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Social facilitation theories posit: the presence of others can increase a person’s drive and focus (e.g., Carron, 1996; Strauss, 2002)
Social Facilitation: A Self-Presentational View

Charles F. Bond, Jr.
Connecticut College

This article offers a self-presentational account of performance in others' presence. The account attributes social facilitation to the performer's active regulation of a public image, and it attributes social impairment to embarrassment following loss of public esteem. Individuals lose esteem by making numerous errors on difficult tasks. This self-presentational analysis is tested in a study of context effects in verbal learning. Two tasks are studied: a difficult task that includes a few simple items and an easy task that includes a few complex items. Consistent with the self-presentational analysis (but not with drive theories of social facilitation), the presence of an observer impairs the learning of simple items if those items are embedded within a difficult task. Also, an observer's presence does not impair the learning of complex items if those items are embedded within an easy task. Questionnaire responses suggest a naturally occurring confound between task difficulty and perceived failure.

The influence of the presence of others on individual behavior, a classic topic in social psychology, was studied extensively in the early 1900s (Dash, 1935). Contemporary interest in the topic derives from Zajonc's proposal (1965) that the presence of others acts as a source of generalized drive (Spence, 1956), and energizes the dominant response tendency to the exclusion of competing responses. Cottrell (1972) amended Zajonc's theory, contending that the presence of others arouses apprehension over evaluations. He claimed evaluation apprehension as a source of generalized drive.

This article proposes an alternative analysis of behavior in others' presence. Following Cottrell, the analysis attributes the influence of others' presence to the potential that presence gives them for evaluation. But Cottrell seemed to ignore the fact that the object of evaluation is the individual's performance. The contingency of others' evaluation on the exhibited performance renders any generalized drive interpretation of their influence obtuse. Because a favorable evaluation could be secured or an unfavorable one avoided by competent performance, the nonactive presence of others provides an incentive for exhibition of socially valued behaviors (Green, 1979). In addition, the performer's status as the basis for evaluation gives that performance ongoing psychological significance for the performer. Lacking direct access to another's evaluation, the individual is left to infer it. The inference derives, in part, from a moment-by-moment retrospective self-evaluation that may influence subsequent behavior.

Erving Goffman elaborates related insights in his self-presentational analysis of social interaction (1959, 1967). Self-presentation theory depicts behavior in others' presence as attempts to control or reactions to a public self-image. According to Goffman when the individual appears before others, he or she will discover that an idealized self-image has been claimed. This acceptable image (called face) has a normative character. It obligates others to accord the individual the status claimed and obligates the

Bond reframes social facilitation in terms of Goffman's presentation of self.

Presence of others can motivate the individual to project image of competence.

For tasks perceived to be too difficult, however, performance may actually decline as individual becomes self-conscious.
Potential Dichotomy
Increased motivation vs. increased anxiety

SFF Externalizes Performance
Wearables & Sports

Wearables for Sensing

Wearables for Sensing & Visualization
Wearables & Sports

Wearables for **Sensing**

Wearables for **Sensing & Visualization**
Under Armour E39
Real-time athlete monitoring
Adidas miCoach Elite
Real-time athlete monitoring
Wearables & Sports

Wearables for Sensing

Wearables for Sensing & Visualization
Wearables & Sports

Wearables for Sensing

Wearables for Sensing & Visualization
Reebok Checklight
Co-located sensing & feedback on athlete
TeamAWear
Page & Vande Moere, Pervasive’07
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SFF: Design and Evaluation Process

- Ideation & Lo-Fi Proto.
- Parallel Prototyping (3 Designs)
- Refine Final Design
- Field Study of 10 Running Groups
- 2 Race Studies

Steps:
- Informal Pilot Studies
- Final Pilots
DESIGN GOALS

- Comfort
- Robustness
- Display Content
- User Experience
SFF: SYSTEM OVERVIEW

RunKeeper

Mobile phone interface showing:
- Time: 52:43
- Avg Min/Mi: 8:31
- Calories: 469
- Heart rate: 132
- Distance: 4.5 miles
- Current Pace: 9:37

Options: Stop, Pause
SFF: System Overview

Wirelessly transmits run data to wearable display

Android Smartphone with RunKeeper

Wearable Prototype

Battery
Designing the Visual Content
Glanceable & Easy-to-understand
SFF: PRIMARY VISUALIZATIONS
SFF: PRIMARY VISUALIZATIONS
Although RunKeeper tracks a single user, these measures are shared across the running group as they run together.
SFF: Primary Visualizations

- Time: 52:43
- Distance: 4.5 mi
- Pace/Mi: 09:37
- Duration: 52:43
- Heart Rate: 132 bpm
- Calories: 469

Primary Visualizations:

- Distance
- Current Pace
- Time
- Heart Rate
- Calories

Weight Control: 50-70%
- pace
- avg min/mile
- distance
- cal. burned
- time

SFF
1:21:41

1343
240

132

10:09
avg min/mi

8:05
miles

Social fabric
Fitness
Comfort

Low-Fidelity Prototypes
SFF: Design and Evaluation Process

Ideation & Lo-Fi Proto.

Parallel Prototyping
3 Designs

Informal Pilot Studies

Refine Final Design

Final Pilots

Field Study of 10 Running Groups

2 Race Studies
SFF: Design and Evaluation Process

1. Ideation & Lo-Fi Proto.
2. Parallel Prototyping
   3 Designs
3. Informal Pilot Studies
4. Refine Final Design
5. Final Pilots
6. Field Study of 10 Running Groups
7. 2 Race Studies
3 PROTOTYPE DESIGNS
Prototype #1
Custom LED Matrix Display
Prototype #1
Three prototyping dimensions
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Prototyping **Technology**

1. Select MCU Platform
2. Prototype Circuit Designs
3. Build Software

Prototyping **Visualization**

4. Layout PCB

Prototyping **Materials**

5. Manufacture PCB
6. Test Final PCB & Software
Prototype #1
Prototype Circuit Designs

Q1

Q2

Q3

A

C

E

2:00.5

Can we solve Charlieplexing brightness issue?
Abandon Charlieplexing?
Parts list?
Prototype #1
Single Letter Display Test
Prototype #1
Scrolling Display
Prototype #1

Three prototyping dimensions
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Prototype #1

Three prototyping dimensions
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Prototyping **Visualization**
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4. Layout PCB

Prototyping **Materials**
5. Manufacture PCB
6. Test Final PCB & Software
Prototype #1
Prepare PCB Schematic
Prototype #1
Prepare PCB Schematic
Prototype #1
Manufactured Flexible PCB
Manufactured at PCBUniverse.com and pick-and-place performed by Tristate Electronics
Flexible PCB
24 x 6 Matrix
Green or Blue LEDs

Prototype #1
Manufactured Flexible PCB

Manufactured at PCBUniverse.com and pick-and-place performed by Tristate Electronics
Prototype #1
Flexible PCB
Prototype #1
Prototype Evolution

Flexible PCB
Prototype #1

Three prototyping dimensions
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1. Select MCU Platform
2. Prototype Circuit Designs
3. Build Software

Prototyping **Visualization**

4. Layout PCB
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Prototype #1
Three prototyping dimensions

1. Select MCU Platform
2. Prototype Circuit Designs
3. Build Software
4. Layout PCB
5. Manufacture PCB
6. Test Final PCB & Software

Prototyping Technology
Prototyping Visualization
Prototyping Materials
Prototype #1

Three prototyping dimensions

Prototyping **Technology**

Prototyping **Visualization**

Prototyping **Materials**
Prototype #1

Three prototyping dimensions

Prototyping **Technology**

Prototyping **Visualization**

Prototyping **Materials**
PACE
??44
Prototype #1
Final Prototype

- 2 x Arduino Pro Minis
- 2 x LED Matrices on Flexible PCB
- 2 x 3.7V (2000 mAh) LiPoly Batteries
- Velcro Perimeter
- Cotton Diffusion Layer
- Pleather Enclosure
SFF: THREE PROTOTYPES

Prototype #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display Weight</td>
<td>66.9 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weight</td>
<td>152.9 g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a comparison:
iPhone 4S = 140 g

* With enclosure
SFF: **Three Prototypes**

### Prototype #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display Weight</td>
<td>66.9 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weight</td>
<td>152.9 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixels</td>
<td>24 x 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refresh Rate</td>
<td>5 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions*</td>
<td>21.3 x 12.2 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display Thickness*</td>
<td>13.5 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* With enclosure
Prototype #1
Custom LED Matrix Display

Prototype #2
Electronic Ink Display

Prototype #3
Erogear LED Matrix Display
Prototype #2
Electronic Ink Display
Prototype #2
Three steps

Find Manufacturer

Prototyping Software

Prototyping Materials
YOU'RE LOOKING AT THE WORLD'S 1ST PRODUCTION-READY PLASTIC DISPLAY
PLASTIC LOGIC
DURATION
1:13:34
DISTANCE
10.4 miles
Prototype #2
Final e-Ink Prototype

Plastic Logic Flexible e-Ink Display 4.7” (320 x 240)

Nylon Enclosure

4 x 1.5V (2000 mAh) AA Batteries

Plastic Logic Display Controller (HummingBird)

32-bit BeagleBone (AM335x 720MHz ARM)

DISTANCE
10.4 miles
## SFF: Three Prototypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prototype #1</th>
<th>Prototype #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display Weight</td>
<td>66.9 g</td>
<td>25.4 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weight</td>
<td>152.9 g</td>
<td>411.7 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixels</td>
<td>24 x 12</td>
<td>320 x 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refresh Rate</td>
<td>5 Hz</td>
<td>1.1 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions*</td>
<td>21.3 x 12.2 cm</td>
<td>18.4 x 14 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display Thickness*</td>
<td>13.5 mm</td>
<td>4.9 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* With enclosure
Prototype #3
Erogear LED Matrix Display
Prototype #3
Early Erogear Visualizations
Prototype #3
Extremely Flexible/Lightweight
Prototype #3
Final Erogear Prototype

- 2 x 32-bit MCU; 16-bit LED Matrix Driver; Bluetooth Modem
- 2 x 32x8 Erogear LED Matrices
- 2 x 3.7V (2200 mAh) Li-Ion Batteries
**SFF: Three Prototypes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prototype #1</th>
<th>Prototype #2</th>
<th>Prototype #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Display Weight</strong></td>
<td>66.9 g</td>
<td>25.4 g</td>
<td>46.8 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Weight</strong></td>
<td>152.9 g</td>
<td>411.7 g</td>
<td>161.2 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pixels</strong></td>
<td>24 x 12</td>
<td>320 x 240</td>
<td>32 x 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refresh Rate</strong></td>
<td>5 Hz</td>
<td>1.1 Hz</td>
<td>38 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimensions</strong></td>
<td>21.3 x 12.2 cm</td>
<td>18.4 x 14 cm</td>
<td>20.3 x 15.2 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Display Thickness</strong></td>
<td>13.5 mm</td>
<td>4.9 mm</td>
<td>4.8 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* With enclosure
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- Ideation & Lo-Fi Proto.
- Parallel Prototyping (3 Designs)
- Refine Final Design
- Field Study of 10 Running Groups
- 2 Race Studies
- Informal Pilot Studies
- Final Pilots
Informal Pilot Studies

- Evaluate Comfort
- Examine Viewability
- Investigate Robustness
- Gain qualitative reactions
Pilot Studies

In-situ observation

Prototype #1

Prototype #2
Data Collection

In-situ observation
Data Collection
In-situ observation
Data Collection
Pre- and Post-Surveys
Analysis
Post-hoc review
Viewability
Examining Diffusion Layers
Viewability
Prototype #1 & #2
Viewability
Prototype #3: Lighting Conditions
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- Informal Pilot Studies
- Final Pilots
SFF: Design and Evaluation Process

- Ideation & Lo-Fi Proto.
- Parallel Prototyping: 3 Designs
- Refine Final Design
- Informal Pilot Studies
- Final Pilots
- Field Study of 10 Running Groups
- 2 Race Studies
Prototype #3
Erogear LED Matrix Display
SFF: PRIMARY VISUALIZATIONS

TIME 52:43
PACE/MI 09:37
DISTANCE 4.5 mi
HEARTRATE 132 bpm
DURATION 52:43

SFF: PRIMARY VISUALIZATIONS

TIME 8:31
PACE/MI 09:37
DISTANCE 4.5 mi
HEARTRATE 132 bpm
DURATION 52:43
SFF: Final Visualizations

[Images of different visualizations on a phone and a shirt]
SFF: **Shared Goal Visualization**

- **Group set target pace**
- **07:45**
- **Last 9 mins of the run**
SFF: Shared Goal Visualization

Running faster than set pace
Still faster than set pace but slowing down
Now running \textcolor{red}{slower} than set pace
Final Prototype
Shared Goal Visualization
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SFF: Design and Evaluation Process

1. Ideation & Lo-Fi Proto.
2. Parallel Prototyping
   - 3 Designs
3. Refine Final Design
4. Field Study of 10 Running Groups
5. 2 Race Studies

- Informal Pilot Studies
- Final Pilots
Running Groups Needed to Help Evaluate New Wearable Running Technology

Do you run? Do you run in groups? We need your help! In our study, we are looking for existing groups of runners (3 or more) to assist us as volunteers in a research project exploring e-textile athletic jerseys.

Specifically, we have designed and constructed prototype athletic jerseys that communicate running information such as pace, duration, and distance via a live, wearable display. As a participant, your role is to help us better understand how these jerseys impact your sense of the run activity and the runners around you.

For the study, we will ask you to first complete a short demographic and pre-activity survey. Then, you will perform a short running activity of 20 – 35 minutes (depending on your preference) with the group. One (or two) people in the running group will be wearing our e-textile jersey along with a provided mobile phone and arm strap. After completing the run, you will be asked to fill out a short survey about your experience. The entire session should last approximately 60 minutes.

Participants will be reimbursed $20 per hour for their time. Study sessions will be conducted on the University of Maryland, College Park campus or, in some cases, at a specific physical location of your choice. All participants must be 18 years of age or older and be an active runner. Apart from that restriction, we encourage people of all genders and ethnicities to participate. If you are interested in participating, please email Matthew Mauuilo (matmm@cs.umd.edu) the following information:

- How often you run (e.g., once a week, three times a week)
- How often you run in a group and the typical group size
- How you currently track your runs (e.g., Nike+, Runkeeper, paper + pen)

Feel free to take a look at our research lab’s website to find out more about our research program: http://www.cs.umd.edu/hcil. Please also feel free to redistribute this posting.

Sincerely,

~Matthew Mauuilo, MS
Department of Computer Science
University of Maryland
A.V. Williams Building, 4122
College Park, MD 20742

http://www.cs.umd.edu/~matmm/
Twitter @matmm401
SFF: Study Procedure

Overview

Pre-Study Questionnaire
Social Fabric Fitness
Pre-Study Questionnaire

Instructions to participants: This survey is for research purposes only. Your responses will be anonymized. We will not look at your responses until we get back to our research lab.

About Your Experience
Please answer the following questions openly and honestly. If something is not clear, please feel free to ask a research staff member for clarification.

1. Your age: _______________

2. Gender: Male____ Female____ Other _______

3. What is your profession? If you are currently a student, please indicate your current field of study:
   ____________________________________________________________________

4. In the last seven days, I have run _______ times.

5. In the last seven days, I have run with at least one other person _______ times.

6. My typical run is _______ (miles / kilometers), which lasts _______ minutes

7. I consider myself an active, fit person.
   Strongly Agree ______ Weakly Agree ______ Neither agree ______ Disagree ______ Strongly Disagree ______
SFF: Study Procedure

- SFF Overview
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SFF: STUDY PROCEDURE

- SFF Overview
- Pre-Study Questionnaire
- SFF Run (30-60 minutes)
- Post-Study Questionnaire
Participant ID: ______________ Date: ______________ Time: ______________

Social Fabric Fitness
Wearer Post-Study Questionnaire

Instructions to participants: This survey is for research purposes only. Your responses will be anonymized. We will not look at your responses until we get back to our research lab.

Devices and Comfort
1. I wore the heart rate monitor (check one). Yes __________ No __________
   a. Please describe why you chose to wear it.

2. Briefly describe where you wore the battery and how this worked for you.

3. Briefly describe where you wore the armband and how this worked for you.

4. In terms of physical comfort, I did not notice the _______ during the run.
SFF: Study Procedure

- SFF Overview
- Pre-Study Questionnaire
- SFF Run (30-60 minutes)
- Post-Study Questionnaire
- Post-Study Interviews
5:30AM
Obligatory Red Bull
FIELD STUDY PARTICIPANTS
10 GROUPS; 52 INDIVIDUALS (35 FEMALE)

Avg Group Size: 5
Avg Age: 40.7
Avg Target Pace: 10:14
Avg Distance: 3.5 mi
We analyzed the Likert scale survey data to uncover trends and use the interview and open-form data to provide context.
**SFF: Field Study Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>User Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display Content</td>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Self-Consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Other Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SFF: FIELD STUDY RESULTS

- Comfort
- Display Content
- Awareness
- Motivation
- User Experience
- Cohesiveness
- Self-Consciousness
- Other Technology
FIELD STUDY RESULTS

COMFORT; WEARERS (N=19)

7-Point Likert Scale
Higher is **more** comfortable
FIELD STUDY RESULTS
Comfort; Wearers (N=19)

Battery

7-Point Likert Scale

5.5
**FIELD STUDY RESULTS**

**Comfort; Wearers (N=19)**

- **Battery:** 5.5
- **Display:** 5.2

7-Point Likert Scale

![Battery](image1)

![Display](image2)
“I thought [the system] would be uncomfortable; it turned out to be unnoticed.”

-G5P2-W
FIELD STUDY RESULTS

COMFORT; WEARERS (N=19)

7-Point Likert Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battery</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIELD STUDY RESULTS
Comfort; Wearers (N=19)

Battery: 5.5
Display: 5.2
Heart Monitor: 5.1
Armband: 4

Higher is better
“Armband is heavy; other [equipment] was fine...”

-G2P1-W
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Comfort
Display Content
Awareness
Motivation

User Experience
Cohesiveness
Self-Consciousness
Other Technology
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**Field Study Results**

**Display Content; All (N=52)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order List</th>
<th>Average Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualization</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Rate</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SFF: Field Study Results
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- Comfort
- Display Content
- Awareness
- Motivation
- User Experience
- Cohesiveness
- Self-Consciousness
- Other Technology
“It made me more aware of our pacing and kept me more focused on the run.”

-G2P2-W
SFF: Field Study Results

- Comfort
- Display Content
- Awareness
- Motivation

- User Experience
- Cohesiveness
- Self-Consciousness
- Other Technology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SFF: Field Study Results</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Made me feel like I was pushing my efforts, which is good."

"Motivated me to go faster than the pace displayed."

-G7P8

-G7P7
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SFF: Field Study Results

- Comfort
- Display Content
- Awareness
- Motivation

User Experience
Cohesiveness
Self-Consciousness
Other Technology
“Yes, I expected to feel more conspicuous; didn’t really mind it.”

-G2P2-W
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SFF: Design and Evaluation Process

- Ideation & Lo-Fi Proto.
- Parallel Prototyping 3 Designs
- Refine Final Design
- Field Study of 10 Running Groups
- 2 Race Studies
- Informal Pilot Studies
- Final Pilots
# Race Study Participants

4 Individuals (1 Female)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part. ID</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Pace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1P1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>County 8K</td>
<td></td>
<td>6:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1P2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>County 8K</td>
<td></td>
<td>8:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2P1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Labor Day 10K</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2P2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Labor Day 10K</td>
<td></td>
<td>8:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Male, 34
Target Pace: 6:10
County 8K

Female, 33
Target Pace: 8:20
County 8K

Male, 26
Target Pace: 7:45
Labor Day 10K

Male, 18
Target Pace: 8:30
Labor Day 10K
Race Deployment

Competitive Interactions
“It made me run faster because my performance was on display.”

-R2P1-W
Limitations
Limitations

- Noveltly
- Observational Bias
Future Work
Encouragement

GOOD Job!

Keep Going!
Future Work
Social Media Integration
Future Work
Spectator Sports
Future Work
Cross Domains
Summary

This work contributes to two rapidly growing areas: personal informatics and wearable technology.

Through parallel prototyping, iterative design, and exploratory studies we demonstrate the potential to motivate group fitness performance with wearable technology.
Our Research Team:

Matt Mauriello
@mattm401

Michael Gubbels
@mokogobo

Jon Froehlich
@jonfroehlich

Thanks to our collaborators: RunKeeper and Erogear

Thanks to Nokia for funding
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**Fire**
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http://thenounproject.com/term/fire/8023/

**Warning**
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**Running**
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**Awareness**
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**Watch**
Kiran Malladi
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**Weight Lifting**
Nithin Viswanathan
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Edaward Boatman
http://thenounproject.com/term/calendar/6730/

**Education**
Chris Matthews
http://thenounproject.com/term/education/3012/
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