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Motivation

- Motivated by Isokoski (2000)’s work desire to circumvent dwell time, we developed EyeWrite
- A new system for eye-typing that uses gestures similar to hand-printed letters
- EyeWrite is based on EdgeWrite’s unistroke alphabet (Wobbrock et al., 2003; Wobbrock & Myers, 2006b)
- EyeWrite reduces the need for eye-tracker accuracy, a large screen footprint, and tedium
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- Dwell-time on-screen keyboards usually need layouts with large keys (Majaranta & Räihä, 2007)
- They often require a large screen footprint (e.g., Tobii Technology’s (2007) patent-pending MyTobii or the ERICA system (Hutchinson et al., 1998))
- One reason is the need for large keys—size facilitates selection (Fitts’ Law), esp. in the presence of noise
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Besides dwell-time, input can be performed by gaze gestures

- Isokoski’s (2000)’s MDITIM used discrete, consecutive gestures
- MDITIM’s gestures did not necessarily resemble roman letters

- Other well-known system is Dasher (Ward & MacKay, 2002)
  - Dasher’s zooming display is modeless—no dwell time needed
  - Very fast input times have been reported with word completion feature (25-34 wpm)

- Other gestural approaches include Urbina and Huckauf’s (2007) pEYEdit, with which 6-10 wpm rates have been reported
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- Pros and cons of mouse gestures well documented
- Precise target acquisition is circumvented (Dulberg et al., 1999)
- Gestures can be faster than point-and-click
- Consecutive (compound) gestures, however, are slower since they carry an inherent multi-stroke handicap
- EyeWrite’s weighted average number of strokes per character (with initial and terminating saccades) is 4.52
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EyeWrite

- EyeWrite is EdgeWrite (Wobbrock et al., 2003) for the eyes
- To our knowledge, first letter-like text entry system for the eyes
- Two important styles for input
  - Alphabet resembles roman characters, enhancing memorability
  - Input mode is based on crossing, not pointing
- Three design iterations (Wobbrock et al., 2007)
  - v1.0: mimicked EdgeWrite with literal trace between input areas
  - v2.0: vector-based approach—worked well but decoupled stroke corner from POG
  - v3.0: returned tight coupling but drew stylized arcs
- Short self-study set window to 400 × 400 size with dwell time set to 269 ms for segmentation with a 1.5 adaptive dwell time multiplier
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  - width squeezed in as far as app would allow (> 400)
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- Longitudinal study spanned 15 sessions
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  - No more than 48 hours could elapse between sessions
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- Data captured with TextTest and analyzed with StreamAnalyzer (Wobbrock & Myers, 2006a)
- Real-time \((x, y)\) POG calculated as average of valid (validity code 0) left and right gaze points, smoothed over last 5 data points
- Eight participants (4 M, 4 F), age range [20-25], mean 21.8
- Participants asked to balance speed and accuracy during input (e.g., try character twice before moving on)
- Apparatus was the Tobii ET-1750
- Experimental design was within-subjects with one two-level factor for input technique (EyeWrite, Click-N-Type)
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- **Speed measured as words per minute**
- Input technique as well as session used as fixed factors in 2-way repeated measures ANOVA (with subject as random factor; see Baron and Li (2007) for examples in R)
- Over last 14 sessions, average speed for EyeWrite was 4.87 wpm and 7.03 for Click-N-Type ($F(1,189) = 113.42, p < 0.01$)
- Session also significant ($F(13,189) = 7.52, p < 0.01$)
- Each method improved about equally, with no technique $\times$ session interaction ($F(13,189) = 0.74, p = 0.74$, n.s.)
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Accuracy: Uncorrected Errors

- Uncorrected errors are ones left in final text entry
- They are precisely at odds with speed
- Over last 14 sessions, average uncorrected error rate for EyeWrite was 2.21% and 4.62% for Click-N-Type ($F(1,189) = 3.83$, $p = 0.05$)
- Effect is seen mainly in the first 5 sessions; effect no longer significant over last 9 sessions
Accuracy: Uncorrected Errors

- Uncorrected errors are ones left in final text entry
- They are precisely at odds with speed
- Over last 14 sessions, average uncorrected error rate for EyeWrite was 2.21% and 4.62% for Click-N-Type ($F(1,189) = 3.83, p = 0.05$)
- Effect is seen mainly in the first 5 sessions; effect no longer significant over last 9 sessions
Accuracy: Uncorrected Errors

- Uncorrected errors are ones left in final text entry
- They are precisely at odds with speed
- Over last 14 sessions, average uncorrected error rate for EyeWrite was 2.21% and 4.62% for Click-N-Type ($F(1,189) = 3.83, p = 0.05$)
- Effect is seen mainly in the first 5 sessions; effect no longer significant over last 9 sessions
Accuracy: Uncorrected Errors

- Uncorrected errors are ones left in final text entry
- They are precisely at odds with speed
- Over last 14 sessions, average uncorrected error rate for EyeWrite was 2.21% and 4.62% for Click-N-Type \((F(1,189) = 3.83, p = 0.05)\)
- Effect is seen mainly in the first 5 sessions; effect no longer significant over last 9 sessions
Corrected errors are made and corrected during entry
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Subjective Impressions

- Participants noted significant preferences for EyeWrite in terms of ease of use \((z = 49.00, p < .001)\), perceived speed \((z = 47.00, p < .01)\), and fatigue \((z = -51.00, p < .001)\).
- Perceived ease of use and speed increased over sessions for both methods while perceived (ocular) fatigue decreased.
- EyeWrite was thought more difficult only during 1st session.
- It is remarkable that a gestural alphabet would be so quickly learned and thought as easier to use than an on-screen keyboard.
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Discussion

- Click-N-Type is faster than EyeWrite, at the expense of accuracy
- Thus, a speed-accuracy tradeoff is observed
- It seems that once familiar with gestures, participants were more willing to correct errors with EyeWrite than with Click-N-Type
- It is plausible they did so because they perceived EyeWrite the faster input modality even though it was not
- EyeWrite’s small screen footprint may be an advantage over off-screen targets due to smaller saccade requirement
- Eye-typing may not necessarily the best application of EyeWrite
- Other applications may include web browsing, as per Moyle and Cockburn’s (2005) study showing 11%–18% speed increase over mouse gestures (on certain tasks)
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