

19: Usability of Multimedia

Mark Handley
(based on work by M. Angela Sasse)



Overview

- Background: Internet Videoconferencing
- Quality Assessment
 - Task performance and subjective assessment
 - Physiological responses
- Users and QoS parameters

Background

- Internet research at UCL Computer Science since 1973
- IP Videoconferencing since 1992 (MICE, ReLaTe)
 - Suffering from broken-up audio, low framerates
- Much research work on conferencing tool development:
 - rat, vic, nte, sdr
- Humans don't always respond in predictable ways:
 - Need evaluation of which things *actually work*.


A/V Quality Assessment

- Telecommunications
 - ITU 5-point scales
 - Mean Opinion Score (MOS)
 - Short clips, no relation to task
 - “spot the degradation”
- HCI-based assessment approach
 - Real users in context
 - Real tasks/materials
 - Repeated trials
 - Is quality adequate/comfortable for the task?

<i>Quality of the speech/Score</i>	
Excellent	5
Good	4
Fair	3
Poor	2
Bad	1

PIPVIC-2 Trials

- Piloting IP Videoconferencing over UK Academic Network
- 13 partner sites
- Jan. - Sept. 1999
- multicast (rat, vic, wb, nte)
- teaching, research, admin
- lectures and tutorials :
 - languages
 - medical
 - sociology
 - business studies
 - history
 - computer science



Trial results


- Objective and subjective quality were collected for all the multimedia sessions
 - 1/3 of session reports rated that the audio quality was less than adequate
 - but *objective* quality (network and tool stats) good (< 5% packet loss) throughout sessions
- Qualitative data and recordings indicate that the session setup and usage are the main cause of dissatisfaction.

Experimental study

- Compare network with other packet loss (repaired with packet repetition)
 - Reference (no loss), 5% loss, 20% loss
- Volume differences
 - *too loud, too quiet*
- Acoustic problems
 - *echo, bad mike*

Watson & Sasse: Procs ACM Multimedia 2000

Results: Subjective



Results: *subjective* ratings


- Ratings were very consistent across repeated measures.
- No significant difference between the reference condition, 5% packet loss, and *quiet*.
- *Bad microphone* significantly worse.
- No significant difference between *echo*, *loud* and 20% packet loss.

Capturing users' physiological responses



- Procomp measurement device on left hand
 - *Blood Volume Pulse*
 - *Heart Rate*
- Under stress, BVP decreases and HR increases.
- Objective measure of the “cost” to the user.

Results: Objective



Results: physiological responses


- *bad microphone, loud and 20% loss* were significantly more stressful than *quiet* and *5% loss*
- *echo* was more stressful than *quiet* and *5% loss*
- *bad microphone* and *loud* more stressful than *20% loss*

Video Experiment 1

- Effects of 5fps and 25fps.
- Participants watched recorded University admission interviews and answered questions.
- Physiological & subjective assessment.

Wilson & Sasse Procs HCI 2000

Mean Heart Rate



Results

- Significant increase in galvanic skin response (GSR) and heart rate (HR) at 5 fps for 78% of participants
- Subjectively, 16% noticed change in frame rate
- 18% felt under stress due to quality
- Subjective responses are cognitively mediated, subject to memory biases

Physiology implications

- Differences between subjective ratings and physiology
- Indication of strain, fatigue in longer-term use (stress, RSI)
- Danger of mis-attribution (e.g. in interviews)

Summary (1)

- Users evaluate quality in terms of perceived *utility* for a task performed (*value*)
- QoS parameters vary across tasks
 - Speed, resolution,
 - security, allowing focus on task
- *Predictable, consistent* quality valued more highly than variable, “best available”.
- Each task has critical thresholds and critical period that determines perception of quality per session

Bouch et al., Procs IWQoS 2000


Video Experiment 2

- Watching football clips
 - particular emphasis on video on handheld devices, such as 3G phones, etc.
- Goal was to evaluate the tradeoff between frame rate and quantization.
 - Conventional guidelines recommend high frame rates for high-motion video such as sports events.


Details

- Two video streams:
 - CIF (352x288 pixels) on a LCD monitor.
 - QCIF (176x144 pixels) on an iPAQ palmtop.
- Vary framerate between 6fps and 25fps
- Vary quantization parameters.
- Verbal feedback from subjects
- Use eye-tracker
- Use heart measurements.

Results: CIF size



Results: CIF vs QCIF



Bandwidth vs Acceptability

