

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgement.....	i
Abstract.....	iii
Executive summary.....	v
Contents.....	ix
List of figures.....	xiv
List of tables.....	xviii
CHAPTER 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Motivation and research goals.....	1
1.1.1 Navigation and its sub-tasks.....	3
1.1.2 Display centricity and viewpoint definition	8
1.2 Definition of terms.....	10
1.3 Dissertation overview.....	15
CHAPTER 2: Literature Overview on Navigation and Orientation.....	17
2.1 Models of navigation.....	18
2.2 Spatial information, spatial knowledge, and cognitive maps.....	21
2.3 Spatial abilities and their measurement.....	23
2.4 Display viewpoint design.....	24
2.4.1 Viewpoint definition.....	24
2.4.2 Display centricity.....	25
2.4.3 2D versus 3D.....	29
2.4.4 Viewpoint tethering.....	34
CHAPTER 3: Dynamic Viewpoint Tethering	40
3.1 Definition and mathematical descriptions.....	41
3.2 Viewpoint responses and display presentation.....	48
3.2.1 Viewpoint responses to avatar’s translational inputs.....	49

3.2.2 Viewpoint responses to avatar’s rotational inputs.....	53
3.3 Display principles and their impact on task types.....	58
3.4 Frequency separated display.....	63
3.5 Tether length and preview information.....	66
3.6 Dynamic tether space.....	69
3.7 Software implementation and hardware setup.....	72
3.8 Hypotheses and experimentation plan.....	75
CHAPTER 4: Experiment 1: Dynamically tethered viewpoint versus conventional viewpoint settings - a baseline experiment.....	78
4.1 Introduction.....	78
4.2 Hypotheses.....	79
4.3 Experiment.....	80
4.3.1 Participants.....	80
4.3.2 Apparatus.....	81
4.3.3 Displays.....	84
4.3.4 Tasks.....	89
4.3.5 Experimental design.....	90
4.3.6 Procedure.....	90
4.4 Results.....	92
4.4.1 Local guidance performance.....	93
4.4.2 Global awareness performance.....	98
4.4.3 Subjective preferences.....	100
4.5 Discussions of results.....	102
4.5.1 Major findings.....	102
4.5.2 Display frame of reference and navigational performance.....	102
4.5.3 Dynamic versus rigid tether.....	105
4.5.4 Problems encountered with subjective evaluations.....	106
CHAPTER 5: Experiment 2: Investigating the dynamic properties of viewpoint tethering: an exploration of tether rigidity and viscosity.....	107

5.1 Objective and hypotheses.....	108
5.2 Method.....	111
5.2.1 Participants.....	111
5.2.2 Apparatus.....	112
5.2.3 Displays.....	115
5.2.4 Tasks.....	116
5.2.5 Experimental Design.....	118
5.2.6 Procedure.....	119
5.3 Results.....	120
5.3.1 Local guidance performance scores in display group A.....	121
5.3.2 Local guidance performance scores in display group B.....	127
5.3.3 Global awareness performance under active flying tasks.....	132
5.3.4 Performance judgement for passive-flying tasks.....	137
5.4 Discussion of results.....	142
5.4.1 Major experimental results.....	142
5.4.2 Consolidation of results in the dynamic tether space.....	143
5.4.3 Tether dynamics and local guidance performance.....	144
5.4.4 Tether gain factors and local guidance performance.....	145
5.4.5 Experiment 1 results revisited.....	150
5.4.6 Tunnel shape recognition as a secondary task.....	152
 CHAPTER 6: Experiment 3: An investigation of the effect of tether length on overall navigational performance.....	 154
6.1 Objectives and hypotheses.....	154
6.2 Spatial abilities and their measurements.....	157
6.3 Method.....	159
6.3.1 Participants.....	159
6.3.2 Apparatus.....	160
6.3.3 Displays.....	161
6.3.4 Tasks.....	163
6.3.5 Experimental design.....	164

6.3.6 Procedure	164
6.4 Results.....	166
6.4.1 Local guidance performance.....	166
6.4.2 Global awareness performance.....	170
6.4.3 Analyzing tunnel shape recognition score using information channel theory.....	172
6.4.4 Individual differences in spatial abilities.....	174
6.5 Discussion of results.....	175
6.5.1 Major findings.....	175
6.5.2 Spatial abilities and their relations to global awareness.....	176
6.5.3 Experiment 2 results revisited.....	177
6.5.4 Optimal tether length.....	178
 CHAPTER 7 Conclusions, Contributions, and Future Research.....	 180
7.1 Experiment summary.....	182
7.2 Limitations.....	186
7.3 Contributions.....	188
7.4 Recommendations for future research.....	190
7.5 Closing remarks.....	193
 REFERENCE.....	 194
 APPENDIX	 210
A1 Experimental protocol, information sheet, and consent form.....	210
A1.1 Experimental protocol.....	210
A1.2 Information sheet	215
A1.3 Consent form.....	216
 A2 Questionnaires.....	 217
A2.1 Demographic questionnaire used in three experiments.....	217
A2.2 Post-trial questionnaire used in experiment 1.....	219

A3 Statistical output (Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results).....	221
A3.1 experiment 1.....	221
A3.2 experiment 2.....	228
A3.3 experiment 3.....	259
A4 Contingency tables.....	263
A5 Regression analysis results from experiment 3.....	270
A6 RMS error and its calculation.....	272

List of Figures

1.1 An example of a composite display solution for presenting information from both egocentric and exocentric frames of reference: snapshots from the PC game DOOM [®] showing a front-forward first-person view and a north-up map view.	6
1.2 Examples of composite displays with differing viewing arrangements.	7
1.3 Centricity Continuum: Illustration of the transition from egocentric to exocentric viewpoints (modified from Milgram and Colquhoun, 1999).	13
2.1 A model of navigation representing the continuum between ego-referenced information, supporting local guidance, and world-referenced information, supporting global awareness. (Adapted from Wickens and Prevelt, 1995.)	20
3.1 Spatial relationships among a virtual tether, a viewpoint, and an avatar.	43
3.2 A single degree of freedom forced mass-spring-damper system.	44
3.3 Transient response of MSD systems with different damping ratios: (a) an under damped system, $\zeta < 1$; (b) a critically damped system, $\zeta = 1$; and (c) an over damped system, $\zeta > 1$.	47
3.4 A Cartesian coordinate system used in describing the translational motions of the avatar and the viewpoint.	50
3.5 Illustrations of viewpoint response to a translational avatar input.	52
3.6 A spherical coordinate system used in describing the viewpoint behaviour in response to rotational inputs from the avatar.	53
3.7 Illustrations of viewpoint response to a rotational avatar input.	56
3.8 Gain plot of a one DOF MSD system.	64
3.9 Sketch illustrating the different amount preview information provided by the two cameras (viewpoints). Given the identical field of view, the long tethered camera 1 provides more preview information (e.g. object B is covered by camera 1) than the short tethered camera 2.	67
3.10 Sketch illustrating the different amount of preview information provided by the two cameras (viewpoints). Given the identical field of view, camera 2 provides more preview information (e.g. object B is covered by camera 2) than camera 1.	68

3.11 Dynamic tether space.	69
3.12 An example of a winding tunnel-like 3D virtual environment used in DTS. a) Outside, exocentric view. b) Inside, tethered view.	73
3.13 Illustration of three rotational degrees of freedom control using a Spaceball: pitch (RX), yaw (RY), and roll (RZ).	74
4.1 Photograph of the experimental setup: wearing a pair of IMAX stereoscopic goggles, a participant uses a Spaceball to interact with the Dynamic Tether Simulator (DTS), rendered on a SGI O2 workstation.	82
4.2 An external view of a typical virtual environment used in Experiment 1. The grid floor has been added here to enhance the 3D perspective in the side view; it was removed from the scene during the experimental testing.	83
4.3 Photo of physical models of the eight virtual tunnels used in Experiment 1.	84
4.4 (a) Screen snapshot of an egocentric viewpoint display used in experiment 1; (b) Spatial relationship between the virtual viewpoint and the avatar.	85
4.5 (a) Screen snapshot of an exocentric display used in experiment 1. (b) Spatial relationship between the virtual viewpoint and the avatar.	86
4.6 (a) Screen snapshot of a rigidly tethered display used in experiment 1. (b) Spatial relationship between the virtual viewpoint and the avatar.	87
4.7 (a) Screen snapshot of a dynamically tethered display used in experiment 1. (b) Spatial relationship between the virtual viewpoint and the avatar.	88
4.8 Overall RMS error across the egocentric, rigidly tethered, dynamically tethered, and exocentric display conditions.	94
4.9 Overall RMS errors summarized across tunnel settings. Each data point is obtained by averaging 12 participants' performance scores.	96
4.10 Global awareness performance scores (i.e. correct judgements in path recognition task) across the four displays.	98
4.11 Average ratings of the four display conditions for the five display usability factors.	100
4.12 Pair-wise preference comparison among four display conditions.	101
4.13 Sample screen views from a tethered viewpoint and an egocentric viewpoint	104

for the same situation, illustrating the different amount of ‘preview’ information available on each viewpoint.

5.1 Tether configurations of the ten display conditions used in Experiment 2.	109
5.2 Examples of tunnels from low and high frequency groups.	114
5.3 Photo of the six miniature tunnel models used in Experiment 2.	114
5.4 Local guidance performance scores (Display: group A, Tunnel: high + low frequency.)	121
5.5 Local guidance performance scores across display group A under low frequency (hatched bars) and high frequency (un-hatched bars) task conditions.	123
5.6 Overall RMS errors produced by each display in group A across high frequency tunnel conditions.	126
5.7 Local guidance performance scores (Display: group B; Tunnel: high + low frequency)	128
5.8 Local guidance performance scores across display group B, under low frequency (hatched bars) and high frequency (un-hatched bars) task conditions.	130
5.9 Overall RMS errors produced by each display in group B across high frequency tunnel conditions.	132
5.10 Tunnel shape recognition scores (Display: Group A; Tunnel: low frequency tunnels (non-hatched bars) and high frequency tunnels (hatched bars)).	134
5.11 Tunnel shape recognition scores (Display: Group B; Tunnel: low frequency tunnels (non-hatched bars) and high frequency tunnels (hatched bars)).	134
5.12 Passive flying performance evaluation scores (Display: Group A; Tunnel: low frequency tasks (hatched bars), high frequency tasks (un-hatched bars)).	139
5.13 Passive flying performance evaluation scores (Display: Group A; Tunnel: low frequency tasks (hatched bars), high frequency tasks (un-hatched bars)).	139
5.14 Global awareness performance scores under passive flying condition (Display: Group A; Tunnel: low frequency (hatched bars), high frequency (un-hatched bars)).	140

5.15 Global awareness performance scores under passive flying condition (Display: Group B; Tunnel: low frequency (hatched bars), high frequency (un-hatched bars)).	141
5.16 Local guidance performance scores plotted as a function of the Spring Constant (K) and Damping Coefficient (C) values.	144
5.17 Tether gain factors versus frequency ratio.	146
5.18 Changes in gain factor for display Group A as task frequency increases.	148
5.19 With increasing tunnel frequency, gain factor of each display in Group B decreases, as indicated by the arrow for the critically damped curve.	150
5.20 Local guidance performance scores across display Group B (critically damped tethered viewpoint displays) with increasing tether rigidity from left to right, averaged over low and high frequency tunnels. The U-shaped curve approximates the performance change in Experiment 2, while the hatched performance bar represents an imaginary level of local guidance performance for the same critically damped tethered viewpoint used in Experiment 1.	152
6.1 Sample questions from Guilford-Zimmerman Aptitude Survey. (a) Spatial orientation test (top), (b) Spatial visualization test (bottom).	159
6.2 Miniature of eight physical tunnel models used for global awareness measure in Experiment 3.	161
6.3 Screen views from the shortest tethered display (left) and the longest tethered display (right) used in Experiment 3.	162
6.4 Local guidance performance scores across six tethered displays.	167
6.5 Overall RMS errors produced by each display across tunnel conditions.	170
6.6 Tunnel shape recognition scores across six tethered displays.	171
6.7 Diagram of an information channel. (Adapted from Sheridan and Ferrell, 1974).	173
6.8 The amount of information (input, output, equivocation, noise, and transmitted) associated with each information channel (i.e. display).	174

List of Tables

2.1 Comparison of experimental results between north-up and track-up map displays.	27
2.2 Experimental result comparison between 3D and 2D display formats.	31
2.3 Experimental comparison of 3D displays with varying viewpoint centrality.	37
4.1 Parameters of rigid and dynamic tethers tested in Experiment 1.	89
4.2 Summary of the overall RMS errors across four displays.	93
4.3 Summary of ANOVA tables for Experiment 1.	94
4.4 Tukey pair-wise test of mean overall RMS errors among display.	95
4.5 Tukey pair-wise comparison for overall RMS errors among tunnels.	96
4.6 Summary of the percentage of correct judgements across four displays.	98
4.7 ANOVA for tunnel shape recognition score across four displays.	99
4.8 Tukey pair-wise test of mean tunnel shape recognition score among tunnels.	99
5.1 Parameters for the dynamically tethered viewpoints compared in Experiment 2.	116
5.2 Overall RMS errors (Display: group A, Tunnel: high + low frequency)	121
5.3 ANOVA table for overall RMS errors (Display: group A, Tunnel: high + low)	122
5.4 Overall RMS errors (Display: group A; Tunnel: high, low frequency separated)	123
5.5 ANOVA for overall RMS errors (Display: group A; Tunnel: low frequency)	124
5.6 ANOVA for overall RMS errors (Display: group A; Tunnel: high frequency)	125
5.7 Tukey's pair-wise comparisons (Display: Group A; Tunnel: high frequency)	125
5.8 Tukey's pair-wise comparisons for overall RMS errors among tunnels (Display: Group A, Tunnel: high frequency)	126
5.9 Overall RMS errors (Display: group B, Tunnel: high + low frequency)	127
5.10 ANOVA table for overall RMS errors (Display: group B, Tunnel: high + low)	128
5.11 Overall RMS errors (Display: B; Tunnel: high, low frequency separated)	129

5.12 ANOVA for overall RMS errors (Display: group B; Tunnel: low frequency)	130
5.13 ANOVA for overall RMS errors (Display: group B; Tunnel: high frequency)	131
5.14 Tukey's pair-wise comparisons (Display: Group B; Tunnel: high frequency)	132
5.15 ANOVA for tunnel shape recognition score (Display: group A; Tunnel: low frequency)	135
5.16 ANOVA for tunnel shape recognition score (Display: group A; Tunnel: high frequency)	135
5.17 ANOVA for tunnel shape recognition score (Display: group B; Tunnel: low frequency)	136
5.18 ANOVA for tunnel shape recognition score (Display: group B; Tunnel: high frequency)	136
5.19 Tukey's pair-wise comparisons (Display: Group B; Tunnel: low frequency)	137
5.20 Local guidance performance scores versus tether gain factors across Group A displays, for constant rigidity (i.e. constant ω_n).	147
5.21 Local guidance performances scores versus tether gain factors across Group B displays (all critically damped, except rigid tether B6).	149
6.1 Parameters configurations of six tethers compared in Experiment 3	162
6.2 Overall RMS errors across six displays	167
6.3 ANOVA for overall RMS error across six tethered displays	168
6.4 Tukey's pair-wise comparisons for overall RMS error score among tethered displays.	168
6.5 Tukey's pair-wise comparisons for overall RMS error score among tunnels.	169
6.6 Tunnel shape recognition scores across six displays	171
6.7 ANOVA for overall RMS error across six tethered displays	171
6.8 Tukey's pair-wise comparisons for tunnel shape recognition score	172

6.9 Information (input, output, equivocation, noise, and transmitted) associated with each information channel (i.e. display).	173
6.10 Participants' spatial orientation and spatial visualization scores using Guilford-Zimmerman Aptitude Survey.	175
6.11 Sample coefficient of determination, R^2 , obtained from the regression analysis.	175