de completar toda a duração destas sessões.

OBSERVAÇÕES

Durante as tarefas e exploração livre, serão registadas através de notas as dificuldades encontradas, comentários espontâneos e sugestões dos participantes. O investigador intervirá minimamente, apenas para esclarecer

dúvidas relacionadas com os controlos. A cada tarefa, ser-lhe-ão indicados os controlos exatos para utilizar a funcionalidade abordada.

Durante a exploração, colisões com os limites da pintura silenciam todos os sons em cena, basta mover para dentro dos limites da pintura para se retomarem os sons. Ao usar controlos de toque, existem alguns estímulos hapticos presentes, nomeadamente numa colisão com os limites da pintura e a carregar/largar qualquer um dos joysticks. Finalmente, em qualquer uma das tarefas está livre para utilizar ou não as funcionalidades que lhe foram introduzidas nas tarefas anteriores.

TAREFAS

- **Tarefa 0 (VISUAL):**

Controle o nível de zoom consoante a sua preferência e experimente alternar entre os modos visuais (imersivo, acessível, minimalista). Pode ajustar o zoom livremente durante qualquer uma das tarefas.

- **Tarefa 1 – Movimento:**

Utilizando o joystick esquerdo, navegue pela cena para identificar fontes sonoras espaciais. Mover o joystick verticalmente define movimento para a frente ou para trás, enquanto movimento horizontal roda o utilizador no sítio, em intervalos de 30º - uma hora. À medida que se aproximar de diferentes elementos do quadro, notará diferenças nos sons produzidos. Desloque-se pela cena até sentir o som da fogueira próximo de si e à sua direita.

- **Tarefa 2 – Orientação atual:**

Procure orientar-se relativamente à orientação original do quadro ao inquirir a sua direção atual. Ouvirá uma narração da sua orientação no formato das horas do relógio. Por exemplo, se estiver a apontar na direção original da pintura ouvirá "12 horas", apontar na direção oposta acusaria "6 horas". Com o joystick esquerdo para se rotacionar e recorrendo a esta funcionalidade, tente virar-se de frente para as direções de "3", "6" e "9", e "12" horas, sabendo que cada "click" representa uma rotação de uma hora.

- **Tarefa 3 – Scanner direcional e narração global:**

Usando o joystick direito (scanner), aponte para diferentes elementos na pintura. Ouça a narração de pelo menos 3 objetos à medida que aponta para diferentes direções. Repare como o áudio é emanado da direção para a qual aponta. Para cancelar uma narração, basta largar o joystick direito. Procure agora despoletar uma narração global da cena. Pode cancelar esta narração exatamente da mesma maneira que a ativou.

- **Tarefa 4 – Sensor de proximidade:**

Nesta tarefa utilizará o sensor de proximidade sonoro, semelhante em funcionalidade ao de um automóvel, reproduzindo um som intermitente na presença de um objeto à sua frente, quanto mais perto do objeto mais frequente se torna o som. Dentro do seu alcance pré-definido, este sensor detetará sempre a fonte de som espacial mais próxima de si frontalmente. Usando esta funcionalidade e auxiliando-se do scanner direcional, dirija-se à fogueira, até estar muito próximo da mesma. Pode agora desativar o sensor.

- **Tarefa 5 – Regulação sonora:**

Desative o som ambiente e altere o número de fontes sonoras espaciais ativas. Nesta cena em particular, existem 5 fontes de som espacial, todas ativas por omissão. Tente gradualmente reduzir este número para 0, e depois aumentar até 2. Mova-se pela cena e reparará que as 2 fontes sonoras ativas serão sempre as 2 mais próximas de si. Pode voltar a ativar o som ambiente, se quiser.

- **Tarefa 6 – Modos de reprodução:**

Por omissão, a aplicação encontra-se no modo de reprodução simultânea, em que todas as fontes sonoras ativas mais próximas de si reproduzem som ao mesmo tempo. No modo de reprodução sequencial, as fontes sonoras ativas mais próximas de si reproduzem som ordenadamente, durante um período pré-determinado. Alterne para o modo sequencial e move-se pela cena, atente em como os diferentes modos de reprodução afetam a sua experiência. Pode voltar a mudar para o modo simultâneo.

SESSÕES DE EXPLORAÇÃO LIVRE

Explore livremente a cena usando quaisquer funcionalidades da aplicação.

- Sessão 1: Até 3 minutos – Comando de consola (PS4)
- Sessão 2: Até 3 minutos – Controlos de toque

INQUÉRITO

4. Grau de visão *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

- Cego
 Baixa visão
 Outra: _____

Perguntas qualitativas

Avalie cada afirmação utilizando uma escala de 1 a 5, sendo:

1. Discordo Totalmente
 2. Discordo
 3. Neutro
 4. Concordo
 5. Concordo Totalmente

5. (VISUAL) Achei fácil controlar o nível de zoom e alternar entre os modos visuais * disponíveis - imersivo, acessível, minimalista.

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

- Disc
-
-
-
-
-
- Concordo totalmente

6. Senti-me confortável ao navegar pela cena com o joystick esquerdo, conseguir uma noção do meu movimento e orientação.

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

- Disc
-
-
-
-
-
- Concordo totalmente

Questionário de avaliação da aplicação móvel para exploração interativa de pinturas por pessoas cegas e com baixa visão

As suas respostas são anónimas e serão utilizadas exclusivamente para fins académicos.

* Indica uma pergunta obrigatória

Informações gerais do participante

1. Identificador numérico do participante *

2. Idade *

3. Género *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

- Feminino
 Masculino
 Outra: _____

7. Conseguí identificar claramente a direção das fontes sonoras espaciais. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

- Disc
-
-
-
-
-
- Concordo totalmente

8. Conseguí identificar claramente a proximidade das fontes sonoras espaciais. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

- Disc
-
-
-
-
-
- Concordo totalmente

9. A funcionalidade para inquirir a minha orientação atual (formato "horas do relógio") foi intuitiva e útil na navegação pela cena.

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

- Disc
-
-
-
-
-
- Concordo totalmente

10. O scanner direcional (joystick direito) foi fácil de utilizar e ajudou-me a identificar claramente os objetos na pintura. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

- Disc
-
-
-
-
-
- Concordo totalmente

11. O sensor de proximidade sonoro foi eficaz e ajudou-me claramente a perceber * a proximidade aos elementos sonoros na pintura.

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

- Disc
-
-
-
-
-
- Concordo totalmente

12. A narração global contribuiu positivamente para a compreensão da cena. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

- Disc
-
-
-
-
-
- Concordo totalmente

13. Achei que o som ambiente me distraía dos elementos espaciais na pintura. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

- Disc
-
-
-
-
-
- Concordo totalmente

14. Achei útil poder ativar ou desativar o som ambiente. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

- Disc
-
-
-
-
-
- Concordo totalmente

15. Achei útil poder ajustar o número de fontes sonoras espaciais ativas mais próximas de mim. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

16. Notei um impacto significante dos diferentes modos de reprodução sonora (simultâneo e sequencial) na minha experiência com os elementos sonoros da pintura. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

17. Quando comparada à reprodução simultânea, a reprodução sequencial permitiu-me apreciar mais detalhadamente elementos individuais da pintura. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

18. Considero a reprodução simultânea mais imersiva do que a reprodução sequencial. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1hPKBnue-CoMgbKSZ2kU9kLUVshXvignXso7GdBe5l8w/edit>

5/8

<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1hPKBnue-CoMgbKSZ2kU9kLUVshXvignXso7GdBe5l8w/edit>

6/8

28/09/25, 19:59 Questionário de avaliação da aplicação móvel para exploração interativa de pinturas por pessoas cegas e com baixa visão

23. Preferi os controlos de comando físico de consola aos de toque. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

24. A aplicação proporcionou-me uma interação imersiva e estimulante com a pintura. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

25. Sinto que a partir das funcionalidades disponíveis, fiquei com uma ideia relativamente completa do conteúdo e essência da pintura. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

Perguntas abertas

26. Qual foi a sua impressão geral sobre a aplicação e a experiência proporcionada? *

19. Prefiro que os sons espaciais toquem em simultâneo do que sequencialmente. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

20. Os estímulos hapticos (vibração) em colisões e ao utilizar os joysticks foram eficazes e úteis. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

21. Os controlos de comando de consola foram-me intuitivos e fáceis de usar. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

22. Os controlos de toque foram-me intuitivos e fáceis de usar. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

27. Encontrou dificuldades específicas em alguma das tarefas realizadas? Se sim, quais foram e porquê?

28. Preferia utilizar esta aplicação remotamente (por exemplo, em casa) ou integrada numa visita física a um museu? Explique a sua escolha. *

29. Tem outros comentários ou sugestões finais para melhorar esta aplicação? *

Este conteúdo não foi criado nem aprovado pela Google.

Google Formulários

B.2 Desktop Soundscape Editor

PROTOCOLO DE AVALIAÇÃO DA APLICAÇÃO WINDOWS

OBJETIVO

O objetivo deste protocolo é avaliar o sistema final da aplicação de PC desenvolvida para permitir a criação de representações sonoras interativas de pinturas por utilizadores sem experiência prévia em design sonoro, acessíveis a pessoas cegas e com baixa visão. Pretende-se avaliar a eficácia das funcionalidades implementadas, a sua usabilidade e facilidade de compreensão.

EQUIPAMENTO NECESSÁRIO

- Computador com a aplicação instalada
- Headphones

CENÁRIO DE UTILIZAÇÃO

Utilizando um computador e headphones, irá criar autonomamente uma representação sonora interativa da pintura "O Bosque Sagrado" de Maria Benamor. O seu objetivo geral será carregar a imagem, definir uma narração global, e colocar e editar elementos sonoros em cena conforme um sistema de grelha, e finalmente simular a experiência que será posteriormente utilizada por pessoas cegas e com baixa visão. Após completar as tarefas estruturadas, que o apresentarão às funcionalidades da aplicação, terá uma sessão livre de até 5 minutos em poderá editar a cena que criou conforme entender. Não tem de completar toda a duração desta sessão.

OBSERVAÇÕES

Durante as tarefas e exploração livre, serão registadas através de notas as dificuldades encontradas, comentários espontâneos e sugestões dos participantes. O investigador intervirá minimamente, apenas para esclarecer dúvidas relacionadas com as funcionalidades da aplicação. A cada tarefa, ser-lhe-ão indicados os controlos exatos para utilizar a funcionalidade abordada.

Para agilizar a criação da paisagem sonora, todos os ficheiros de multimédia a usar encontram-se em subdiretorias na pasta 'Ficheiros', que lhe será indicada pelo investigador. Durante a tarefa em que editará as fontes sonoras ambiente e

espaciais que colocou em cena, e lhe associará o ficheiro de áudio correspondente, deve usar apenas o ficheiro cujo nome começa com um underscore (exemplo: _ficheiro.wav). Alterar o tamanho das células da grelha altera o sistema de coordenadas da grelha, pelo que se o fizer, invalidará os elementos atualmente presentes na cena. Se desejar recuperar estes elementos, deve definir o tamanho das células da grelha para o valor que tinha quando esses elementos foram colocados. Alternativamente, pode fazer o *reset* da grelha ao carregar no botão  no canto superior direito – a grelha ficará em branco.

TAREFAS

- **Tarefa 1 – Definir a pintura de fundo:**

Carregue a imagem "O Bosque Sagrado" para a cena, usando o botão  no canto superior esquerdo do ecrã. Em qualquer tarefa, pode fazer zoom-in e zoom-out usando o scroll do rato.

- **Tarefa 2 – Ajuste da Grelha:**

Usando o botão  no canto superior direito do ecrã, abra o painel de edição da grelha. Defina o tamanho das células da grelha para um valor à sua escolha entre 1 e 2. Finalmente, ajuste a espessura das linhas para o seu gosto pessoal.

- **Tarefa 3 – Colocação de Elementos:**

Usando os botões do painel situado no centro inferior do ecrã, entrará em modo de colocação (a grelha ficará visível e o seu cursor realçará a célula selecionada), pode fechar o modo de colocação com  no canto inferior esquerdo do ecrã. Colocará diferentes elementos em cena, caso se engane e queira apagar algum, use o botão  no canto inferior direito para entrar no modo de remoção. Pode usar  para apagar todos os elementos. Coloque os elementos nos pontos da pintura a que correspondem:

-  **2 sons ambientes:** Floresta; riacho;
-  **5 sons espaciais:** Fogueira, cavalos, voz da mulher deitada, voz da mulher de vermelho, casal distante;
-  **1 jogador:** A pessoa que explorar a cena começará no trilho à esquerda da fogueira.

- **Tarefa 4 – Edição de Elementos:**

Entre no modo de edição ao carregar no botão  no canto inferior esquerdo do ecrã. Editará todos os elementos em cena. Para cada:

- **Som ambiente:** Defina um nome, o ficheiro de áudio e atribua 0.2 ao volume, mantenha o loop ativado e pode atribuir um valor à sua escolha para a entrada e saída de som;

- **Som espacial:** Defina os mesmos atributos que definiu para o som ambiente (mas com o volume do áudio com um valor de 0.3 a 0.5); defina o ficheiro de áudio para a narração e atribua 1 ao volume da narração. Finalmente regule a atenuação do volume – defina o mínimo para um valor para 1 ou 2, e o máximo para um valor entre 10 e 15, pode experimentar em mudar a cor da visualização;
 - **Jogador:** Defina a orientação inicial do jogador para 2 e a velocidade de movimento para 6. Mantenha a amplitude do cone de deteção em 90º e regule a definição de proximidade do sensor com os valores – próximo = 6, intermédio = 12, máximo = 18.
- **Tarefa 5 – Definir Narração Global:**
Usando o botão  no canto superior esquerdo do ecrã, escolha o ficheiro de áudio correspondente à narração global e ajuste o seu volume para 0.8.
 - **Tarefa 6 – Teste do Modo Interativo:**
Simulará a experiência de um utilizador na paisagem sonora que criou.
Usando o botão  no canto superior direito do ecrã, transite para o modo interativo da aplicação. Experimente as funcionalidades utilizando os joysticks e botões disponíveis. Teste diferentes ajustes de cardinalidade sonora, modos de reprodução e visualização. Por fim, volte ao modo de desenvolvimento carregando no botão  novamente.

SESSÃO DE EXPLORAÇÃO LIVRE

Edite livremente a paisagem sonora utilizando os controlos disponíveis, associando os ficheiros que quiser e alternando entre os modos de desenvolvimento e interativo. Esta sessão dura até 5 minutos e não tem de a concluir.

INQUÉRITO

Questionário de avaliação da aplicação Windows para criação de paisagens sonoras acessíveis a pessoas cegas e com baixa visão

As suas respostas são anónimas e serão utilizadas exclusivamente para fins académicos.

* Indica uma pergunta obrigatória

Informações gerais do participante

1. Identificador numérico do participante *

2. Idade *

3. Género *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

- Feminino
 Masculino
 Outra: _____

Perguntas qualitativas

Avalie cada afirmação utilizando uma escala de 1 a 5, sendo:

1. Discordo Totalmente

2. Discordo

3. Neutro

4. Concordo

5. Concordo Totalmente

5. Achei fácil carregar e definir a pintura de fundo. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

6. Senti-me confortável ao ajustar o tamanho das células e a espessura das linhas da grelha.

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

7. Os tipos de elementos disponíveis (som ambiente, som espacial e jogador) foram suficientes para construir uma paisagem sonora que represente adequadamente a pintura.

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

8. A colocação, remoção e edição dos elementos em cena foi intuitiva e clara. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

9. O sistema de grelha utilizado para a colocação, remoção e edição de elementos * foi claro e fácil de utilizar.

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

10. No contexto da aplicação, considero o sistema de grelha atualmente * implementado mais eficaz do que outras alternativas como drag-and-drop ou point & click.

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

11. As opções disponíveis para editar elementos sonoros eram compreensíveis e * fáceis de utilizar.

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

12. Os atributos editáveis das fontes sonoras ambiente foram suficientes para representar adequadamente o ambiente sonoro desejado. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

13. Os atributos editáveis das fontes sonoras espaciais foram suficientes para representar adequadamente as características sonoras pretendidas. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

14. A definição dos atributos do jogador (orientação inicial, velocidade de movimento, cone de deteção, sensor de proximidade) foi clara, compreensível e suficiente para personalizar a experiência. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

15. Achei fácil definir e ajustar o volume da narração global para a cena. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

16. Alternar entre o modo de desenvolvimento e o modo interativo foi rápido e intuitivo. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

17. O propósito dos modos de desenvolvimento e interativo foi claro e os seus papéis estão bem diferenciados na aplicação. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

18. Senti falta de um botão de ajuda sempre acessível para esclarecer dúvidas pontuais. *

Marcar apenas uma oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Disc Concordo totalmente

22. Qual foi a sua impressão geral sobre a aplicação e a experiência de criação sonora proporcionada? *

23. Encontrou dificuldades específicas em alguma das tarefas realizadas? Se sim, quais foram e porquê? *

24. Considera que as funcionalidades disponíveis são suficientes para criar representações sonoras imersivas e detalhadas para pessoas cegas e com baixa visão? Justifique a sua resposta. *

25. Tem outros comentários ou sugestões finais para melhorar esta aplicação? *

Perguntas abertas

Este conteúdo não foi criado nem aprovado pela Google.

Google Formulários



2025 Accessibility in museums for the blind or visually impaired through sound