HCI Research in Augmented Reality

Philipp Wacker
Media Computing Group
RWTH Aachen University

Summer term 2016

http://hci.rwth-aachen.de/cthci

A New User Interface Paradigm

- Beginnings in the 1960's, then into research labs, and since 2005 in commercial applications
- Driven by improvement in display and tracking technologies
- Information is integrated into the user's perception of the real world
- No standard input devices
- Towards an invisible interface



Definition

- Characteristics for AR system [Azuma, 97]
  - Combines real and virtual objects in a real environment
  - Registers (aligns) real and virtual objects with each other
  - Runs interactively and in real time

Mixed Reality Continuum



- Reality–Virtuality continuum [Milgram & Kishino, 94]
  - In AV and VE/VR the surrounding environment is virtual, in AR the surrounding environment is real
  - Other AR variants: mediated reality, e.g., diminished reality

AR != VR

Copyright 2010 Jan Herling

Herling ISMAR '10

AR Advantages

- Simplifying and enhance people's lives by integrating virtual information in their surroundings
- Enhances people's perception and interaction with the world
- Substitute missing senses
  - Example, augmenting the sight of blind users or users with poor vision by the use of audio

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Building Block of AR Systems

- Technologies
- Authoring tools
- Interaction techniques
- Applications
- Usability and experiences

Technologies

- Display technologies
  - Show virtual objects overlaying the real world in 3D space
  - Head mounted, spatial, handheld displays [Bimber & Raskar, 05]
- Tracking (and registration) technologies
  - To register virtual objects in 3D space and track user input
  - Track the (a) scene (b) the user's 6DOF viewpoint (head and/or eyes), (c) the user's hands/body for input, and (d) input devices

Head Mounted Displays

- Optical see-though (glasses or contact lenses)
  - Direct and better view of the world, safer
- Video see-through
  - Occlusion, wider field of view, better registration and calibration, no perceived delays
- Advantages: hands free interaction
- Disadvantages: wearing it (socially and physically), brightness



Optical see-through



Video see-through

Spatial and Handheld Displays

- Spatially aligned displays or projectors
  - Can be wearable
  - Advantages: provide public displays and project on irregular surfaces
  - Disadvantages: brightness, focus, resolution, FOV, and contrast
- Handheld displays
- Other displays: haptic, tactile, and audio



[Mistry et al., SIGRAPH 09]

Spatial and Handheld Displays

- Spatially aligned displays or projectors
  - Can be wearable
  - Advantages: provide public displays and project on irregular surfaces
  - Disadvantages: brightness, focus, resolution, FOV, and contrast
- Handheld displays
- Other displays: haptic, tactile, and audio

Bimber et al., SIGGRAPH, 01

RWTHAACHEN UNIVERSITY

Spatial and Handheld Displays

- Spatially aligned displays or projectors
  - Can be wearable
  - Advantages: provide public displays and project on irregular surfaces
  - Disadvantages: brightness, focus, resolution, FOV, and contrast
- Handheld displays
- Other displays: haptic, tactile, and audio

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Go9rf9GmYpM

Comparison

	HMD Video see-through	HMD Optical see-through	Projectors	Handheld
Pros.	visual control, sync., less dependent on environment	more natural perception	displays directly onto physical objects' surfaces	portable, widespread, powerful, camera, tracking
Cons.	camera and processing, unnatural perception	time lag, jitter of virtual image	(+/-) not user dependent	small display

[Carmigniani et al., 11]

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Tracking and Register Technologies

- Track the user's viewpoint 6DOF (X, Y, Z, Roll, Pitch, Yaw) and update the appearance of virtual objects
- Register virtual objects in 3D and reduce lag
- Inertial sensors: Compasses, accelerometers, gyroscope, etc.
- Active sensors: GPS, Wifi, ultrasonic, etc.
- Optical/visual tracking
  - Marker-based, e.g., fiducial
  - Markless-based (infrared or camera), e.g., computer vision methods and depth cameras

[Reitmayr et al., AUIC '03]



[Heller et al., CHI 14]

Tracking Criteria and Challenges

- Criteria
  - Accuracy, tethering, cost, 6DOF, noisiness, resolution/range
- Challenges
  - Jitter, occlusion, brightness, user and environment changes, latency, ease of calibration
- Choice of tracking technology depends on AR System (fixed/mobile, indoor/outdoor)

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Authoring Tools

- Tracking libraries, e,g., ARToolKit, Vuforia, Wikitude
- 3D rendering engine for designing virtual objects
- IDE for design AR scenes
- Compete systems, e.g., AMIRE, BuildAR, Wikitude Studio
- Visual programming: AR to design AR, e.g., iaTAR [Lee et al., 04] use real objects to to design AR scenes

AR Systems and Experiences

- Categorizing AR systems help make design decisions regarding the display, tracking technology, input technique, and application
- Outdoor AR
  - Information browsers and navigation
- Indoor location based AR
- Handheld AR
- Carmigniani and Furht categorized AR systems into five categories
  - Fixed indoor systems, fixed outdoor systems, mobile indoor systems, mobile outdoor systems, and mobile indoor and outdoor systems

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Mobile AR

- Features
  - Enable user to focus on task rather than UI
  - Present private information
  - When wearable: keep hands free
- Location access: Geo-location, object recognition, image processing, and dynamic tracking
- Apps (mobile browsers)
  - Navigation, public transportation, social media tags, coupons and commercial offers, games, wikipedia, tourism
- Obstacles: GPS accuracy and limited screen





AR Interaction

- Interaction tasks
  - 2D tasks: text entry, selection, position, and quantify [Foley]
  - 3D tasks: navigation, pointing and selection, manipulation (drag, rotate, scale), and data input [Bowman]
- Input devices
  - Tangibles, heterogeneous devices (other displays), specially designed devices
- Input modalities
  - Gestures, speech, eye movement, brain signals
- Techniques or Metaphors

Viewpoint Control

- Using basic 2D and 3D tasks
- Used in navigation apps, information browsers, guidance interfaces
- Manipulate the view of the AR environment but not the content

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Free 3D Hand Interaction

- Track 6DOF of user head and hand
- Manipulate virtual objects in 3D space
- Natural interaction
- No tactile feedback



RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Multimodal Input

- Multimodal free hand and speech to control 3D virtual objects
- Experimental setup (Wizard of Oz) [Lee & Billinghurst, 08]
  - Tasks: change object color, location, and shape
  - IV: speech only, gesture only, multimodal
  - DV: time, error, preference
- Results
  - Multimodal was faster, and more preferred, with no difference in error count
  - Speech is good of quantity and modal commands, e.g., change color
  - Gestures are good for quality and spatial manipulation



RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Handheld Finger Tracking

- Compared finger tracking with touch input on mobile devices for a grab-move-place gesture [Hürst et al., 13]
- Finger tracking was slower and less accurate
  - Nature of interaction (grab vs. tap)
  - Reduced feedback (tactile and visual) when the user is reaching out to the virtual object
  - Absolute position of virtual objects in 3D
- A simple buzzer on the finger tips can provide valuable haptic feedback when finger tips intersect with virtual objects [Buchmann et al., 04]







Handheld Hand Tracking

- Compared hand tracking with touch input on mobile devices for 3D manipulation tasks [Bai et al., 14]
- 3D gesture are slower but more preferred
    - Touch 3 axis movements faster than locating object in 3D space and 1 spatial movement for scaling and translation
    - No significant differences in placement errors
    - 3D easy to learn but causes physical stress







Task completion time (error bar: SE).

Handheld Device Interaction

Tangible AR

- Combine TUI with AR
- User physical objects to control virtual objects
- 1:1 or 1:* physical virtual mapping



[Kawashima et al., ISMAR 01]

Natural Interface

- Interfaces for treatment exposure (Kinect) [Corbett-Davies et al., 13]
- Model the scene
- Track the body
- Apply physical simulation engine on virtual objects

Applications

Applications

- Entertainment
- Marketing
- Medical
- Maintenance and assembly
- Training
- Museums guides
- Navigation

[Bichlmeier et al., ISMAR 07]



[Anderson at al., UIST 13]

Training Apps

Marner 3DUI '10

Training Apps

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DsZ-9opi150

Museum and Exhibit Navigators

- Rich information
- On the move
- Support several languages
- No need to wait in line

Bichlmeier IEEE ‘07

Geographic and Navigation Information Systems

- Augmented Maps
  - Represent the environment in a more natural and representative fashion
- Augmented Territories
  - Augment the environment itself to enhance users' interaction
  - Sea navigation
  - Road navigation
  - Augmenting underground constructions
  - Indoor navigation



RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

User Evaluation

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

User-based Studies in AR

- Based on work conducted by Swan and Gabbard, most AR user evaluations fit into one of four categories:
  - Low-level tasks: understanding human perception and cognition in AR contexts
  - User task performance: how AR technology could impact underlying tasks
  - Examine user interaction and collaboration
  - System usability

Evaluation Methods in AR

- Objective measurements
  - Measured numbers, reliable and repeatable, e.g., completion time, accuracy, object position
- Subjective measurements
  - Subjective judgment of people, e.g., from questionnaire and rankings

Gabbard and Swan, IEEE Trans. ‘08



[Knörlein et al., ISMAR 09]

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Evaluation Methods in AR

[Morrison et al., CHI 09]

- Qualitative analysis
  - Data is gathered through observations and interviews
- Non User-Based techniques
  - Such as cognitive walkthroughs or heuristic evaluations with experts
- Informal testing
  - Reporting observations gathered during demonstration

Visualisation Challenges

1. Depth sensing techniques
   - Occlusion paradox
   - Context preservation



Livingston ISMAR ‘03



Kalkofen ISMAR ‘07

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Visualisation Challenges



Mendez, '10:

2. Attention direction techniques

   - Overlays, e.g., using arrows and circles; (+) visibility, (-) increase visual clutter
   - Pixel-based, e.g., by manipulating the brightness, contrast, size, etc of parts of the image; (+) maintain scenes from visual pollution, (-) hard to perform in real time

Visualisation Challenges

3. View management

- How information should be represented in digital displays to avoid/decrease visual clutter, distortion, and occlusion
- Related object properties: visibility, position, size, transparency, and priority



Future Research in AR



- Improve technology: tracking systems and displays
- New seamless and natural interaction techniques
  - Context aware and more intelligent [Billinghurst]
- Understand human perception and attention models
- Study the effect of AR on fatigue and strain
- Social acceptance
- Privacy
- Methodologies to analyze AR systems and manifests their value [Wilson et al., 06]

"The ultimate display would, of course, be a room within which the computer can control the existence of matter. A chair displayed in such a room would be good enough to sit on. Handcuffs displayed in such a room would be confining, and a bullet displayed in such a room would be fatal. With appropriate programming such a display could literally be the Wonderland into which Alice walked."

–Ivan Sutherland in 1965

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY

Referenced Literature 1/2

- Azuma, Ronald T. "A survey of augmented reality." Presence 6.4 (1997): 355-385.
- Milgram, Paul, and Fumio Kishino. "A taxonomy of mixed reality visual displays." IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Information and Systems 77.12 (1994): 1321-1329.
- Bimber, Oliver, and Ramesh Raskar. Spatial augmented reality: merging real and virtual worlds. Vol. 6. Wellesley, MA: AK Peters, 2005.
- Carmigniani, Julie, et al. "Augmented reality technologies, systems and applications." Multimedia Tools and Applications 51.1 (2011): 341-377.
- Lee, Gun A., et al. "Immersive authoring of tangible augmented reality applications." Proceedings of the 3rd IEEE/ACM international Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality. IEEE Computer Society, 2004.
- Lee, Minkyung, and Mark Billinghurst. "A Wizard of Oz study for an AR multimodal interface." Proceedings of the 10th international conference on Multimodal interfaces. ACM, 2008.
- Hürst, Wolfgang, and Kevin Vriens. "Mobile Augmented Reality Interaction via Finger Tracking in a Board Game Setting." MobileHCI2013 AR-workshop, Designing Mobile Augmented Reality. 2013.

Referenced Literature 2/2

- Buchmann, Volkert, et al. "FingARtips: gesture based direct manipulation in Augmented Reality." Proceedings of the 2nd international conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques in Australasia and South East Asia. ACM, 2004.
- Bai, Huidong, et al. "3D gesture interaction for handheld augmented reality." SIGGRAPH Asia 2014 Mobile Graphics and Interactive Applications. ACM, 2014.
- Corbett-Davies, Sam, et al. "An advanced interaction framework for augmented reality based exposure treatment." Virtual Reality (VR), 2013 IEEE. IEEE, 2013.
- Gabbard, Joseph L., et al. "An empirical user-based study of text drawing styles and outdoor background textures for augmented reality." Virtual Reality, 2005. Proceedings. VR 2005. IEEE. IEEE, 2005.
- Sutherland, Ivan E. "The ultimate display." Multimedia: From Wagner to virtual reality (1965).