

Mason, J. S., Klippel, A., Bleisch, S., Slingsby, A. & Deitrick, S. (2016). Special issue introduction: Approaching spatial uncertainty visualization to support reasoning and decision making. *Spatial Cognition and Computation*, 16(2), pp. 97-105. doi: 10.1080/13875868.2016.1138117



**CITY UNIVERSITY  
LONDON**

[City Research Online](#)

**Original citation:** Mason, J. S., Klippel, A., Bleisch, S., Slingsby, A. & Deitrick, S. (2016). Special issue introduction: Approaching spatial uncertainty visualization to support reasoning and decision making. *Spatial Cognition and Computation*, 16(2), pp. 97-105. doi: 10.1080/13875868.2016.1138117

**Permanent City Research Online URL:** <http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/14922/>

### **Copyright & reuse**


City University London has developed City Research Online so that its users may access the research outputs of City University London's staff. Copyright © and Moral Rights for this paper are retained by the individual author(s) and/ or other copyright holders. All material in City Research Online is checked for eligibility for copyright before being made available in the live archive. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to from other web pages.

### **Versions of research**

The version in City Research Online may differ from the final published version. Users are advised to check the Permanent City Research Online URL above for the status of the paper.

### **Enquiries**

If you have any enquiries about any aspect of City Research Online, or if you wish to make contact with the author(s) of this paper, please email the team at [publications@city.ac.uk](mailto:publications@city.ac.uk).



**Introduction to the Special Issue on Visually-Supported  
Spatial Reasoning with Uncertainty**

Journal:	<i>Spatial Cognition and Computation: An Interdisciplinary Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Mason, Jennifer; The Pennsylvania State University, Geography Klippel, Alexander; The Pennsylvania State University, Geography Bleisch, Susanne; University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland Slingsby, Aidan; City University London, Deitrick, Stephanie; Arizona State University
Keywords:	uncertainty, visualization, reasoning, decision-making

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Introduction

Uncertainty is ubiquitous in spatial data ([Couclelis, 2003](#); [Hope & Hunter, 2007](#)). With more data and sophisticated tools available for exploring and analyzing them, additional research is imperative to address and develop ways to advance the understanding of how humans reason and make decisions under spatial uncertainty. While research on uncertainty and decision-making have a long history across several disciplines, recent technological developments producing new open data sources compels researchers to rethink how to best address and understand uncertainty inherent in data and models. One such approach is to use visualization techniques proposed by the geographic visualization and information visualization communities. When decisions are made from visualized geospatial data without the uncertainty explicitly mentioned or depicted with the dataset, it can lead to an inaccurate or misleading understanding of spatial patterns and processes. [Hunter and Goodchild \(1993\)](#) state that without proper attention to uncertainty, outcomes can result in the “use of wrong data, in the wrong way, to arrive at the wrong decision” (p. 55). Thus, recent efforts have attempted to support the decision-maker through integration of uncertainty in data visualization. For a comprehensive overview of research in this area, see [Kinkeldey, MacEachren, Riveiro, and Schiewe \(2015\)](#).

In research, the large number of current uncertainty visualization techniques draw mostly upon existing cartographic methods using standard visual variables (e.g., [MacEachren et al., 2012](#)), however less research focuses on the impact this has on reasoning and decision-making ([Kinkeldey et al., 2015](#)). This is largely due to the lack of comprehensive and generalizable empirical studies across the entire domain of uncertainty visualization. Additionally, while progress has been made, results are scattered across different disciplines ([MacEachren et al., 2005](#)) and various contexts without enough communication and interdisciplinary work. This lack of comprehensive and generalizable empirical testing may partially be due to the conflicting and numerous definitions of uncertainty ([Aerts, Clarke, & Keuper, 2003](#); [Pang, Wittenbrink, & Lodha, 1997](#)). For instance, [Deitrick and Edsall \(2008\)](#) find that the term uncertainty is an issue across multiple disciplines often defined through numerous terms: data quality, accuracy,

1  
2  
3 precision, error, vagueness, ambiguity, etc. This disagreement makes this topic both complex  
4 and difficult to research, understand, and visualize.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 Beyond having mixed terminology among researchers focusing on uncertainty, [Aerts et al.](#)  
10 [\(2003\)](#) point out that there is still only a small amount of literature and research addressing  
11 perceptual and cognitive questions as well as the effectiveness of visualizing uncertainty among  
12 various approaches. In many instances, we may be prematurely attempting to create  
13 uncertainty visualizations that may not appropriately take users and their heuristics, biases,  
14 experiences, and abilities into account. For example, researchers have identified that heuristics,  
15 or experience-based approaches aiding in reasoning, play a key role for reasoning under  
16 uncertainty ([e.g., Tversky & Kahneman, 1974](#)). Heuristics are strategies that people use in order  
17 to simplify a difficult judgment or decision such as understanding probabilities through a rule of  
18 thumb or common sense. In this special issue, Ruginski et al. used a think aloud exercise to  
19 disentangle their results and found several heuristics that users employ in order to reason  
20 about potential damage to an oil rig. Some potential issues arising from the use of heuristics  
21 and prior experience is that individuals have several types of systematic errors, or biases, that  
22 affect our judgment capabilities ([Tversky & Kahneman, 1974](#)). This presents a unique problem  
23 in the case of uncertainty visualization. Since both experts and non-experts apply heuristics and  
24 biases when they only have partial or uncertain information, it is also likely that this  
25 characteristic of human decision-making will apply when interacting with spatial visualizations  
26 like maps containing uncertainty. Thus, uncertainty visualization researchers must understand  
27 and face this issue and develop methodologies that will help users overcome these biases and  
28 make better-informed decisions. Additionally, researching how other differences including prior  
29 experience, knowledge, and abilities relevant to the context and uncertainty visualization may  
30 impact the outcome (including decisions, comprehension, etc.) are important to support the  
31 data visualization users.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53  
54 Understanding how and when users utilize uncertainty to assist reasoning and decision-making  
55 is of extreme importance in research. To begin with, quantifying uncertainty so that the result is  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of relevance to the decision maker is a necessary first step. In this special issue, Salap –Ayca and  
4 Jankowski calculate uncertainty to aid in the selection and decision for agricultural lands to be  
5 placed in conservation and crop reserve. Aside from quantifying uncertainty, one must also  
6 question whether uncertainty should always be presented to the data visualization user. In the  
7 empirical work from [Aerts et al. \(2003\)](#), more than 70% of participants agreed that the  
8 visualization of uncertainty enhanced their analysis and decisions. The feedback from  
9 participants in their study and another from [Leitner and Buttenfield \(2000\)](#) was mostly positive,  
10 where users felt that the incorporation of uncertainty visualization clarified the geospatial data  
11 rather than making it more complicated. Similarly, [Bisantz, Marsiglio, and Munch \(2005\)](#) found  
12 that visualizing uncertainty enhanced the decisions of users, where decisions were most  
13 impacted during times of greater uncertainty. In this special issue, Riveiro discovered that even  
14 with uncertainty, experts reported high levels of confidence and significantly more than the  
15 novices. It should be noted, however, that the inclusion of uncertainty ([Van Oort & Bregt, 2005](#))  
16 can in some cases decrease user confidence and make the data appear less reliable and  
17 unfavorable. Moreover, some research finds that users may explicitly attempt to ignore  
18 uncertainty ([Hope & Hunter, 2007](#)) because, for example, they are not aware of it, they do not  
19 understand it, do not know what to do with it, it makes the data appear less reliable or valid  
20 ([Slingsby, Dykes, & Wood, 2011](#)), it is too difficult to investigate, or it makes a decision too  
21 complicated. Based on these findings, it would appear that successful visualization of  
22 uncertainty is highly dependent on the context, task, and individuals or groups interacting with  
23 it.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 This special issue arises from the continuing need and support for more research on Visually-  
46 Supported Spatial Reasoning with Uncertainty. While research on uncertainty visualization to  
47 support spatial reasoning and decision-making have been prominent and important topics over  
48 the past few decades, calls for papers, workshops, research groups, and grants continue to  
49 appear in GIScience. The following research avenues show the prominent role uncertainty  
50 continues to play. At the 2016 AAG conference, several sessions have sent out calls for papers  
51 to include research on uncertainty and its visualization. A workshop on “visualization for  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 decision making under uncertainty” and several papers on uncertainty visualization were  
4 presented at the VIS 2015 conference. The National Center for Geographic Information and  
5 Analysis ([NCGIA, 2015](#)) is a consortium that was established in 1988 and mainly funded from  
6 the National Science Foundation with members from the University of California, Santa  
7 Barbara, the University at Buffalo, and the University of Maine. The first area they undertook  
8 was accuracy and uncertainty in spatial data and they continue to research this important topic.  
9 Another collaborative project ("[Modeling, Display, and Understanding Uncertainty in](#)  
10 [Simulations for Policy Decision Making," 2015](#)) is underway between groups from the University  
11 of Utah, the University of Washington, Clemson University, and University of California, Santa  
12 Barbara. The National Institutes of Health has an open funding opportunity for Spatial  
13 Uncertainty: Data, Modeling, and Communication to include ways to visualize and  
14 communicate spatial uncertainty beginning in 2015. With this continued demand for research  
15 on the topic, this special issue is responding to this need and is the logical extension to two  
16 successful and well-received workshops some of the editors held at the Conference on Spatial  
17 Information Theory in 2013 and GIScience in 2014.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 The following articles in this special issue present research in the area of visually-supported  
35 spatial reasoning with uncertainty. We have used a visual summary graphic developed by  
36 [Mason, Retchless, and Klippel \(in revision\)](#) to provide an overview of each paper. This visual  
37 summary applies a graphic typology with various domains of uncertainty visualization research.  
38 Shaded regions show those domains that each paper employs in their research. This typology  
39 has framed uncertainty visualization research as comprising three major domains: User effects,  
40 visualization techniques, and stimulus effects. User effects are characteristics an individual user  
41 has which will ultimately affect the way they interact with a visualization of uncertainty. These  
42 include individual differences, prior knowledge and experience. Visualization techniques refer  
43 to the various ways in which uncertainty can be visualized, organized, and evaluated. This  
44 includes the type of data used, intrinsic or extrinsic representations, coincident or adjacent  
45 displays, etc. The final domain, stimulus effects, encompasses the various effects that the  
46 stimulus, or an uncertainty visualization, can have on the user. For instance, a visualization may  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 impact the decisions a user makes, how they comprehend uncertainty, or elicit some sort of  
4 emotional response. There are numerous other sub-domains of which we will discuss as each  
5 paper covers them.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 In the article by Salap-Ayca and Jankowski, the authors explore the uncertainty in land  
12 allocation criteria weights from multi-criteria evaluation models to assist in identifying  
13 agricultural land that should be placed for land conservation and crop reserve. Upon running  
14 Monte Carlo simulations, they have created maps of average suitability and uncertainty and  
15 further ran a sensitivity analysis. The authors employ both global and local methods to  
16 ascertain how the local spatial heterogeneity impacts the criteria weights. In order to visualize  
17 the uncertainty of the suitability map, sensitivity maps were created focusing on the average  
18 and standard deviation of the weights. This decision making model offers a look into the  
19 uncertainty for each of the watersheds in Southwest Michigan showing both the average  
20 suitability and the standard deviation (or uncertainty) in each. Combinations of high and low  
21 suitability with high and low standard deviation shows how the uncertainty in the suitable areas  
22 can affect final decisions. The approach taken by the authors offer alternative options to  
23 support decision makers and providing them with multiple scenarios and their associated  
24 uncertainty. Figure 1 presents the visual summary of the aforementioned article. This article  
25 presents visualization techniques utilizing the polygon and field (raster) data, a coincident  
26 display method, and intrinsically visualizes uncertainty.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

44 Figure 1. Visual Summary of Salap-Ayca and Jankowski (2016)  
45  
46  
47

48 Ruginski et al. compare how different visualizations of the uncertainty for a hurricane track  
49 impact decision-making for non-experts in a controlled experiment. The five visualizations  
50 include: the traditional “cone of uncertainty” map as often presented by the National Hurricane  
51 Center, a cone without the center track line, a center line without the outer cone, a fuzzy-  
52 boundary without the center track, and an ensemble of potential tracks. Other factors included  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 varying the hurricane, temporal points, and oil rig locations. The study then asked participants  
4 to estimate damage to the oil rig and in a later task follow a think aloud protocol and discuss  
5 their reasoning and decision-making strategies which were coded into various heuristics. The  
6 findings of the think aloud protocol yielded a high inter-rater reliability for Cohen's Kappa,  
7 revealing that these participants used similar heuristics when reasoning and making decisions  
8 about the hurricane. Figure 2 reveals the different topics that the presented research covers:  
9 intrinsic and extrinsic visualization methods, line and polygon uncertainty data, coincident  
10 display method, and an evaluation of the visualization techniques which implicitly ascertain  
11 whether users comprehend the various visual components presented on the maps. This  
12 research contributes both quantitative and qualitative methods to better understand how  
13 reasoning and decision-making heuristics interplay while interacting with various visualizations  
14 and with different factor conditions (i.e. the hurricane forecast, temporal points, oil rig  
15 locations). The authors have importantly focused on non-experts, the major consumers of these  
16 visual products who are potentially affected by hurricanes and have to make decisions from a  
17 variety of sources, including maps with uncertainty like those presented in the study, to  
18 ultimately make decisions about their well-being and property.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE

37  
38 Figure 2. Visual Summary of Ruginski et al. (2016)

39  
40  
41 The study by Riveiro focuses on user expertise to assess the threat of targets in an air traffic  
42 control simulation. Both sets of participants (all military officers) have some training in this  
43 area, however their domain expertise varies in the length of time they had practical experience  
44 (either a maximum of 3 years for novice or more than 10 years for expert in air surveillance and  
45 risk assessment). Each participant was tasked with protecting a radar station from various  
46 targets and upon using an interactive system and map, look at various information (i.e. altitude,  
47 distance, speed, etc.) and their uncertainties to make decisions about their potential threat and  
48 the priority of each (low, medium, and high) to be sent to the next in command. Overall,  
49 experts have more confidence with the additional uncertainty information than the novice  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 users and performed better at correctly determining targets in the simulations. Figure 3 shows  
4 the comprehensive nature of this research in the uncertainty visualization field. As reflected in  
5 the visual summary, Riveiro evaluates how context (background related to the mapping  
6 context, i.e. novice and expert domain expertise) affects decisions and comprehension of  
7 intrinsic and extrinsic uncertainty in an animated and interactive coincident display of both  
8 points and lines. By including the entire user effects, visualization techniques, and stimulus  
9 effects, Riverio obtains a comprehensive picture of the entire process of a user interacting with  
10 a visual display of uncertainty.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE

21 Figure 3. Visual Summary of Riveiro (2016)  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 Outlook

27  
28 Upon viewing these visual summaries, the reader will find that each of these articles covers  
29 different topics in the uncertainty visualization domain, offering complementary research in  
30 this field. Understanding this uncertainty and its impact on users is a puzzle that we are now  
31 actively trying to understand. Uncertainty visualization will continue to be an important field of  
32 research as uncertainty plays an increasing role in data analysis and practical human decisions  
33 with the increasing amount of data and combination of various data sources. With the large  
34 and expanding utilization of geospatial data and its visualization, a largely ignored component  
35 in many analyses and visualizations is the uncertainty interwoven throughout the data. In many  
36 cases, this may cause user misinterpretation and poor reasoning and decision-making behaviors  
37 because users do not fully grasp the complexity of the different uncertainties arising from data  
38 collection, manipulation, analyses, visualizations and our human cognitive capacities and  
39 biases. Decision-making under uncertainty is a process that many users among numerous  
40 domains must face. Visualization of uncertainty for geospatial data is a promising mode for  
41 presenting this attribute to support these various researchers and people who make decisions  
42 and reason about their data. The large knowledge gap in this area is the application and  
43 extension of research on individual differences, prior experience, and conceptualization of  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 uncertainty in other research areas and how they might apply in designing effective uncertainty  
4 visualizations to support reasoning and decision-making. Furthermore, extending this body of  
5 research and finding new ways to explore how these visualizations may help or hinder the  
6 analytical and reasoning process of humans continues to be a necessary step towards better  
7 knowledge and decisions taking into account all available evidence.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

## 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

- Aerts, J. C. J. H., Clarke, K., & Keuper, A. (2003). Testing Popular Visualization Techniques for Representing Model Uncertainty. *Cartography and Geographic Information Science*, 30(3), 249-261.
- Bisantz, A. M., Marsiglio, S. S., & Munch, J. (2005). Displaying Uncertainty: Investigating the Effects of Display Format and Specificity. *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, 47(4), 777-796.
- Couclelis, H. (2003). The certainty of uncertainty: GIS and the limits of geographic knowledge. *Transactions in GIS*, 7(2), 165-175.
- Deitrick, S., & Edsall, R. (2008). Making Uncertainty Usable: Approaches for Visualizing Uncertainty Information, in *Geographic Visualization: Concepts, Tools and Applications*. In M. Dodge, M. McDerby, & M. Turner (Eds.), *Geographic Visualization: Concepts, Tools and Applications* (pp. 277-291). Chichester, UK.: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Hope, S., & Hunter, G. J. (2007). Testing the effects of positional uncertainty on spatial decision-making. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 21(6), 645-665.
- Hunter, G. J., & Goodchild, M. F. (1993). Managing Uncertainty in Spatial Databases: Putting Theory into Practice. *Journal of Urban and Regional Information Systems Association*, 5(2), 52-62.
- Kinkeldey, C., MacEachren, A. M., Riveiro, M., & Schiewe, J. (2015). Evaluating the effect of visually represented geodata uncertainty on decision-making: systematic review, lessons learned, and recommendations. *Cartography and Geographic Information Science*, 1-21.
- Leitner, M., & Buttenfield, B. P. (2000). Guidelines for the Display of Attribute Certainty. *Cartography and Geographic Information Science*, 27(1), 3-14.
- MacEachren, A. M., Robinson, A., Hopper, S., Gardner, S., Murray, R., Gahegan, M., & Hetzler, E. (2005). Visualizing Geospatial Information Uncertainty: What We Know and What We Need to Know. *Cartography and Geographic Information Science*, 32(3), 139-160.
- MacEachren, A. M., Roth, R. E., O'Brien, J., Li, B., Swingley, D., & Gahegan, M. (2012). Visual Semiotics & Uncertainty Visualization: An Empirical Study. *Visualization and Computer Graphics, IEEE Transactions on*, 18(12), 2496-2505.
- Mason, J. S., Retchless, D., & Klippel, A. (in revision). Domains of Uncertainty Visualization Research: A Visual Summary Approach. *Cartography and Geographic Information Science*.
- Modeling, Display, and Understanding Uncertainty in Simulations for Policy Decision Making. (2015). Retrieved from <http://visunc.sci.utah.edu>

- 1  
2  
3 NCGIA. (2015). NCGIA Overview. Retrieved from  
4 <http://www.ncgia.ucsb.edu/about/overview.php>  
5  
6 Pang, A. T., Wittenbrink, C. M., & Lodha, S. K. (1997). Approaches to Uncertainty Visualization.  
7 *The Visual Computer*, 13(8), 370-390.  
8  
9 Slingsby, A., Dykes, J., & Wood, J. (2011). Exploring Uncertainty in Geodemographics with  
10 Interactive Graphics. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 17(12),  
11 2545-2554.  
12  
13 Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases.  
14 *Science*, 185(4157), 1124-1131.  
15  
16 Van Oort, P., & Bregt, A. (2005). Do Users Ignore Spatial Data Quality? A Decision-Theoretic  
17 Perspective. *Risk Analysis*, 25(6), 1599-1610.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 1. Visual Summary of Salap-Ayca and Jankowski (2016)  
139x146mm (300 x 300 DPI)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 2. Visual Summary of Ruginski et al. (2016)  
139x146mm (300 x 300 DPI)






Figure 3. Visual Summary of Riveiro (2016)  
139x146mm (300 x 300 DPI)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60