

From icons perception to mobile interaction

Chrysoula Gatsou School of Applied Arts Hellenic Open University Patra , Greece Email: cgatsou@teiath.gr Anastasios Politis Graphic Arts Technology Faculty of Fine Arts and Design, TEI of Athens Athens, Greece Email: politisresearch@techlink.gr Dimitrios Zevgolis School of Applied Arts Hellenic Open University Patra , Greece Email: zevgolis@eap.gr

Abstract—This study deals with the vital issue of whether a mobile phone interface icon effectively expresses the function related to it. The subject of the effectiveness of icons used in mobile phone interfaces deserves examination. Icons are an integral part of most mobile interfaces, for they are the bridge enabling interaction. We also examine how far any icon represents the meaning of the function for which it has been designed, chosen and installed by the mobile phone manufacturer and designer. Among the chief findings are (1) graphical representation affects the recognition rate of icons and influences user perception and (2) there are significant differences in performance in recognizing icons among different age groups.

Keywords—icons recognition; human factors; interface design; mobile interaction.

I. INTRODUCTION

OBILE phone interaction is nowadays part of Leveryday human behavior and an activity which involves speaking, listening, touching and performing other tasks, in order to communicate. Interactivity converts a system into a communication medium by eliciting user interaction with the interface. One of the main goals of a mobile phone interface is to relate phone functions and operations to elements of interaction that are performed well (e.g. sounds and visual elements). Mobile interfaces use icons to represent the functionality required by users in Since visual aspects, such as performing their tasks. graphics and icons, are essential elements of user-device interaction, are used extensively in interface design on the assumption that visual icons are capable of transcending language barriers and of presenting meaning in condensed form [1], [2], [3]. With the increase in the use of new technologies and of the internet at home, there is an exponential growth in numbers of novice users, that is, ordinary people who lack skills in computer science and are drawn from a wide range of backgrounds, they face difficulties in operating their computers. Ordinary people are now the main target of the market, which produces new applications very rapidly. Consequently, there is a need for new tools with particular features to assist such users. Yet there has been little investigation of the influence of graphical icons on the perception of ordinary mobile phone users.

An icon can be defined as a graphical representation of concepts that symbolize computer actions [4]. Exponents of icons argue that iconic interfaces enjoy many advantages [5].

One such suggested advantage is that icons are easily recognized [6]. Also, it is suggested, that graphic images help users memorize and recognize functions available within an application [7]. In addition, iconic interfaces are especially important for novice users who only infrequently use interactive systems. To be effective, an icon must fulfill several criteria, such as whether it is visible, legible, and comprehensible. Studies have found that the visual and cognitive features of icons significantly influence an icon's effectiveness [8], [9], [10]. Recently designers of mobile interfaces have been using icons to represent the functionality required by users to perform their tasks. Icons are a popular method for visually representing functionality, because they provide direct access, allow direct manipulation and can economise on valuable space in interfaces. A key concern in the design of iconic interfaces is the effective depiction of the meaning of the icon. Potentially speaking, an icon can represent both the referent and its attributes, associations, and state [2].

The proper use of iconic mobile interfaces reduces system complexity and helps users interact with mobile phones more easily.

Given this discussion, present study seeks answers to the following questions:

1. Are mobile phone function icons easily recognizable by a wider audience?

2. Is there any difference in recognition rate among different age groups?

3. Are there any differences in the recognition rate between the genders in each of the age groups?

II. ICON CLASSIFICATION, SEMIOTICS AND INTERACTION

Icons can be divided into broad categories that rest on Pierce's early explanation of semiotics. Pierce classified signs in three categories that is, **icon**, **index** and **symbol** [11]. For a sign to exist, it must consist of all three parts (the object, the representamen and the interpretant) and the interaction between them is a process Peirce termed *semiosis* (from Greek '*sēmeiōsis*').

Icon. An icon is the simplest of these types of representation, since it consists of a pattern of lines that physically resembles what it 'stands for'. Icons display features that resemble the object they signify.

Index. An index correlates in space and time to its meaning and relates indirectly to the concept of its referent.



Fig. 1 Types of icon representations (adapted from Nadin)

Symbol. A symbol is a sign whose relation to what is signified is conventional or arbitrary.

Wileman states that symbols can be assigned in three groups. Pictorial, graphic and verbal symbols range from concrete to abstract representations [12]. Fig. 1, illustrates several representations of a "camera" based on Nadin's idea [13]. Different amount of interpretation from concrete to abstract and different types of icons (iconic, indexical, symbolic) plays an important role in user performance. The interpretation becomes easier, as the representation becomes more schematic. As the level of abstraction increases, the sign becomes progressively more generic and less complex. From a semiotic point of view, the design of an interface for a mobile application consists of various signs. By means of these, the designer tries to convey the meaning he intends to convert [14]. When the user interacts with the screen of the mobile phone, he or she is required to guess the object of the sign, since the sign is designed to convey specific meanings. When the user's interpretation (interpretant) matches the intended object of the sign, the designer has achieved his aim of producing a successful icon [13]. Ideally, the link between the representamen and object should be obvious to all the users of the interface and result in only one interpretant. This should activate the correct mental model, which allows the user both to understand the action and to interact appropriately [15].

III. DIFFERENT SYMBOLS, DIFFERENT MEANINGS, IDENTICAL FUNCTIONS

There is an increasing range of existing iconography in mobile phones, together with a number of interesting graphics. Not all users though can transfer their skills from one model to another, because of differences in the interface and the icons between the two models. Different individuals interpret the same icon in different ways and one icon may be capable of more than one interpretation, this phenomenon is being labeled the 'ambiguity' of the icon.

Rossi and Querrioux - Coulombier suggest that "the relationship between an icon and its meaning should be automatic and consequently independent of any learning" [16]. This means that for an icon to work more effectively

than some other means of representation, such as a textual description, it needs to draw on the understanding of the implicit meaning of the icon. Various icons on various handsets, differing among themselves in appearance, but representative of the same function, may complicate the intellectual model applied by the user and so cause problems in the perception on the part of the user.

The most important role of an icon is to convey, without the use of text, the meaning of the function it represents, thereby making icons more efficient than text in the operation of mobile phones and in function implementation. The effectiveness of an icon in relation to its intended meaning also depends on the degree of mapping between physical form and function, this being known as the "articulatory distance"[17]. The closer the visual representation is to the intended meaning, the shorter the articulatory distance becomes.

Ideally, the icons used in the interface for representing information will activate the appropriate mental models in the users. How the user interprets the sign will depend on the user's mental models. Likewise, how the designer chooses to represent the object may also depend on his own set of mental models [18]. It is important to note that the function assigned to an icon by those designing it may be quite different to the meaning actually attributed to it by users.

The correct interpretation of icons also depends on other factors, such as the context in which the icon is used. Any text labels that might be displayed together with an icon and the user's familiarity with the icon and with its application context [19]. The elderly are likely to have less experience than other younger age-groups with contemporary handset devices and to be less familiar with icons displayed by a device and with applications, which thus makes such icons more difficult to interpret.

	iPhone	hone NOKIA		MOTOROLA		SAMSUNG		SONY ERICSSON	
	2007-2010 (4 εκδόσεις)	2006 (N73) 2008 (5320)	2008 (5800) 2009 (N900)	2003 (V600)	2009 (evoke QA4)	2008 (D780)	2009 (bada OS)	2005 (K750i)	2009 (C903)
PHONE BOOK	1		-	1	1	2	5	\diamond	ซ
PHONE CALL	S	**	*	B	Ø		5	(\$	(\$
MESSAGE	\$	4	M			\times	-		\sim
SETTINGS		2	2	12	0	Ħ	\odot	3.	×
CAMERA	0			6	0			1	6
CLOCK		\odot	\odot	2	S	4	Ø	NO	۶Ì
INTERNET	1	-	4	•	ø	۲	٢	<i>i</i>	Ċ
GAMES	20		n 63.62	2			2	R	

Fig. 2 Types of icon representations from different handsets

Previous studies have shown that mobile phone icons make for faster, more direct access to a mobile function [16]. This then leads to the inevitable question, "What makes an effective comprehensive interface mobile icon"?

In Fig. 2, we see eight of the most frequent functions from five different popular brands of mobile phones, namely, Iphone, Nokia, Motorola, Samsung and Sony Erikson. We present icons from two models per brand (Nokia, Motorola, Samsung and Sony Erikson) and one model from Iphone. It is to be observed that even the same company is not consistent in its choice of symbols to depict functions. In Nielsen's view, "the latest mobile devices are agonizingly close to being practical, but still lack key usability features required for mainstream use" [20].

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

There are several criteria that an icon must satisfy, if it is to be effective. Among these are legibility, distinctiveness, comprehension, the reaction time [21].

The main problem in evaluating icons is the proper construction and modification of them [22]. Several methods have been utilized to evaluate graphic symbols and icons. The method used most often is a comprehension test, also termed a 'recognition test' [23]. Howell and Fuchs were the first to devise criteria for the correct recognition of symbols, grouping them into the following categories: identifiable (60-100%), medium (30-60%) and vague (0-30%) [24]. Many researchers have employed procedures involving "matching tests" to evaluate graphic symbols [25],[26]. In the "matching" method, the suitability of an icon is evaluated in relation to other icon variables. Yet another method is the icon intuitiveness test, created by Nielsen and Sano, in which an icon is shown without any label to a small number of users, typically five [27]. The users are asked to guess what the icon is intended to represent. Sanders and McCormick have also shown that the criteria for selecting symbols generally include a degree of recognition, a matching degree and a subjective preference and opinion [28].

A. The selection of the sample for the evaluation.

After choosing handsets from five different manufacturers on the basis of brand popularity, we selected icons for our study from the main menu functions. It was impossible to represent each function by a standard number of icons, since the icons in question are extremely diverse in appearance. Some were selected on the grounds that, although they were drawn from different brands, they converged and we were eager to investigate whether such convergence aided user perception. Our goal was to determine whether or not the visual representations offered by icons do indeed help users to understand the functionality of the icon in question.

B. Participants

We employed a sample of 60 participants, all volunteers. They possessed mobile phones and came from various backgrounds. They were roughly equal in terms of gender and their age distribution is given in Table 1. All participants have normal vision, though some wore glasses or contact lenses. The majority had owned a mobile phone for more than one year. Each subject was given a brief overview of the experiment and briefed as to the purpose and procedure of the study.

C. Icon recognition questionnaire

Before answering the icon recognition questionnaire, all participants completed a pre-experiment questionnaire which collected personal details and data relating to technology skills and mobile phone experience. A paper-based icon

TABLE I. Age, gender and number of participants.

	No.of				
Age group	participants	Participant Gender			
		Male	Female		
20-29	10	5	5		
30-39	11	7	4		
40-49	12	5	7		
50-59	14	8	6		
60-69	8	2	6		
70-79	5	5			
Σ	60	28	32		

recognition questionnaire was prepared, which involved 54 mobile phone function icon .The questionnaire was designed to examine icon recognition and perception performance over different age groups. According to the Organization International Standardization (ISO3864), for icon recognition rates should be at least 66.7%, to be acceptable [29]. With a view to making the procedure of presenting the participants with the icons they were to interpret as efficient as possible, a table was constructed in Adobe InDesign with numbered rows, placed an icon next to each number, and left the space to the right for a set of referents from eight functions that participants had to select the proper one. Since the test required that the icons be clearly visible, they were printed at high resolution. The recognition rate was computed as follows:

(Number of correct choices / Number of respondents) x 100=Recognition rate(%)

No	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A7	
Phone book	1	_	2	<i>[</i>	1	2	\diamond	B	
Recognition	56.7	63.3	78.3	30.3	56.7	56.7	40.7	70.0	
No	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B 7	B8	B9
Phone call	<u> </u>	*		B	0		5	(\$	(\$
Recognition	75.0	50.0	60.0	20.0	53.3	21.7	55.0	60.0	60.0
No	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6			
Message	9		M	-		\bowtie			
Recognition	98.3	93.2	88.3	86.7	95.0	96.7			
No	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	D8	
Setting	Ø	2	11	0	ľ	0	a.	×	
Recognition	65.0	91.7	90.0	68.3	95.0	58.3	58.3	91.7	
No	E1	E2	E3	E4					
Camera	0		6	<u> </u>					
Recognition	78.3	96.7	96.7	100.0					
No	F1	F2	F3	F4					
Clock	2	Ø	N	* 1					
Recognition	60.0	100.0	61.7	61.7					
No	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G6	G7	G8	G9
Internet	1	2	٢	(Ø			<i>?</i>	Ċ
Recognition	• 40.0	68.3	93.3	45.0	95.0	91.7	95.0	85.0	65.0
No	H1	H2	Н3	H4	Н5	H6			
Games	2		n-6362	4	P	æ			
Recognition	78.3	40.0	30.0	81.7	85.0	93.0			

Fig. 3 Recognition rate of icons.

In this study, the 54 icons were graded according to their recognition rate.

V. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The summary of the test results is shown in Fig. 3. The recognition rate for 29 icons was over 66.7%, a fact which provides an overall answer to questions we posed ourselves. In view of the ISO standard mentioned above, we award the icons we tested one of two grades: 'good', with a correct answer rate of above 66.7%, and 'low', with a correct answer rate below 66.7%. On this basis, 29 of the icons tested are to be considered 'good' and so are suitable for mobile phone use, the remaining 25 icons achieving only a recognition rate below this level.

Other facts emerge from our analysis. Six mobile icons were easily recognized and associated with their correct functions, thus fulfilling Howell's criteria. Icons E4 and F2 enjoyed the highest recognition rate of all, 100%. However, the analysis of our test results relates to our research questions to a greater degree than this. It is clear that the icon recognition rate differs over age groups, some icons enjoying a high recognition rate and some others a lower rate. Older participants were less accurate in recognizing and interpreting the meaning of the icons. The findings shown in Fig.4 and Table II illustrate this point.



Fig. 4 Recognition rate and different age group

TABLE II. Mean recognition rate in Age groups

Age group	No. of	Mean
	participants	Recognition rate
20-29	10	86.9%
30-39	11	83.5%
40-49	12	71.0%
50-59	14	67.3%
60-69	8	60.6%
70-79	5	42.2%
Σ	60	68.5%

If we regard a recognition rate of 66.7% as indicating success, the most effective icons are:

- F2 and E4, with a recognition rate of 100%,
- C1, with a recognition rate of 98.3%,
- E3, with a recognition rate of 96.7%,
- F2, with a recognition rate of 96.7%,
- F3, with a recognition rate of 96.7% and
- D5, with a recognition rate of 95.0%.

Information regarding matters of experience with technology and of gender was derived from the proexperiment questionnaire. An analysis of the results is given in Fig. 5 and 6. As for the six icons whose recognition rate fell between 20%-40%, various suggested factors, which are summarised in Table III, may be responsible for this poor performance.



Fig. 5 Recognition rate and experience with technology.



Fig. 6 Recognition rate and gender.

 $T_{ABLE \ III.}$ Icons with low recognition rate $20\%{-}40\%$

Icons	R/r*	Original meaning	Possible reasons for misunderstanding					
~	40%	phone book	The graphic, intended to indicate a note book, is visually unclear.					
	40%	internet	The use of a compass to denote the internet is unfamiliar to some users. Generally an icon of a globe is more effective.					
P	30%	phone book	The combination of head phone and notebook is confusing.					
∩-6 362	30%	games	The addition of the word 'games' would probably add to clarity and effectiveness					
	21.7 %	phone call	The combination of handset and an individual is ambiguous.					
R	20%	phone call	The resemblance to a notebook may cause confusion with the phone book					

R/r = recognition rate

Interestingly, the recognition rate for the various icons denoting a very basic function, "phone call" (Fig. 7), is surprisingly low, with the exception of the icon employed by the Iphone, which consists of a head phone. This enjoyed the highest rate of recognition (75%), whilst that of all the other icons fell beneath 66.7%

	iPhone NOKIA		(IA	MOTOROLA		SAMSUNG		SONY ERICSSON	
Phone call	<u></u>	**	*	B	0		5	(\$	(\$
Recognition rate	75%	50%	60%	20%	53.3%	21.7%	55.0%	60.0%	60.0%

Fig. 7 Recognition rates for various icons representing 'phone call' function

VI. DISCUSSION

In this particular study, we found that:

• 29 of our 54 icons enjoyed a recognition rate of more than 66.7%,

• is a significant difference in recognition rates among age groups, with recognition rate decreasing as age increases and that

· there is no importance difference between genders, with the recognition rate displayed by males being only 4% higher than that displayed by females.

Our study suffers from limitations that may have given rise to inaccuracies in our results. As we have pointed out, we settled upon a paper-based form of test, as some of our participants were unfamiliar with computer technology. Such participants, ignorant of computer technology, were unable to compare the icon they were requested to evaluate with other icons from the application from which the test icon was drawn. This does not reflect reality, where the users of an application may be in a better position to guess the meaning of the icon in question by comparing it with other icons in the same application.

For reasons of legibility, comparatively large depictions of icons were used in our recognition test. In reality, of course, icons are becoming ever smaller and less visible [22]. Our focus was upon ordinary people. Although they were not necessarily experienced users of technology and were drawn from various age groups, they were called upon to evaluate icons, no easy task. Among the factors of which account needs to be taken is the medium in which the icons were presented and examined and, above all, age differences.

In general, however, iconic signs are more easily recognized than symbolic signs. It is thus extremely important that the appropriate design style be selected at the initial stage of the icon design process. If either information or function has strong ties with an object, a pictorial icon is the best choice. Examples of this are our icons F2 and E4, which enjoyed a recognition rate of 100%.

VII. CONCLUSION

We have dealt in this study only with the representation and recognition of icons, yet our findings can contribute to the improvement in how a larger number of users experience interfaces. Other issues, however, such as the structure of menus and colour combinations employed in icons, also require in-depth study.

Since the amount of information in our lives continues to increase, information designers must design solutions that match users' requirements as much as possible. The proper selection of graphical elements are one way to optimize communication with users, but requires designers to be aware of how users interact with graphical elements.

The use of an appropriate icon is a vital factor in ensuring the correct functioning of mobile phone applications. In order for icons to evoke the intended meaning in the viewer's consciousness, or even subconsciousness and for them to achieve communication between designer and user, a symbol should display a strong, direct association with the desired meaning, in the mind of both designer and user. During the icon formulation process, a design whose aim is to produce functional results makes such functions comprehensible. Furthermore, in order to help new or ordinary users interpret icons correctly, some form of comprehensive test or test of recognition should precede any attempt at improving performance.

We hope that the results of our study will offer a deeper understanding of how a wider audience uses mobile phones and icons, in particular.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was supported by the European program ESPA and by HERAKLEITOS II in Greece. We are also grateful to the participants in the study.

References

- S. Caplin, Icon design: Graphic icons in computer interface design. [1] London: Cassell, 2001.
- D. Gittins, "Icon-based human-computer interaction". International [2] Journal of Man Machine Studies, 24, (1986), pp.519-543
- S. J. P. McDougall, M. B. Curry, and O. de Bruijn, "Exploring the ef-[3] fectsof icon characteristics on user performance: The role of icon concreteness, complexity, and distinctiveness," Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, vol. 6, no. 3, 2000, pp. 291-306.
- C.Ware, *Information Visualization*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2000. G.Shank. and P. Darke. "Understanding Corporate Data Models," In-[5] formation and Management, 35:1, 1999, pp. 19-30.
- [6] B. Shneiderman, Designing the User Interface: Strategies for Effective Human-Computer Interaction, 3rd ed. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1997
- K. Siau, "Human-computer interaction: The effect of application do-[7] main knowledge on icon visualization," J. of Computer Information Systems, 45(3), 2005 p.p53-62.
- M. A Blattner, D. A. Sumikawa, and R. A. Greenberg, "Earcons and [8] icons: their structure and common design principles". Human± Computer Interaction. 1989
- M. E. Familant, and M. C. Detweiler, "Iconic reference:evolving per-[9] spectives and an organizing framework", International Journal of Man± Machine Studies, 39, 705± 728, 1993
- [10] Y. Rogers, "Icons at the Interface: Their Usefulness," Interacting with Computers, 1:1, 1989.
- [11] C. S Peirce. Logic as semiotic: the theory of signs. In: Innis, R. E. (Ed.) Semiotics: an introductory reader. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press. 1985.
- [12] M. S. Wileman Visual Communicating. Educational Technology Publications, New Jersey, 1993.
- [13] M . Nadin, "Interface design: A semiotic paradigm". Semiotica. 69: 269-302, 1988.
- [14] R. Buchanan, "Declaration by Design: Rhetoric, Argument, and De-monstration in Design Practice", Design Issues, 2(1),1985, pp, 4-22.
- S. Isherwood, "Graphics and Semantics: The Relationship between What Is Seen and What Is Meant in Icon Design". HCI (17) 2009, p.p. 197-205
- [16] J. Rossi, & G. Querrioux-Coulombier, "Picture Icon and Word Icon". From Human and Machine Perception. New York, NY: Plenum Press, 1997.
- [17] E.L.Hutchins, D.J.Hollan, and D.L. Norman,. "Direct manipulation interfaces", in Norman, D.A. and Draper, S. (eds) user-centered system design Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, USA, 1986

- [18] D. Norman, Things That Make Us Smart, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, MA 1993
- [19] W. Horton, The Icon Book - Visual symbols for computer systems and documentation, New York: Wiley and Sons, 1994.
- [20] J. Nielsen, UseIt.com [Online].Available: http://www.useit.com/ /alertbox/20030818.html
- [21] R. Dewar, "Design and evaluation of public information symbols," in Visual Information for Everyday Use: Design and Research Perspectives, H. J. G. Zwaga, T. Boersema, and H. C. M. Hoonhout, Eds. London: Taylor & Francis, 1999, pp. 285-304.
- [22] S. Blankenberger and K. Hainj. Effects of icon design on human-computer interaction. Int. J. Man-Machine Studies 1991, 35, 363-377
- [23] W. C. Howell, & A. H. Fuchs, Population stereotypy in code design. Organisational Behavior in Human Performance 3, 1968, pp 310-339.

- [24] H. I. Cheng, P. E. Patterson,." Iconic hyperlinks on e-commerce websites. Applied Ergonomics " 38 (1), 2007, pp 65–69. E. Heard, "A symbol study-1972," Paper No 740304, Society of Au-
- [25] tomotive Engineers, New York, 1974.
- [26] Easterby and H. Zwaga (Eds.), Information design, "The design and evaluation of signs and printed material"(pp. 277-297). New York: J. Wiley & Sons
- [27] J. Nielsen, and D. Sano, SunWeb: User Interface Design for Sun Microsystem's Internal Web. In Proc. 2nd World Wide Web Conf. '94: Mosaic and the Web. Chicago, IL, pp. 547.557.
- [28] Sanders, M. S. and McCormick, E. J "Human factors in engineering and design,"7th ed, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.
- D. P. T. Piamonte, J. D. A. Abeysekera, and K. Ohlsson, Under-[29] standing small graphical symbols: a cross-cultural study. International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics, 27 (6), 2000, pp. 399-404