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**Abstract**

Keyboard layouts with key shaped as hexagons made in this project are alternatives to standard QWERTY layout with rectangular keys widely used while typing on mobile phones. Idea was to design hexagonal keyboard layout while using standard QWERTY layout, existent Typewise layout and custom designed layout which should theoretically allow better typing speeds. All three mentioned layouts are than put to the test together with standard rectangular QWERTY layout (later Default layout).

1. INTRODUCTION

Aim of this project was to test text typing efficiency of mobile keyboard where buttons have hexagonal shape. Three different hexagonal layouts were made: first is layout similar to QWERTY, second is layout same as existent Typewise layout and third is custom designed layout. Custom layout had to be designed to have theoretical typing speed greater than previous two mentioned layouts. After implementation, text typing efficiency of all three layouts were tested and compared with default layout. Aside from text typing efficiency, usability and NASA-TLX factors were measured whereby that data were derived from questionnaires participants filled out.

1. HEXAGONAL KEYBOARD LAYOUTS DESIGNS
2. QWERTY

This keyboard layout has letter order same as the default keyboard layout and because of that it is called QWERTY. It contains lowercase letter buttons and control keys (backspace button, space button, ENTER button and Settings button). Layout is shown on the figure below. Since QWERTY letter order is often used it wouldn't be great to make any adjustments here based on dominant hand because users are so used to QWERTY order that it would require their adjustment to modified layout. Space button is placed in the middle of the screen to be in the same position for left-handed and right-handed users since whole layout can't be adjusted to them as explained earlier. ENTER button and Settings button are placed around space button. It is true that ENTER button is harder to reach for left-handed users but difference is not that big. Backspace button is in the same position as in default QWERTY layout. All buttons have the same size based on screen on which it is used.
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Figure 1: QWERTY Hexagonal layout

1. Typewise

Typewise layout is taken from existent Typewise layout [3]. This layout is made to optimize two-handed typing but here it is used to test its efficiency in one-handed usage. Since letter order has similarities with QWERTY letter order it didn't allow letter order to be adjusted to the dominant hand for the same reason explained for Hexagonal QWERTY layout. As it is shown below there are two buttons without any functionality and it allowed this layout to be a little adjusted to dominant hand because now space and backspace buttons can be placed on the left side of the screen for the left-handed users and the opposite for right-handed.
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Figure 2: Typewise Hexagonal layout for right-handed users
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Figure 3: Typewise Hexagonal layout for left-handed users

1. Custom

This layout is designed to have the best theoretical typing speed (WPM\_max) in English language between all three layouts designed in this project. Because this layout is completely unknown to users it can be fully adjusted based on dominant hand. Adjustment is made mirroring the whole layout as shown on figure below In that case, both left-handed and right handed users can have the same theoretical WPM\_max and mirroring doesn't cause any difference in that matter.

Layout is designed to minimize the thumb travel. Based on digraph probabilities in English language [reference] letters that appear in more often digraph are placed closer to each other and letters in digraphs that appear rarly are placed in further positions. That is how the best WPM\_max is achieved.

By studying digraph probabilities it can be seen that space appears in most of the most common digraphs and that's why space is put so close to the dominant hand. All the letters that appear in digraphs with space are placed around space or very close to it.
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Figure 4: Custom Hexagonal layout for right-handed users
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Figure 5: Custom Hexagonal layout for left-handed users

1. PARTICIPANTS

There were 9 people that participated in an experiment. Two of them are females and seven of them are male with an average of 25 years. All of them use mobile phones several times a day and have a lot of typing tasks per day. They are all non-expert users. All of the users have been right-handed. 8 participants were male and 1 was female. They all normally use Standard QWERTZ layout and do that with two hands. The study lasted around 45 minutes for each participant.

1. APPARATUS

Participants conducted a research on different mobile devices with different versions of Android OS and different screen resolutions. Experiment was handled in two Android application called FittsTouch and Text Input Logger.

Text Input Logger uses 500 predefined phrases from English language and gives us the option of defining our custom phrases. While we do an experiment app logs information about each written phrases such as timestamp, user info, test session info, text entry metrics, task execution time, text entry metrics (calculated) (WPM, TER, CER, NCER, CPS, etc.), etc.

FittsTouch is used for ISO Multi-directional tapping test. In that test participants selected circular targets as fast and as accurate as they could. Data collected with that app is than examined and Fitts’ coefficients were extracted. They are needed for predictive modeling explained later.

Before doing an experiment participants filled out a form with their personal data (name, mobile device, number of typing tasks, etc.). After a short training on each of the Hexagonal keyboard layouts exoeriment could begin. Each participant than entered 20 phrases with default device keyboard using QWERTY layout and each Hexagonal keyboard layout. They typed phrases as fast as possible, as accurate as possible while errors were allowed in submitted text. After the experiment they gave their personal opinions about keyboard layouts design, their usability, NASA-TLX factors and what Hexagonal keyboard layout they would continue to use.
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Figure 6: Number of typing tasks per day

1. PREDICTIVE MODELING

To calculate WPM\_max predictive modeling with Fitts' law was used. For that we need Movement time model shown below:

Language model is also needed for predictive model.

Language model:

* Target language: English
* Character set: C = {a, …, z, space}
* Possible digraphs 27 x 27 = 729
* Calendar
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Figure 6: Digraph count table [1]

From this table probabilities were extracted by dividing digraph count with total number of letters.

Next, pairing of movement time model and language time model was done with formulas below:

* Average thumb movement time between two buttons on a keyboard

where is probability of specific digraph, is movement time between buttons, CT stands for *Character Time*

* Characters per second
* Predicted typing efficiency (WPM)

1. PERFORMANCE ESTIMATION OF HEXAGONAL KEYBOARD LAYOUTS

For all hexagonal keyboard layouts theoretical typing speeds (WPM\_max) were calculated. Firstly, it was done for QWERTY and Typewise keyboard layouts. Based on that results Custom layout was designed to have best WPM\_max value of other two hexagonal layouts. Actual button locations and width on mobile screen were used in modeling. In that way, when I calculate distance of two targets (keyboard buttons) that are actual distance on screen. After rendering keyboard on Samsung Galaxy S5 and finding out actual button locations on screen theoretical could be calculated.

For testing, calculation was done with Fitts’ coefficients from literature and with Fitts’ coefficients extracted from FittsTouch experiment.

From literature [4]: a = 0.1154, b = 0.1098

From experiment: a = 0.3887, b = 0.0639

1. Performance of Hexagonal QWERTY layout

With coefficients from literature theoretical speed of 36.485 WPM was calculated. But with coefficients from experiment speed is 23.39 WPM In the next subsection it can be seen how it compares to the other two layout.

1. Performance of Hexagonal Typewise layout

Here we will have two values because layout has an adjustment based on dominant hand as explained earlier.

For right-handed users theoretical value is 39.314 with coefficients from literature and 24.447 with coefficients from experiment. From that we can conclude that Hexagonal Typewise layout is better than Hexagonal QWERTY layout even though existent Typewise layout is adjusted for two-thumb typing.

Left-handed theoretical typing speed was calculated to be 41.256 WPM with coefficients from literature literature and 24.037 with coefficients from experiment which is even better than Hexagonal QWERTY layout and Hexagonal Typewise layout for right-handed users.

1. Performance of Hexagonal Custom layout

Theoretical typing efficiency of this layout was calculated to be 44.274 WPM with coefficients from literature and 25.036 with coefficients from experiment.. Since the idea of this layout was to have the best value of all hexagonal layouts designed in this project it can be concluded that it is successfully achieved. As it was explained earlier, left-handed and right-handed users should have the same value and that is the case. It can be said that left-handed and right-handed users have the same theoretical typing speed and there are no differences in that matter like it was with Hexagonal Typewise layout.

1. RESULTS
2. WPM
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Figure 7: WPM by phrase
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Figure 8: Overall WPM

Graphs above shows an average WPM values by phrase and overall for each keyboard layout tests. For each layout there isn’t a trend od improving WPM after each phrase but there are noticeable differences in WPM if we compare them to the other layouts. Default layout has the best WPM across all phrases. Hexagonal QWERTY layout is the first behind because of the familiar letter order by since it is smaller than default users needed to adjust to it. Third best layout here Hexagonal Typewise layout and that is due to the new letter order comparing to QWERTY. It is similar to QWERTY but has some differences. Custom layout was the worst in text typing speed because of completely new letter order. Users would need a very long time to adjust to it and amount of training they did before the experiment wasn’t enough.

To test if there are any statistical differences in WPM values One-way ANOVA with repeated measures was used.
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Figure 9: Descriptive statistics

1. Default
2. QWERTY
3. Typewise
4. Custom
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Since p<0.001, which is smaller than 0.05, it can be concluded that there are significant differences between WPM values of each layout. To see where the differences occur Friedman test Is used.
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Comparison between each of the layouts shows that there is significant difference between all of them.

1. TER
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Figure 11: TER by phrase
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Figure 12: Overall TER

To test if there are any statistical differences in WPM values One-way ANOVA with repeated measures was used.
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Figure 13: Descriptive statistics

Table

Description automatically generated

Figure 14: One-way ANOVA with repeated measures test

One-way ANOVA test showed that there are NO statistically significant differences between TER values of each layout. That was also proved in multiple
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1. Design considerations

Based on subjective opinions participants gave after the experiment analysis looks like this:
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Figure 16: Control keys test

Figure 15: Well-suited test
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Questions that were asked were:

1. Is each hexagonal layout well suited for single-handed one-thumb typing?
2. Is standard QWERTY layout recognizable from Hexagonal QWERTY layout?
3. Are adaptability options useful?
4. Are control keys placed on comfortable places?
5. Are thumb movements less troubled using Hexagonal keyboard layouts?

To see if there is any statistical difference between layouts on the first, the third and last question Friedman test is used.
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Figure 17: Movements test

* There was NO statistically significant difference in perceived well-adjustment to one-thumb typing depending on which keyboard layout was used, , p = 0.648
* There was NO statistically significant difference in perceived control keys correct placement depending on which keyboard layout was used, , p = 0.125
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived comfortable thumb movement depending on which keyboard layout was used, , p < 0.034

1. NASA-TLX factors

After the experiment users were asked to fill out questionnaire in which they gave their subjective opinions about mental demand, physical demand, frustration, performance and effort. They did that for default layout and all three hexagonal keyboard layouts.
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Figure 18: Mental demand comparison
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Figure 19: Physical demand comparison
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Figure 26: Performance test

Figure 23: Mental demand test

Figure 25: Frustration test

Figure 20: Frustration comparison
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Figure 21: Performance comparison

Chart, box and whisker chart

Description automatically generated

Figure 22: Effort comparison
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Figure 24: Physical demand test

To test if there is any difference between between each keyboard layout for each of the dependent variables shown on the graph I used Friedman test.

* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived mental demand depending on which keyboard layout was used, , p < 0.001
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived physical demand depending on which keyboard layout was used, , p = 0.008
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived frustration depending on which keyboard layout was used, , p < 0.001
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived performance depending on which keyboard layout was used, , p = 0.016
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived effort depending on which keyboard layout was used, , p < 0.001

To examine where the differences actually occur, we need to run separate Wilcoxon signed-rank tests on the different combinations of related groups. In this case:

* Default vs QWERTY (on Mental demand, Physical demand, Frustration and Effort)
* Default vs Typewise (on Mental demand, Physical demand, Frustration and Effort)
* Default vs Custom (on Mental demand, Physical demand, Frustration and Effort)
* QWERTY vs Typewise (on Mental demand, Physical demand, Frustration and Effort)
* Table

  Description automatically generatedQWERTY vs Custom (on Mental demand, Physical demand, Frustration and Effort)
* Typewise vs Custom (on Mental demand, Physical demand, Frustration and Effort)

Because we are making multiple comparisons we need to use a Bonferroni adjustment on the results we get. To calculate the Bonferroni adjustment we take significance level we were initially using (0.05) and divide by the number of tests you are running. Here we made 6 tests so we divided 0.05 by 6 and that means that we have statistically significant difference if p-value is lower than 0.0083.

Figure 27: Effort test
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Figure 28: Mental demand pairwise tests

* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived mental demand between Default and QWERTY keyboard layouts, Z = -2.701, p = 0.007
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived mental demand between Default and Typewise keyboard layouts, Z = -2.673, p = 0.008
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived mental demand between Default and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.684, p = 0.007
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived mental demand between QWERTY and Typewise keyboard layouts, Z = -2.673, p = 0.008
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived mental demand between QWERTY and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.677, p = 0.007
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived mental demand between Typewise and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.673, p = 0.008
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Figure 29: Physical demand pairwise tests

* There was NO statistically significant difference in perceived physical demand between Default and QWERTY keyboard layouts, Z = -2.251, p = 0.024
* There was NO statistically significant difference in perceived physical demand between Default and Typewise keyboard layouts, Z = -0.000, p = 1.000
* There was NO statistically significant difference in perceived physical demand between Default and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.060, p = 0.039
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived physical demand between QWERTY and Typewise keyboard layouts, Z = -2.060, p = 0.039
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived physical demand between QWERTY and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.754, p = 0.006
* There was NO statistically significant difference in perceived physical demand between Typewise and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -1.543, p = 0.123
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Figure 30: Frustration pairwise tests

* There was NO statistically significant difference in perceived frustration between Default and QWERTY keyboard layouts, Z = -1.857, p = 0.063
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived frustration between Default and Typewise keyboard layouts, Z = -2.680, p = 0.007
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived frustration between Default and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.675, p = 0.007
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived frustration between QWERTY and Typewise keyboard layouts, Z = -2.673, p = 0.008
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived frustration between QWERTY and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.677, p = 0.007
* There was NO statistically significant difference in perceived frustration between Typewise and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.527, p = 0.012
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Figure 31: Effort pairwise tests

* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived effort between Default and QWERTY keyboard layouts, Z = -2.714, p = 0.007
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived effort between Default and Typewise keyboard layouts, Z = -2.670, p = 0.008
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived effort between Default and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.673, p = 0.008
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived effort between QWERTY and Typewise keyboard layouts, Z = -2.680, p = 0.007
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived effort between QWERTY and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.687, p = 0.007
* There was NO statistically significant difference in perceived effort between Typewise and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.539, p = 0.011

Because we are making multiple comparisons we need to use a Bonferroni adjustment on the results we get. To calculate the Bonferroni adjustment we take significance level we were initially using (0.05) and divide by the number of tests you are running. Here we made 6 tests so we divided 0.05 by 6 and that means that we have statistically significant difference if p-value is lower than 0.0083.

1. Usability

After the experiment participants also filled out questionnaire in which they gave their subjective opinions about usability, learnability, satisfaction, and engagement. They did that for all three hexagonal keyboard layouts.
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Figure 32: Usability attributes

To test if there are any statistical differences between each keyboard layout for each of the usability attributes shown on the graph I used Friedman test.
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Figure 33: Usability test

Figure 34: Learnability test

Figure 35: Engagement test

* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived usability depending on which keyboard layout was used, , p < 0.001
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived learnability depending on which keyboard layout was used, , p < 0.001
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived satisfaction depending on which keyboard layout was used, , p < 0.001
* There was NO statistically significant difference in perceived engagement depending on which keyboard layout was used, , p = 0.289

To examine where the differences actually occur, we need to run separate Wilcoxon signed-rank tests on the different combinations of related groups. In this case:

* QWERTY vs Typewise (on Usability, Learnability and Satisfaction)
* QWERTY vs Custom (on Usability, Learnability and Satisfaction)
* Typewise vs Custom (on Usability, Learnability and Satisfaction)

Because we are making multiple comparisons we need to use a Bonferroni adjustment on the results we get. To calculate the Bonferroni adjustment we take significance level we were initially using (0.05) and divide by the number of tests you are running. Here we made 3 tests so we divided 0.05 by 3 and that means that we have statistically significant difference if p-value is lower than 0.017.
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Figure 36: Satisfaction test

Figure 37: Pairwise comparison

* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived usability between QWERTY and Typewise keyboard layouts, Z = -2.701, p = 0.007
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived usability between QWERTY and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.699, p = 0.007
* There was NO statistically significant difference in perceived usability between Typewise and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.121, p = 0.034
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Figure 38: Pairwise comparison

* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived learnability between QWERTY and Typewise keyboard layouts, Z = -2.724, p = 0.006
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived learnability between QWERTY and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.692, p = 0.007
* There was NO statistically significant difference in perceived learnability between Typewise and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -1.725, p = 0.084
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Figure 39: Pairwise comparison

* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived satisfaction between QWERTY and Typewise keyboard layouts, Z = -2.687, p = 0.007
* There was a statistically significant difference in perceived satisfaction between QWERTY and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -2.694, p = 0.007
* There was NO statistically significant difference in perceived satisfaction between Typewise and Custom keyboard layouts, Z = -1.667, p = 0.096

1. Users preference
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1. CONCLUSION

In this project three different hexagonal layouts were implemented where one is custom successfully designed to have the best theoretical WPM\_max. They are put to the test against default QWERTY layout. Unsurprisingly, default layout was better in average WPM. It is better because every participant probably uses default layout at least 100 times a day for a very long time and neither hexagonal layout could beat that familiarity. Hexagonal QWERTY layout is right behind mostly because of the familiar letter order. Hexagonal Typewise layout is the third best in average WPM. Its letter order is similar to QWERTY but there are difference and adjustment is needed. Custom layout gave the worst results in an experiment but that’s expected because that layout was completely new to all users. A lot of typing tasks with it is required to make use of it as it was needed for default layout. It is very hard to immediately adjust to the completely new layout. After a lot of time theoretical WPM\_max could be achieved.
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