



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Ali, R., Dykes, J. & Wood, J. (2013). Framework for Studying Spatially Ordered Treemaps. Paper presented at the 26th International Cartographic Conference: From Pole to Pole, 25 - 30 August 2013, Dresden, Germany.

This is the unspecified version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://city-ref-test.eprints-hosting.org/id/eprint/2609/>


Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

Framework for Studying Spatially Ordered Treemaps

Ali Ramathan, Jason Dykes, Jo Wood - giCentre, City University London

1) To what extent are people able to interpret data and geography in a spatially ordered treemap (SOT) by performing complex graphical perception tasks?

Which of the 4 maps to the right shows the geographic distribution of the map to the left?



Objective 1

To investigate whether people are able to make sense of SOTs & to identify the kinds of inference tasks that are suitable for such a technique.


Objective 2

To investigate and identify what kind of support mechanisms & metaphors (visual indicators or morphing) are useful in supporting the process of spatial problem solving & decision making when using SOTs.

Objective 3

To investigate the effects of spatial ability; that is to examine how task performance and support mechanisms are modulated by spatial ability with respect to SOTs.

2) Tasks



There are three geographic tasks: distribution, compare and locate [2]. Where appropriate each task is further divided into statistical, geographical and statistical geographical tasks. We then use the concept of direct & inverse [1] to ensure the questions are not biased towards a single way of asking. Each of the tasks are further divided to test single level maps (Flat) and/or multiple level hierarchical (Hier) tasks.

3) Hypotheses

HYPOTHESIS ONE: Statistical tasks
Ho: Choropleth(CHO) maps will perform better than SOT on statistical tasks;
H1: SOT will perform better than CHO on statistical tasks.

HYPOTHESIS TWO: Geographical tasks
Ho: CHO maps will perform better than SOT on geographical tasks;
H1: SOT will perform better than CHO on geographical tasks.

HYPOTHESIS THREE: Statistical Geographical tasks
Ho: CHO maps will perform better than SOT on statistical geographical tasks;
H1: SOT will perform better than CHO on statistical geographical tasks.

HYPOTHESIS FOUR: Hierarchical tasks
Ho: CHO maps will perform better than SOT on hierarchical tasks;
H1: SOT will perform better than CHO on hierarchical tasks.

HYPOTHESIS FIVE: Effects of spatial ability
Ho: Subjects with better scores in the spatial ability test will outperform subjects with poor scores in the spatial ability test in the perceptual tasks;
H1: Spatial ability has no effect on perceptual tasks.

References

[1] Andrienko, N., and Andrienko, G. Exploratory Analysis of Spatial and Temporal Data Systematic Approach. Berlin: Springer, 2006.

[2] Bertin, J. Smiologie Graphique Paris: Edition Gauthier-Villars, 1967.

Contact: alir@soi.city.ac.uk



**CITY UNIVERSITY
LONDON**

gicentre.org