Information and Scientific Visualization: Separate but Equal or Happy Together At Last

Tamara Munzner IEEE Visualizat<u>ion 2003</u>

nomenclature

infovis, scivis

foovis, barvis

names are unfortunate historical accidents

· but too late to change

not scivis iff data generated by scientists

infovis not unscientific

scivis not uninformative

distinction

is spatialization given (scivis) or chosen (infovis)

my infovis definition

· interactive visual representation to help person do a particular task

infovis: how to represent

- · choosing, doing, evaluating
- · huge space of possibilities: random walk ineffective
- \cdot need design guidelines, prescriptive advice

separation

- · now judged by different criteria
- · divergence allows each field to expand/improve faster
- room to explore before borders all tangled

infovis taxonomy

Ben Shneiderman

- · The Eyes Have It: A Task by Data Type Taxonomy for Information Visualizations.
- · Proc. 1996 IEEE Visual Languages
- · citeseer.nj.nec.com/shneiderman96eyes.html

data

· 1D, 2D, 3D, ND, temporal, tree, network/graph

task

· overview, zoom, filter, details-on-demand, relate, history, extract

4

sometimes choose the given space

infovis (vs. scivis)

strengths

- · abstraction
- · creating new visual metaphors
- · design principles
- · evaluation
- · tasks, connection with users

weaknesses

- · scalability
- · adoption
- novelty for novelty's sake with visual metaphors need to characterize when effective hard to make effective ones

significant counterexamples both ways!

6

science

greatest application domain of infovis to date!

abstracting, generalizing from specific examples

our roots: scientists analyzing data

· statistical graphics grew from science, math

methodology

scientific method

- 1. observations
- 2. hypothesis
- · 3. test
- · 4. theorize/generalize

scientific method for vis

- · 1. observe how humans use them to solve problems
- · 2. hypothesize on how best to help people understand
- · 3. evaluate hypothesis
- · 4. build theories

contribution categories

techniques: building better/different vis tools

- here is new technique X [different: infovis] how to do X bigger/faster/generally [better: scivis]
- · judge: evaluation strengthens, but not mandatory
- · implicit assumption: there's some good reason to do X

systems: building too

- techniques alone not enough
- · integration, data model issues

· observe humans using tools to do task informal to structured application domain task to indirect simplified task

contribution categories 2

design study: describe and evaluate hypothesis

- ethnographic uncovering of user's tasks, needs
- discuss/justify/evaluate choices made
- · relate visual encodings and interaction techniques to requirements of target task
- judge: novelty strengthens, but not mandatory
- · lessons learned, principles discovered/gleaned · not application-focused case study
- reporting use of technique X in domain Y
- · instead, useful artifact as means towards end end: infovis prescriptive design guidelines

model

new theoretical framework

hope: directed vs. random param space walk blending many in one paper particularly strong

models

data models

field: differentiate, rotate

discrete

- relations: predicate calculus, relational algebra
- · determine methods of analysis in computer
- · infovis uses both

mental models

- how people think about problems, world
- in your head, vs. data models in computer
- not as flexible: we're hardwired for strong preferences space vs. time: 2D+T!= 3D
- · categorization as major cognition component creating hierarchies to support reasoning

continua of distinction

application domain

- typical: CFD = scivis, social networks = infovis
- misleading, since could be either

Henze's linked derived spaces: infovis CFD chose useful phase space, instead of given space (my analysis, not author's)

continuous/discrete

spatial layout given/chosen

technique vs. design study

integration

solving real problems often multidisciplinary

· no surprise that combining infovis, scivis often works
great!

13

Thanks

to Pat Hanrahan for productive discussions