

# 3D User Interface design for Virtual Reality applications


Which is better: Naturalism or Magic ?

The 3 universal tasks:  
Navigation, Selection, Manipulation

Based on [3DUI theory & practice 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 2017], [A2012],  
D. Bowman course notes, Virginia Tech. and [CACM sept. 2012]

# Why 3D interaction?

- 3D / VE apps. should be useful
  - Immersion
  - Leverage on human natural skills
  - Immediacy of visualization (real-time feedback)
- But, current VE apps have serious usability problems



[D. Bowman]

# What makes 3D interaction difficult?

- Spatial input
- Lack of constraints
- Lack of standards
- Lack of tools
- Lack of precision
- Fatigue
- Layout more complex
- Perception

# Two approaches : naturalism vs magic

- Naturalism (or *interaction fidelity*):
  - use natural movement and body parts to make the VE work exactly like the real world
    - walking
    - full-body action used partially (sport games) or totally (to drive an avatar posture or training)
- Magic: give user new abilities
  - Perceptual
  - Physical
  - Cognitive



## Naturalism vs magic (2)

- The level of naturalism depends on the interaction technique and the application:
  - steering wheel metaphore :
    - is natural for driving simulator
    - is not for shooting a virtual basket ball [B2012]




[Youtube:watch?v=6cLvKTCryBY]

- Some actions in VR/game have no natural equivalent, e.g. teleportation
- in-between case: mapping a bicycle riding movement with hand and arm movement

## Naturalism vs magic [B2012] (3)

- Are 3D UIs inherently more natural than traditional UIs?
- Should we strive primarily for high-level of naturalism, or are other interaction design criteria more important (next slide) ?



[Youtube:watch?v=JFTRXG1yOr8]

- Does a more natural interface result in better performances, greater user engagement, or increased ease of learning ?
- When the most natural mapping cannot be used, is it better to use a moderately natural technique, or are traditional techniques more appropriate ?

# Interaction design criteria

- Performance
  - efficiency, accuracy, productivity
- Usability
  - ease of use, ease of learning, user comfort
- Usefulness
  - users focus on tasks, interaction helps users meet system goals, transfert of skill in the real world.

# Components of 3D interactions

The three universal tasks:

- **Navigation**
- **Selection**
- **Manipulation**



Other 3DUI components

- System control
- Symbolic input
- Constraints
- Passive haptic feedback
- Two-handed interaction




# The **Navigation** component

- Most common task
- is composed of :
  - Travel: the physical movement from place to place
    - Natural travel (walk) is not always the best
    - Steering a vehicle
    - Target-based: choose from a list, point at object,etc
  - Wayfinding: where am I? where do I have to go? How do I get there ?
    - Map-based, e.g. GPS metaphore


# Travel: naturalistic techniques

- walking and turning the head is obviously natural but technically difficult
  - Head-Mounted-Display (HMD) with 6D tracking of the head and sufficient space
  - without HMD -> constrained by the display location
- redirected walking [Razzaque PhD 2005 UNC]
  - tricks the brain about the actual walking direction
  - very active research field but still requires a significant walking surface
  - Ex: [Q18] takes advantage of blindness during saccades to manipulate the orientation




<https://youtu.be/eDk4HrEtGrM>

- walking-in-place [Usoh et al, 1999]
- dedicated interfaces (next slides)




# Travel naturalistic interfaces (1)

Ground-referenced haptic device : bidirectional treadmill [EU Project Cyberwalk]



Control Design and Experimental Evaluation of the 2D CyberWalk Platform, De Luca, Mattone & Giordano, Buelthoff, IROS2009 / MPI, TUM, ETHZ, URoma

Goal: offer omnidirectional navigation through effective 2D body displacement instead of resorting to a metaphore



Concept: synchronized linear belts  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_N$ , are displaced with a common velocity  $V_x$  in the blue direction, which is orthogonal to the individual velocities  $V_y$  (orange) of each belt. Hence it is possible to synthesize a combined velocity with any direction (green) in the plane

## Travel naturalistic interfaces (2)



### Results:

- Max  $V_x$  or  $V_y$  : 1.4 m/s
- Max combined: 2 m/s
- Max acc. along y (a belt): 1.3 m/s<sup>2</sup>
- Max acc. along x (all belts): 0.25 m/s<sup>2</sup>

### System Architecture :

- The control always pulls the walker towards the platform center ( $x_0, y_0$ ).
- The combined walker + platform movement is used to update the viewpoint in the virtual scene
- The user free displacement is measured with a VICON system
- Given the current platform movement, user location, velocity  $V_d$  and estimated acceleration, the Observer component determines an update of the platform velocity to bring the user back in the middle without sudden change.

### Issue:

- drift in case of sudden user stop
- walking on a treadmill is not natural walk

## Travel naturalistic interfaces (3)

concept/proto evolving since 2015:

- infinadeck.com
- not yet on the market / price estimation: 40-60 KUSD

Updated tradeoff:

- low inertia but less space for navigating
- circular safety protection

<https://youtu.be/RyFof9GpWac>





# Naturalistic navigation interfaces (4)

- **Locomotion tracking with virtosphere**
  - An omni-directional free-rolling sphere
  - 10 feet diameter (~3m)
  - To be used with head-mounted display for walkthrough applications, games, etc...
- Limitations:
  - balance control on spherical floor,
  - sphere inertia at fast speed
  - mechanical sound of the movement,
  - small field of view of HMD



# Naturalistic navigation interfaces (5)


- **Locomotion tracking with Cyberith (Austria)**
  - An omni-directional interface with sensor in the base plate, pillars and ring
  - flat slippery surface
  - Use overshoes
  - Can jump or seat too
  - Price ~6KEURO



[<http://www.cyberith.com/>]

# Travel **magic** techniques


- Side note on coordinate systems and orientation control
  - No standard convention regarding handedness
    - **UNITY is left-handed**, vs right handed (most graphic libraries)
  - No standard regarding the vertical direction
    - **UNITY is Y-Up** (vs Z-Up in CAD-CAM)
  - Some agreement on the choice of angles to control head, body, hand orientation (same as a plane)
    - **Yaw** (turn around the vertical axis)
    - **Pitch** (forward/backward inclination)
    - **Roll** (less used but see teleportation example)




Left Handed Coordinates

Right Handed Coordinates

Primalshell\_Licence\_CC\_BY-SA\_3.0



UNITY convention for 3D coordinate system




# Travel magic techniques (2)


- **Steering:** (like in most games / driving metaphor)
  - input device provides front,back,left,right constant speed
    - handheld device, leaning on wiiBalance (inspired by [Wells96])
    - "human joystick" : user stepping is mapped into oriented velocity
  - variants regarding which direction is considered *forward*
    - towards the center of the display vs device pointing direction
    - beneficial to separate *viewing direction* from *travel direction*
- **Target-based / Teleportation / Dash tranfert**
  - point in 3D with ray & jump (instantaneous or fast blurred movement = dash)
  - specify a point of interest from a list (easier but constrained if predefined targets)
- **Map-based** (with additional 2D map)
  - manipulate user icon on the map

# Travel magic techniques: teleportation


The **Yaw** angle  
around the vertical axis  
defines the radial  
Pointing direction




**Pitch** angle



Standard straight line selection metaphor





Recent parabolic curve  
selection metaphor  
-> less fatiguing for pointing  
a target location on the floor



The **Roll** angle  
can be used to define  
the target radial  
Direction [F2019]+video

- Seated steering with the feet: 3d Rudder

- Dedicated to navigation ; frees the hands for other actions
- Low inertia, relatively precise input device (~foot mouse)
- 3 degrees of mobility in rotation (with low amplitude)



Possible steering mapping:

- Yaw to direction changes (turning)
- Pitch to front-back translation (car)
- Roll to side translation (walk)

Other mapping are possible for generating events from short movements

# Naturalistic/Magic travel technique


- Grab the Air [M1995]
  - grab the world and pull yourself through it (or pull it to yourself)
    - naturalistic inspiration: crawling, pulling a rope, swimming, climbing, browsing a book
  - can be achieved with one or two hands
  - can be combined with scaling
  - rotation should be ignored
  - activate through explicit trigger or gesture recognition

# Navigation design guidelines

- There is no unique technique that suits all needs
- The simpler the better
  - Target-based technique for motion to an object
  - Steering technique for search/exploration
  - involve low inertia
- Provide transitional motion to maintain awareness of space (teleportation does disorient users)
- Naturalistic technique is best if the goal is ***training*** a ***real-world task***, or to increase presence

# The **Selection** component

- specifying one or more objects from the environment
- Goal:
  - indicate action on object (e.g. delete, duplicate, etc..)
  - Make object active, travel to object,...
- Natural metaphors:
  - *touching* or *pointing at* with a virtual hand
  - *touching* requires travel if target not within arms' reach
  - *pointing at* with ray/cone casting is still considered natural
    - ray built from hand/device/head orientation
    - or from eye-to-finger direction (Image Plane)







# Selection by ray-casting

## Ray casting technique:

get world hand/device/head pos & orientation  
 compute objects distances to ray segment  
 continuously highlight closest *visible* object to ray  
 select the closest one when a dedicated event is produced by the user (e.g. *button press on google cardboard HMD or simply a timeout event when an object has been the closest for X seconds*).

## Weakness:


difficult to select small/far objects  
 target object can be occluded



# selection by occlusion or framing (image-plane technique)


Ray casting from eye through the finger tip [Pierce 1997]:

- get world head pos/orient -> eye position
- get hand pos/orient -> finger tip position
- compute objects distances to "eye-through-finger" ray
- highlight/select visible object closest to ray  
<=> the finger tip is occluding the object in the image plane



Alternate approaches:





- use 2 fingers or 2 hands to frame the desired object



# Magic selection technique

extended "hyper-natural" touching  
or pointing metaphors

- ex: the Go-Go technique [Poupirov96]:
  - compute the torso-to-hand vector
  - apply the scaling factor
    - 1:1 scaling factor near the body
    - non-linear scaling above a threshold



# Magic selection technique

- World in Miniature (WIM)
  - scale-down the model to enhance user reach ability [Stoakley 1995]
  - remove part of the model (cut-aways) to ease the WIM visualization [Andujar 2010]




# The **Manipulation** component

- modify object properties: position, orientation, scale, shape, color, texture, behavior, etc.
  - For positioning: Virtual hand, ray casting, scaling
  - For orienting: the object should be hand-centered
    - apply the hand (re)-orientation to the manipulated object
  - **Haptic** feedback (future lecture) is required for highly specialized and high risk training (*surgery*)
- Magic technique: miniature proxy copy of objects

# Magic manipulation technique

- HOMER (Hand-centered Object Manipulation Extending Raycasting) [B2005]




- similar to the Go-Go technique :
  - select with the ray
  - manipulate with the hand
- easy selection & manipulation
- large distances
- hand-centered orientation is easy
- hard to move objects away



- the Clutching issue:



- clutching occurs when a manipulation cannot be achieved in a single motion. The object must be released and regrasped to complete the task.
- also means: relocate the working space within a more comfortable reach space to be able to complete a manipulation task. -> see image on the right



# Selection & Manipulation design guidelines

- How to validate a selection and report the event ?
  - provide feedback: graphical, audio, tactile
    - highlight candidate objects for selection
    - confirm user decision when a candidate object is chosen
- Display a virtual hand as a position/orientation ref
- selection should not be activated while manipulating
  - Beware of the « Midas touch » !
- Minimize clutching in manipulation
  - grasp-release-regrasp- etc...
- what happen after manipulating ?
  - remain there ? snap to grid ? fall gently ?



# Benefits & Limitations of Naturalism (1)

[Bowman, MacMahan, Ragan, CACM Sept 2012]


Benefits and limitations of natural 3D interaction for particular user tasks, taken from our prior research.

Task	Benefits of naturalism	Limitations of naturalism
Viewpoint rotation	Users prefer physical turning. <sup>32</sup>	Users prefer virtual turning to a combination of physical and virtual turning. <sup>32</sup>
	Natural turning techniques have better performance than virtual turning for visual search. <sup>38</sup>	
Viewpoint translation/travel	Head tracking can improve spatial understanding and detailed spatial judgments. <sup>33</sup>	The benefits of head tracking may depend on other factors, such as stereoscopic display. <sup>33</sup>
		Moderately natural techniques can have poorer performance than traditional techniques. <sup>38</sup>
Manipulation	Natural techniques improve performance of complex manipulation tasks. <sup>34</sup>	Highly natural techniques have limited range. <sup>28</sup>
	Hyper-natural techniques enhance users' abilities. <sup>28</sup>	Hyper-natural techniques often reduce precision. <sup>36</sup>
	It is possible to design hyper-natural techniques that feel natural and have high levels of precision. <sup>36</sup>	
Vehicle steering	Higher levels of interaction fidelity can be more fun for users. <sup>3</sup>	Moderately natural techniques can have poorer performance than traditional techniques. <sup>3</sup>
Aiming	Highly natural aiming techniques can have better performance than mouse-based techniques. <sup>38</sup>	
Multiple tasks	High levels of interaction fidelity, when paired with high display fidelity, can have very good performance. <sup>38</sup>	High levels of naturalism may not be beneficial if the overall interface is unfamiliar. <sup>38</sup>
	Users feel that highly natural techniques are more engaging and induce higher levels of presence. <sup>38</sup>	

# Benefits & Limitations of Naturalism (2)

[Bowman, MacMahan, Ragan, CACM Sept 2012]

- Traditional interaction interfaces (2D/desktop/mouse, joystick, etc...)
  - are limited in their potential for naturalism
  - but have minimal HW and sensing requirements and are well established & ubiquitous
- 3D Natural interfaces can be seen as more fun & engaging
- Naturalism is most effective when very high level of fidelity can be achieved and when the user interface is familiar to the user
  - can provide a significant advantage
  - already well-mastered skills
  - ex: travel with head tracking ->
- Hypernatural techniques outperform natural ones. However they may reduce presence, the understanding of actions, and the ability of transfer to real world



# Components of 3D interactions

The three universal tasks:

- Navigation
- Selection
- Manipulation

## Other 3DUI components


- System control
- Symbolic input
- Constraints
- Passive haptic feedback
- Two-handed interaction

# System control

- Sometimes seen as a “catch-all” for 3D interaction techniques other than travel, selection, & manipulation
- Issuing a *command to* :
  - Change the system mode (*interpretation of user input*)
  - Change the system state
- Often composed of other tasks


# Floating menus

- Can occlude environment
- Using 3D selection for a 1D task
- Other types:
  - Rotating menu
  - TULIP (3 items)
- Body-centered enhance usage [Mine97]



# Gestural commands

- Can be “natural”
- limited vocabulary
- Fuzzy recognition issues
  - Usually HMM [Be2009]
  - toolkit: <http://ftm.ircam.fr>
- Gesture as command - doesn't mimic our use of gestures in the real world
- Tradeoff between direct control/fatigue [O2014]
- pen-based sketch can be powerful
- More appropriate in multimodal interfaces (*provide more than one technique, e.g. voice*)




[Andreas Riener IEEE Computer 2012]

# System control design guidelines

- Don't disturb flow of action
- Use consistent spatial reference
- Allow multimodal input (redundancy)
- Structure available functions hierarchically
- Prevent mode errors by giving feedback

# Symbolic input

- Communication of symbols (text, numbers, and other symbols/marks) to the system
- Is this an important task for 3D UIs?



[Celluon 2010]



Pranav Mistry: The thrilling potential of SixthSense technology

Keyboards: miniature, low key-count, etc..

Pen-based: pen stroke recognition

Gestures: sign language, numeric, etc

Speech: single char, whole words, general


# Constraints

- Artificial limitations designed to help users interact more precisely or efficiently
- Examples:
  - Snap-to grid
  - Intelligent virtual objects / tools
  - Single Degree Of Freedom controls
    - projected movement in 1D (translation or rotation)

# Passive haptic feedback/Tangible

- Tangible interfaces
- Props or “near-field” haptics
- Examples:
  - Flight simulator controls
  - Pirates’ steering wheel, cannons
  - Elevator railing
- Increase presence
- improve interaction


(e.g. S. Cuendet 2013)



[ concept of Tokyo Disney attraction, IEEE Comp. 12]

# Two-handed interaction


- Symmetric vs. Asymmetric
- Dominant vs. Non-Dominant hand
- Guiard's principles
  - 1) ND hand provides frame of reference



[Scott Mackenzie 2003]

# Two-handed interaction (2)

- Guiard's principles
  - 2) ND hand used for coarse tasks,  
D hand used for fine grained tasks
  - 3) Manipulation initiated by ND hand



[Ken Hinkley et al 1999]

# Two handed interaction (3)

- Combining gesture recognition and continuous input



- Allows surgeon to explore patient image stack data while operating in a sterile environment [O2014]
- ND hand for mode selection
- D hand for continuous control of image parameters
- Currently experimented clinically

- Pen & tablet

- Involves 2D interaction, two-handed interaction, constraints, and props

- Example: Google Tilt Brush with HTC Vive HMD



# Conclusions

- Usability one of the most crucial issues facing VE applications, including ergonomics (fatigue)
- Implementation details critical to ensure usability
- Simply adapting 2D interfaces is not sufficient
- Strengths of 3D interactions:
  - complex 3D data exploration
  - professional tool gesture / protocole training in 3D
  - touchless interaction (e.g. surgeon, driving,...)
  - simple cases of Rehabilitation & ExerGame

# More work needed on...

- System control performance (e.g. latency)
- Symbolic input
- Mapping interaction techniques to devices
- Integrating interaction techniques into complete UIs
- Development tools for 3D UIs
- research in VR: <http://knowledgebase.cs.vt.edu/>

# [References]

- [A2012] Ferran Argelaguet and Carlos Andujar, A survey of 3D object selection techniques for virtual environments, Computers & Graphics, Elsevier, 2012
- [Be2009] F. Bevilacqua, B. Zamborlin, A. Sypniewski et al., Continuous realtime gesture following and recognition, Springer LNAI 5934, pp 73-84, 2009
- [B2005-2011] D. Bowman, E. Kruijff, J. Laviola, I. Poupirov, 3D user Interface, Addison Wesley 2011, <http://people.cs.vt.edu/~bowman/3dui.org/Home.html>
- [B2007] Bowman, D., McMahan, P.: Virtual Reality: How Much Immersion Is Enough? Computer, 40(7), 36--43 (2007), & Course notes from D. Bowman / Immersion & Presence
- [B2012] Doug A. Bowman, Ryan P. McMahan, and Eric D. Ragan. 2012. Questioning naturalism in 3D user interfaces. Commun. ACM 55, 9 (Sept. 2012), 78-88.
- [F2019] M.Funk, F. Müller, M. Fendrich, M. Shene, M. Kolvenbach, N. Dobbertin, S. Günther, M. Mühlhäuser. 2019. Assessing the Accuracy of Point & Teleport Locomotion with Orientation Indication for Virtual Reality using Curved Trajectories *CHI 2019, May 4–9, 2019, Glasgow, Scotland UK*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 12 pages.
- [O2009] N. Ouramdane, S. Otmane and M. Mallem *Les Techniques d'interaction 3D en Réalité Virtuelle : Etats de l'art*, dans la revue TSI (Techniques et Sciences Informatique), Volume 28, Numéro 8, pages 1017-1049, DOI : 10.3166/TSI.28.1017-1049, Lavoisier, 2009.
- [O2014] K. O'hara et al., Touchless interaction in surgery, CACM 57, 1, 60-77
- [Q2018] Q. Sun, A. Patney, L. Wei, O. Shapira, J.Lu, P. Asente, S. Zhu, M. McGuire, D. Luebke, A. Kaufman. Towards Virtual Reality Infinite Walking: Dynamic Saccadic Redirection. ACM Trans. Graph. 37(4), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3197517.3201294>
- [R2005] Razzaque S., Redirected walking ,PhD UNC 2005
- [Riener 2012] A. Riener, Gestural interaction in vehicular Applications, IEEE Computer 2012
- [Usoh 1999] Usoh et al, walking> walking in place> flying, SIGGRAPH 1999
- [TRV 2006] Traité de Réalité Virtuelle, Ed. P. Fuch, vol 2  
UCL: <http://www0.cs.ucl.ac.uk/research/vr/Projects/Interact/Glossary.htm>  
carpenter demo: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vnILeCYxmCs>