# Designing for Bystanders: Reflections on Building a Public Digital Forum

Anthony Tang, Mattias Finke, Michael Blackstock, Rock Leung, Meghan Deutscher, Rodger Lea Media and Graphics Interdisciplinary Centre (MAGIC), University of British Columbia 2424 Main Mall, Vancouver BC V6T 1Z4

{tonyt@ece, martinf@ece, michael@cs, rockl@cs, deutschm@ece, rodgerl@ece}.ubc.ca

### ABSTRACT

In this paper, we reflect on the design and deployment process of MAGICBoard, a public display deployed in a university setting that solicits the electronic votes and opinions of bystanders on trivial but amusing topics. We focus on the consequences of our design choices with respect to encouraging *bystanders* to interact with the public display. Bystanders are individuals around the large display who may never fully engage with the application itself, but are potential *contributors* to the system. Drawing on our recent experiences with MAGICBoard, we present a *classification of bystanders*, and then discuss three design themes relevant to the design of systems for bystander use: graduated proximal engagement, lowering barriers for interaction and supporting covert engagement.

### **ACM Classification Keywords**

H5.m. Information interfaces and presentation (e.g., HCI): Miscellaneous.

#### **Authors Keywords**

bystanders, large display groupware, large displays, mobile computing, sms

# INTRODUCTION

Large public displays are typically used for broadcasting a stream of location-relevant information, but most deployed displays of this nature are not yet interactive. This lack of interactivity may change with the increasing proliferation of high-power handheld devices (mobile phones, PDAs, MP3 players), which enable new forms of use (e.g. [3][4][8]). Despite the emergence of new technology that could allow users to interact with large displays, past research has found that motivating people to interact with these displays in a public space remains a real challenge [1]. An off-cited deterrent is the potential for social embarrassment when interacting with a public display [1].

CHI 2008, April 5-10, 2008, Florence, Italy,

Copyright 2008 ACM 978-1-60558-011-1/08/04...\$5.00.



Figure 1. The MAGICBoard only comprises a small space in the overall deployment location (d), and bystanders comprise the majority of individuals near the display (a), (c). Only a single user is actually interacting with the display (b).

In designing MAGICBoard (shown in Figure 1), a public digital forum, we sought to address this challenge by using SMS messaging as the primary means of interaction with the large display, thereby allowing users to interact with the system from the privacy of their own personal devices—a concept we call *supporting covert engagement and interaction*. The core functionality of MAGICBoard was simple: users post text-based items on the display, which persist until newer items pushed them off-screen. In designing this interactive display application, we found that many of our design choices ultimately focused on individuals who might not be actively engaged with the display itself: *bystanders*.

We situate our work in the context of using public displays as social catalysts—or artifacts/events that focus the attention of diverse inhabitants [5]. Brignull & Rogers describe three classes of users based on their patterns of activity [1]: (i) those engaging in *direct interaction* with the large display; (ii) bystanders whose activities indicated a *focal awareness* of the display, and (iii) bystanders whose activities implied a *peripheral awareness* of the display. These authors advocate designing applications to support *transitions* between these thresholds to motivate bystanders to interact with the system. Our early explorations support this conceptual framework, and draw further attention to *bystanders' needs* in order to allow them to more easily transition from a bystander role to a contributor role.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.



Figure 2. The MAGICBoard's two displays have different functions. The right display is intended to be viewed from a distance, and functions as the "overview." The left display is the "detail" display, and intended to be viewed up close.

In this paper, we first describe MAGICBoard and its deployment, which allowed us to investigate and categorize different *types* of bystanders. From there, we re-examine several design heuristics from [4] and arrive at three thematic design implications to support bystanders' use of public displays: *supporting graduated proximal engagement, lowering barriers for interaction,* and *supporting covert engagement and interaction.* 

# MAGICBOARD: A DIGITAL PUBLIC FORUM

MAGICBoard is a public forum for trivial but amusing topics (see Figure 2). Two side-by-side projectors present the current topic, the votes and opinions of those who have commented on the topic, and a summary of the votes on the topic. The right display allows passers-by to easily glean the overall opinion of the community on different topics. Interested bystanders can engage with the system by stepping closer to view the comments themselves. They can then interact with the display by either: (1) sending an SMS message from a mobile phone, or (2) using a kiosk next to the display. The kiosk provides a basic form-based mechanism of interaction, and the SMS gateway supports more "private" entry and preparation of content [3].

Figure 2 shows each display in action: the left display shows "overview" information while the right display is the "detail view." The overview display (containing the topic and overview of the tallied votes) is intended to be viewable from a long distance: font size is large and viewable from 20 meters. The detail display is intended to be viewed from much closer, and shows the last 16 submitted comments.

MAGICBoard was constructed using the MAGIC RESTBroker, an HTTP-based toolkit intended for the rapid prototyping of large display applications [2]. At its core, the RESTBroker supports lightweight message passing using state-based channel semantics. The toolkit allowed different parts of MAGICBoard to be built and run on different client machines: the kiosk, SMS gateway, and display application are all completely separate applications communicating through this lightweight protocol.

We deployed the MAGICBoard in a common study/social hallway of the applied science building at our university (Figure 1). This corridor is a common area with a small coffee shop to the side, and a small alcove where students frequently meet to study. The two displays themselves measure about  $6m \times 2m$  and were positioned to be visible from the front door of the building throughout the day.

Our interest in MAGICBoard is unique from prior work in two respects: first, our focus on SMS interaction enables participation by users who might otherwise not partake due to the potential for *social embarrassment*, and second, MAGICBoard was deployed in a public setting with bystanders who are unlikely to know one another, whereas prior work frequently deployed such displays in social event settings (e.g. [1]), in a distributed setting [5], or in contexts with known users (e.g. [2][4]).

# DESIGN LESSONS FROM DEPLOYMENT

We deployed MAGICBoard for a week near the beginning of the school year, collecting field notes, photographs and video of users and bystanders making use of and observing the display. We report the most salient observations relevant to design here.

# **Classifying Three Types of Bystanders**

Our interest in bystanders began during the design stage of MAGICBoard in our discussions with our focus group (comprised of primarily engineering and computer science undergrads): What would someone see on the large display? How would one understand what was going on? How would one interact with the display? How would one know *how* to interact with the display? It became clear that our design focus, which typically centers on "users"—those



Figure 3. Examples left-to-right of (a) a *passer-by*, who is en route to another location, and does not linger; (b) a *stander-by*, who is sitting in the space, and therefore somewhat coincident with the display; (c) an *engaged bystander*, who is reading the detailed comments and was about to pull out his cell phone, and (d) a *contributor*, who is actively engaged with SMS on his cell phone.

already interacting with the display, needed to be balanced with an equally concerted focus on *bystanders*—potential contributors who may not yet be engaged with the display, but "users" of the display nonetheless.

Our initial observations of MAGICBoard's use revealed three different types of bystanders: passers-by, standers-by, and engaged bystanders. We differentiate bystanders based on their behaviour and engagement with the display (illustrated in Figure 3).

Passers-by (Figure 3a) were *in-transit*, passing through the area en-route to another location. Thus, the amount of time and effort they expended toward looking at and the display was extremely limited—those that looked at the display gazed for no longer than 10 seconds. And although these passers-by may have glanced at the display, most did not typically stop to interact with it. Standers-by (Figure 3b) were actually spending time in the environment itself (akin to those with peripheral awareness in [1]), be it at a nearby table to study, in the line-up or condiment area of a nearby coffee shop, or simply waiting for someone. While they were not in the environment primarily to interact with the display, they had more time to actually read the content and understand the display. Finally, engaged bystanders (Figure 3c) were interested enough in the display (with focal awareness [1]) that they were actively staring at the display and "making use" of the content on the display.

This classification scheme has strong similarities to those in [1] and [7], and supports the notion that bystanders have differing awareness levels of the display.

#### Support Graduated Proximal Engagement

Bystanders cannot be expected to be standing near the display: instead, bystanders' proximity to the display is extremely variable, affecting their visibility of the display's content. To support distal bystanders, the first approach might be to increase the size of all fonts; however, this solution is not only a suboptimal use of the display space, it also compromises the possible interactive complexity of the display. Our design approach was to support graduated proximal engagement where the display can be engaged with from a variety of distances. This design approach assumes that one's proximity to the display correlates with

one's interest with the display, and aims to "reward" users for being closer to the display by providing those users with an improved experience.

From far away (20m), users can see and make out the topic question (and associated picture if present) on display. Graphics summarizing the votes also show that there is a vote going on, even though it is unlikely that the details of the chart is visible from such a distance. These large visuals are intended to provide awareness of the display's purpose to passers-by. From closer (10m), users can make out the details of the summary charts to see the opinion of the community on the topic. Further, it is possible at this visual distance to read the last comment that was made (presented in bigger font). It is clear from this distance that comments have been posted on the display; however, one cannot read these comments. Standers-by capable of reading this information can make a decision about whether to engage with the display further. From up close (5m), all content on the display is visible. At this point, the user can read all of the detail on the display, and in particular, see the comments of prior users of the display and instructions on how they can vote and comment. Our hope is that engaged bystanders will become contributors when they are close enough to see all of this content.

Although we realize this concept of graduated proximal engagement by varying the size of visual elements on the display, it should be emphasized that rewarding users for transitioning one type of bystander or contributor to another in can occur in a variety of ways. For example, [1] "rewards" users close to the display by providing them a method of interacting with the display. Similarly, [7] provide increasingly personal and explicit interaction for users of ambient public displays based on their tracked proximity to the display.

#### Lowering Barriers for Interaction

Because large interactive public displays are uncommon, *bystanders may not be aware that they are able to interact with the display*. Beyond this initial knowledge barrier, there is the problem that *bystanders may not be aware of how to interact with the display*. In consideration of these issues, we focused on providing knowledge and

# CHI 2008 Proceedings · Exploring Web Content

mechanisms to lower barriers to interaction [4]. This theme raises the design tension between lower fidelity input *vs*. feasibility of complex interactions with the display.

It was important to communicate to bystanders how to interact with the system. Thus, our instructions were designed such that from a medium distance, one could see a cell phone as a cue that the display had something to do with cell phones. We felt that from this cue, interested bystanders could decide to approach the display, thereby becoming *engaged bystanders*; thus, the instructions could be placed in comparatively small font.

Since SMS is already widely used, we chose to support interacting with the display using SMS messaging from the phone rather than another input mechanism (e.g. web-based forms, downloadable mobile applications, etc.). The tradeoff here is clearly evident: we chose to lower the barrier of entry to mobile phone users to increase the number of potential users, but in so doing, sacrifice rich interaction possibilities (e.g. [3][8]). We also provided a form-based interaction mechanism with a laptop right at the display, and we briefly discuss its impact on participation patterns in the next subsection.

# Support Covert Engagement and Interaction

Many authors have suggested that a core deterrent to users making use of large public displays is the potential for social embarrassment [1]. This is likely to occur for several reasons: (1) the display is large, so actions (and errors) are made more obvious to others (compared to a laptop-sized screen); (2) it is likely the display employs an obvious input device (so users are easily identifiable), and (3) it is likely the display system employs novel or one-off software (so users are unfamiliar with how it behaves). Thus we suggest *supporting covert engagement and interaction* (though not necessarily exclusively) to draw in curious onlookers who may be understandably shy.

With MAGICBoard, we support this covert interaction using SMS messaging from users' mobile phones. In general, however, this "covert interaction" approach introduces two new design tensions: the problem of feedback vs. identifiability, and the problem of learnability vs. privacy. The first problem is providing users, who may be dealing with a novel interface (as they were with the SMS mechanism), with feedback in a timely and relevant fashion without revealing their identity. We address this issue by showing only part of the user's semi-unique phone number on the display itself, using a dedicated "Most Recent Post" area of the display to highlight recent contributions (Figure 2, left), and by responding to users' contributions with a text message in return. This SMS response was direct, and "in-context"; any errors would not reveal their identity to the public.

Many authors have observed that bystanders often learn how to use a large display because it provides useful *feedthrough* of interaction (e.g. [1][4]). Clearly, this mechanism for learning is lost with covert interaction. We address this problem by providing easily visible instructions and a straightforward interaction mechanism. Vogel & Balakrishnan provide a video of an actor on the display itself to show bystanders how to use the display [7].

Nevertheless, the covert interaction mechanism (SMS messaging) produced visibly different participation patterns compared to the overt interaction mechanism (the laptop). Parallel to [1], the laptop tended to produce a "honeypot effect", drawing in other bystanders when users made use of it; however, users making use of their cell phones to interact with the display tended to leave longer, more thoughtful messages.

# CONCLUSION

We have presented four key lessons about bystanders that we learned through the deployment of MAGICBoard. In our effort to understand how to design these large interactive displays, we are exploring new "application" areas, and more complex interactions to understand users' capacity and willingness to engage with such displays.

In this paper, we have taken a reflective approach on the design of a large public display called MAGICBoard. The design philosophy emphasizes the importance of designing for *bystanders* rather than the traditional focus on *users*. Since the goal of large public displays is to engage users, we must first understand how to engage *bystanders*, since it is these bystanders that ultimately become users.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Gavin Tain, Crystal Giesbrecht, Joel Lanir, Kirstie Hawkey, Karen Parker, and Sidney Fels.

# REFERENCES

- 1. Brignull, H., and Rogers, Y. Enticing people to interact with large public displays in public spaces. In *Proc. INTERACT* '03, 17-24.
- Erbad, A., Blackstock, M., Friday, A., Lea, R., and Al-Muhtadi, J. MAGIC broker: a middleware toolkit for interactive public displays. To appear in *PerWare '08 Workshop at IEEE PerCom 2008, March 21, Hong Kong.*
- Greenberg, S., Boyle, M., and LaBerge, J. PDAs and shared public displays: Making personal information public, and public information personal. *Personal Technologies 3*, 1 (1999), 55-64.
- 4. Huang, E. M., Mynatt, E. D., Russell, D. M., and Sue, A. E. Secrets to success and fatal flaws: the design of large display groupware. *IEEE CG&A 26*, 1 (2006), 37-45.
- 5. Karahalios, K. and Donath, J. Telemurals: linking remote spaces with social catalysts. In *Proc CHI 2004*, 615-622.
- Myers, B. A., Stiel, H., and Gargiulo, R. Collaboration using multiple PDAs connected to a PC. In *Proc. CHI* '98, 285-294.
- Vogel, D., and Balakrishnan, R. Interactive public ambient displays: transitioning from implicit to explicit, public to personal, interaction with multiple users. In *Proc. UIST '04*, 137-146.
- 8. Wang, J., Zhai, S., and Canny, J. F. Camera phone based motion sensing: interaction techniques, applications and performance study. In *Proc. UIST '06*, 101-110.