

# Parallel Reality: Tandem Exploration of Real & Virtual Environments

CJ Davies



University of  
St Andrews

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree of PhD  
at the University of St Andrews

March 2015

## **1. Candidates declarations**

I, CJ Davies, hereby certify that this thesis, which is approximately 27 words in length, has been written by me, and that it is the record of work carried out by me, or principally by myself in collaboration with others as acknowledged, and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for a higher degree.

I was admitted as a research student in [month, year] and as a candidate for the degree of PhD in [month, year]; the higher study for which this is a record was carried out in the University of St Andrews between 2011 and 2015.

Date

Signature of candidate

## **2. Supervisors declaration**

I hereby certify that the candidate has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution and Regulations appropriate for the degree of PhD in the University of St Andrews and that the candidate is qualified to submit this thesis in application for that degree.

Date

Signature of supervisor

## **3. Permission for publication**

In submitting this thesis to the University of St Andrews I understand that I am giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. I also understand that the title and the abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be made and supplied to any bona fide library or research worker, that my thesis will be electronically accessible for personal or research use unless exempt by award of an embargo as requested below, and that the library has the right to migrate my thesis into new electronic forms as required to ensure continued access to the thesis. I have obtained any third-party copyright permissions that may be required in order to allow such access and migration, or have requested the appropriate embargo below.

The following is an agreed request by candidate and supervisor regarding the publication of this thesis:

- a. No embargo on print copy.

Date

Signature of candidate

Signature of supervisor

# Abstract

This thesis discusses the development of a system that allows its user to observe & move around their real world environment whilst wearing equipment that allows them to alternatively view an immersive virtual reality environment from the equivalent vantage point. This style of interaction with complete real & virtual environments is presented as a new category of alternate reality, called parallel reality. The position of parallel reality is established in relation to previously explored alternate realities & analysis & discussion of results from preliminary user studies of the system are presented.

# Acknowledgements

DRAFT

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Extended Example</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Background, Theory &amp; Rationale</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1	Defining Alternate Realities . . . . .	12
3.1.1	Milgram et al.'s Reality-Virtuality Continuum . . . . .	13
3.1.2	Roy Want's Virtuality Matrix . . . . .	14
3.1.3	Steve Mann's Venn Diagrams . . . . .	15
3.2	Summary of Alternate Reality Definitions . . . . .	16
3.3	Additional Alternate Reality Terms . . . . .	17
3.3.1	HyperReality . . . . .	17
3.3.2	PolySocial Reality . . . . .	18
3.4	Cross Reality . . . . .	19
3.4.1	Alternate Reality Definitions from Cross Reality . . . . .	20
3.4.2	Position of Cross Reality . . . . .	21
3.5	Parallel Reality . . . . .	22
3.5.1	Spatial Equivalence in Parallel Reality . . . . .	23
3.6	Summary of Additional Alternate Reality Definitions . . . . .	25
3.7	Presence . . . . .	25
3.7.1	Waterworth & Waterworth's three dimensions of virtual experience . . . . .	25
3.8	Transitions in Parallel Reality . . . . .	27
3.8.1	Transitions using the Combined Model . . . . .	28
3.9	The Case for Parallel Reality . . . . .	29
3.10	Conclusions . . . . .	29
<b>4</b>	<b>A Virtual Time Window</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1	Virtual Heritage . . . . .	31
4.1.1	Alternate Reality Techniques in Virtual Heritage . . . . .	32
4.2	Virtual Heritage at the University of St Andrews . . . . .	34
4.3	Applying Parallel Reality to Virtual Heritage . . . . .	36
4.4	The Virtual Time Window . . . . .	37
4.4.1	Adapting the Second Life Client . . . . .	38
4.5	Orientation Control . . . . .	38
4.5.1	Exploiting Second Life's Joystick Support . . . . .	39
4.6	Position Control . . . . .	39
4.6.1	OpenSim RegionModule . . . . .	40
4.7	Modifying Second Life for Orientation & Position Control . . . . .	40
4.8	Using the Virtual Time Window . . . . .	42

<b>5 Mirrorshades - Development</b>	<b>47</b>
5.0.1 Case Study - St Salvator's Chapel . . . . .	47
5.1 The Mirrorshades Platform . . . . .	49
5.1.1 Implementation . . . . .	49
5.1.2 Hardware Components . . . . .	50
5.1.3 Software Components . . . . .	50
5.1.4 Integration of Components . . . . .	51
5.2 Investigation 1 - The Case for Mobile XR . . . . .	51
5.2.1 Setting & Task . . . . .	51
5.2.2 Evaluation Techniques . . . . .	51
5.2.3 Hypothesis . . . . .	52
5.2.4 Transition Methods . . . . .	52
5.2.5 Experimental Task & Setting . . . . .	55
5.2.6 Evaluation . . . . .	55
<b>6 Mirrorshades - Evaluation</b>	<b>58</b>
6.1 The Case for Mobile XR . . . . .	58
6.2 Process . . . . .	58
6.3 The Scenarios . . . . .	59
6.4 Hypotheses . . . . .	59
6.5 SUS . . . . .	60
6.6 12-item Questionnaire . . . . .	60
6.7 Log data . . . . .	61
6.8 Interviews . . . . .	61
6.9 Phase 1 Results . . . . .	61
6.9.1 Pre-task Questionnaire . . . . .	61
6.9.2 SUS . . . . .	62
6.9.3 12-item Questionnaire . . . . .	63
6.9.4 Participant 1 . . . . .	64
6.9.5 Participant 3 . . . . .	66
6.9.6 Participant 4 . . . . .	68
6.9.7 Participant 5 . . . . .	69
6.9.8 Participant 6 . . . . .	71
6.10 Phase 2.1 Results . . . . .	74
6.10.1 Participant 7 . . . . .	75
6.10.2 Participant 8 . . . . .	76
6.10.3 Participant 9 . . . . .	78
6.10.4 Participant 10 . . . . .	80
6.10.5 Participant 11 . . . . .	82
6.10.6 Participant 12 . . . . .	84
6.10.7 Participant 13 . . . . .	86
6.11 Phase 2.2 Results . . . . .	88
6.11.1 Participant 14 . . . . .	89
6.11.2 Participant 15 . . . . .	91
6.11.3 Participant 16 . . . . .	93
6.11.4 Participant 17 . . . . .	95
<b>7 Conclusions &amp; Discussion</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>98</b>

# List of Figures

3.1	<i>Reality-Virtuality continuum</i> (top), parallel with <i>Extent of World Knowledge continuum</i> (bottom) . . . . .	13
3.2	Want's original virtuality matrix . . . . .	14
3.3	Modified Want matrix . . . . .	14
3.4	Original Mann Venn diagram . . . . .	16
3.5	Modified Mann Venn diagram . . . . .	16
3.6	Further modified Mann Venn diagram . . . . .	18
3.7	Side view of the virtual Shadow Lab . . . . .	20
3.8	A Ubiquitous Sensor Portal . . . . .	20
3.9	The “ <i>virtual worlds taxonomy as viewed on the real-virtual axis</i> ” presented by Lifton . . . . .	20
3.10	Lifton’s taxonomy as modified by this review . . . . .	21
3.11	Sensor/actuator infrastructure merging a real & a virtual environment, creating XR . . . . .	21
3.12	AR visualised using the virtuality continuum . . . . .	22
3.13	The two environments that comprise a XR system . . . . .	22
3.14	A XR system with the user attending to RW stimuli . . . . .	22
3.15	A XR system with the user attending to VR stimuli . . . . .	23
3.16	The two environments that comprise a XR system, plus the bidirectional information flow between them . . . . .	23
3.17	The combined virtuality continuum/three dimensions of virtual experience model . . . . .	26
3.18	Operation of a PR system represented upon the combined model . . . . .	28
4.1	Taxonomical space of visualization strategies used in cultural heritage . . . . .	32
4.2	Coordinate sets for each approach within the taxonomical space (figure 4.1) . . . . .	33
4.3	St Andrews cathedral today . . . . .	35
4.4	St Andrews cathedral reconstruction . . . . .	35
4.5	Linlithgow Palace today . . . . .	35
4.6	Linlithgow Palace reconstruction . . . . .	35
4.7	Mosfell Viking Longhouse . . . . .	35
4.8	Longhouse interior . . . . .	35
4.9	Caen Township . . . . .	36
4.10	Caen Township wireframe detail . . . . .	36
4.11	Virtual humans in cathedral reconstruction . . . . .	36
4.12	Conversing with virtual humans . . . . .	36
4.13	School students learning via a reconstruction . . . . .	37
4.14	VTTP installation at Timespan . . . . .	37
4.15	OVW via Oculus Rift . . . . .	37
4.16	Museum workshop . . . . .	37
4.17	Example wiring for Arduino with HMC6343 for joystick operation . . . . .	39
4.18	Assembled Arduino + HMC6343 ‘joystick’ . . . . .	40
4.19	Configuration in Second Life client for Arduino + HMC6343 ‘joystick’ . . . . .	41

4.20 Example wiring for Arduino with HMC6343 + u-blox MAX-6. . . . .	43
4.21 Assembled Arduino/sensors. . . . .	43
4.22 Arduino/sensors attached to tablet. . . . .	43
4.23 Config pane in modified Second Life client for HMC6343 + MAX-6. . . . .	44
4.24 OpenSim Server & wireless AP. . . . .	44
4.25 VTW at the cathedral. . . . .	44
5.1 Floor plan of St Salvator's chapel, with IPS routes. . . . .	48
5.2 Overview of the Mirrorshades platform. . . . .	49
5.3 Implementation of Mirrorshades platform. . . . .	49
5.4 HMD with stereo camera solution. . . . .	50
5.5 Positions (black circles) reported whilst walking a slow lap ( $< 1\text{ms}^{-1}$ , following gray path) of a departmental building. The building is approximately 40m wide by 30m tall. . . . .	52
5.6 Hard switch. . . . .	53
5.7 Switch with linear interpolation. . . . .	53
5.8 Analogue selectable opacity. . . . .	54
5.9 Periodic hard switches. . . . .	54
5.10 Hard switch from reduced maximum opacity. . . . .	55
6.1 The path & positions within the chapel that participants are instructed to attend to. . . . .	60
6.2 SUS results. . . . .	62
6.3 12-item questionnaire results. . . . .	63
6.4 Some images, yeah. . . . .	64
6.5 Some images, yeah. . . . .	65
6.6 Some images, yeah. . . . .	66
6.7 Some images, yeah. . . . .	67
6.8 Some images, yeah. . . . .	68
6.9 Some images, yeah. . . . .	69
6.10 Some images, yeah. . . . .	70
6.11 Some images, yeah. . . . .	71
6.12 Some images, yeah. . . . .	72
6.13 Some images, yeah. . . . .	73
6.14 Some images, yeah. . . . .	75
6.15 Some images, yeah. . . . .	76
6.16 Some images, yeah. . . . .	77
6.17 Some images, yeah. . . . .	78
6.18 Some images, yeah. . . . .	79
6.19 Some images, yeah. . . . .	80
6.20 Some images, yeah. . . . .	81
6.21 Some images, yeah. . . . .	82
6.22 Some images, yeah. . . . .	83
6.23 Some images, yeah. . . . .	84
6.24 Some images, yeah. . . . .	85
6.25 Some images, yeah. . . . .	86
6.26 Some images, yeah. . . . .	87
6.27 Some images, yeah. . . . .	89
6.28 Some images, yeah. . . . .	90
6.29 Some images, yeah. . . . .	91
6.30 Some images, yeah. . . . .	92
6.31 Some images, yeah. . . . .	93
6.32 Some images, yeah. . . . .	94
6.33 Some images, yeah. . . . .	95

6.34 Some images, yah. . . . .	96
--------------------------------	----

DRAFT

# 1

## Introduction

*"If the chaos of the nineties reflects a radical shift in the paradigms of visual literacy, the final shift away from the Lascaux/Gutenberg tradition of a pre-holographic society, what should we expect from this newer technology, with his promise of discrete encoding and subsequent reconstruction of the full range of sensory perception?"*

*Burning Chrome, William Gibson*

2

## Extended Example

*“There’s no there, there. They taught that to children, explaining cyberspace.”*

*Mona Lisa Overdrive, William Gibson*

\*\*\*Second Earth parallel reality example, think about what that person at DEMOfest was saying about being able to walk around Paris & at any moment/location to transition into what it was like in the past.

*“The implication of HR is that, wherever you are, you can always be somewhere else”* - HyperReality p149

# 3

## Background, Theory & Rationale

“Where are you?” Hiro says.

“In Reality or the Metaverse?”

“Both.”

*Snow Crash, Neal Stephenson*

The subject of this thesis is the design, development & evaluation of a platform that allows its user to observe & move around their real environment whilst also being able to view an alternative virtual environment from the equivalent vantage point. This combination of real & virtual environments, combined with maintained user mobility, is not well encapsulated by any previously defined alternate reality terminology. It is therefore necessary to explore this terminology in order to correctly frame this new system in relation to them.

The closest existing label is the ‘cross reality’ paradigm; a cross reality system holds the distinction of two discrete environments, one real & one virtual, both complete unto themselves, however cross reality further focusses on a bidirectional exchange of information between the environments & not upon user mobility & tandem visual exploration of both environments.

The term ‘parallel reality’ is proposed to refer to systems such as that developed in this thesis, which combine complete real & virtual environments together in a manner that allows mobile exploration of them both in tandem, relating it & positioning it against previously explored alternate reality terminology.

### 3.1 Defining Alternate Realities

Alternate realities, any situations in which the environmental stimuli received by a subject have been somehow modified or mediated, have received substantial attention in recent decades. These themes have been explored for purposes as diverse as education [1] & new forms of data visualisation [2] to medical [3] & military training [4] in addition to entertainment [5]. Although terms such as *mixed reality* & *augmented reality* are now relatively common, both in the literature & in the mainstream, definitions of such terms have often been used in vague & even conflicting manners.

This chapter investigates popular definitions, classifications & comparisons of alternate realities, combining & modifying these parameters to produce a canonical set of definitions for the remainder of this thesis, allowing *parallel reality* to be introduced into a sound classification framework.

The concept of *telepresence* is not included in this discussion, as it is not deemed representative of an *alternate reality* but rather the ability for a user to experience a sense of presence at a real location remote to them [6]. \*\*\*Check that this is a valid citation for this!

### 3.1.1 Milgram et al.'s Reality-Virtuality Continuum

Milgram et al. addressed the issue of alternate reality definitions in detail and can be accredited with introducing the terms *augmented virtuality* and *mixed reality* to the literature, prompted by their identification of the need for more encompassing terms to supplement the existing definitions of augmented reality [7, 8].

One of the overbearing concepts introduced by Milgram et al. is that whilst both purely real and purely virtual environments do exist they should not be considered discrete alternatives but rather poles lying at opposite ends of a linear scale that stretches from an entirely real environment at one extreme to an ontologically parallel but entirely virtual environment [9] at the other - the *Reality-Virtuality continuum* (figure 3.1, top). The location of an environment along this continuum coincides with its location along a parallel *Extent of World Knowledge continuum* (figure 3.1, bottom), where 'world knowledge' refers to the amount of quantitative information that is associated with the content being presented, or in other words how much of the environment is being 'modelled' by a computer.




Figure 3.1: *Reality-Virtuality continuum* (top), parallel with *Extent of World Knowledge continuum* (bottom).

With a purely virtual environment, the entire viewport must necessarily be computer modelled in order to be rendered and as such there is complete quantitative information about & between all objects being presented. At the opposite end of the spectrum with a completely real environment where none of the viewport is computer modelled there is no quantitative information associated with the content being displayed. At any point between the extremes the environment consists of a mixture of some modelled and some non-modelled content, the computer associating quantitative information to, and between, the virtual objects, but not to the real objects or between the virtual and real objects.

Carrying the continuum concept further, Milgram et al. illustrate their understanding of augmented reality and also introduce two related new terms; augmented virtuality and mixed reality. In this fashion, mixed reality is used to describe any environment that is not completely real or completely virtual; that is, it encompasses all positions on the continuum between the extremes. Augmented reality is used to describe a real environment upon which virtual objects are overlaid and augmented virtuality is used to describe a virtual environment upon which objects sampled from the real world (such as video feeds) are overlaid. It is also shown here that mixed reality encompasses both augmented reality and augmented virtuality.

An obvious question raised from studying this figure is at what point toward the centre of the continuum an environment changes from being augmented reality into augmented virtuality or vice-versa. The answer lies with consideration of the quantitative knowledge associated with the objects that comprise the viewport.

For example, if one were to take a viewport depicting a purely real environment and then incrementally add more and more virtual objects, the environment's classification would progress rightward along the continuum. Eventually the entire viewport would be obscured by virtual objects and the obvious conclusion would be to classify the environment as being purely virtual. However this would only be true if there was complete quantitative information associated with, and between, all of the virtual objects within the real 3D space of the viewport, which is unlikely to be the case.

Likewise if one were to take a viewport depicting a purely virtual environment and incrementally replace the entire viewport with sampled real objects we could not classify the resultant environment as purely real as there would be associated quantitative knowledge with and between the sampled objects, meaning that the environment isn't completely unmodelled and thus could not be classified as purely real.

Thus, Milgram et al. conclude it is not necessarily true that an environment is purely virtual simply because all of the visible objects are computer modelled, nor is it necessarily true that an environment is purely real simply because all of the visible objects are sampled from the real world.

### 3.1.2 Roy Want's Virtuality Matrix

Another method of illustrating the relationships between different categories of alternate realities was put forward by Roy Want in his introductory article for a 2009 issue of IEEE Pervasive Computing dedicated to the *cross reality* paradigm [10]. He presents a 2x2 matrix categorising the different terms according to whether the experience and overlay data are real or virtual (figure ??). Whilst this is a useful representation, some of the definitions & criteria depicted do not match with those of Milgram et al. or even with those of other authors in the same issue of Pervasive, let alone other publications concerning alternate realities. Figure ?? presents a modified version of this matrix that is in keeping with the framework laid out by Milgram et al. & the wider literature.

	Experience virtual	Experience real
Overlay data real	Cross Reality	Embodied Virtuality
Overlay data virtual	Mixed Reality	Virtual Reality
		Augmented Reality

Figure 3.2: Want's original virtuality matrix.

	Experience virtual	Experience real
Overlay data real	Augmented Virtuality	Reality
Overlay data virtual	Virtual Reality	Augmented Reality
		Experience real

Figure 3.3: Modified Want matrix.

Where the original matrix positions cross reality in the upper left quadrant, at the congruence of 'experience virtual' and 'overlay data real', the modified matrix positions augmented virtuality. Referencing Milgram's continuum, 'experience virtual' relates to a position somewhere within the right half, while 'overlay data real' relates to presentation over this necessarily virtual environment of sampled real world data, resulting in a partially modelled environment, leaving us in the area of the continuum occupied by augmented virtuality.

The original matrix also features the term embodied virtuality in the upper right quadrant, at the congruence of 'experience real world' and 'overlay data real'. Want explains that this is an alternative term for *ubiquitous computing* which is "*essentially the opposite of VR*". The modified matrix adopts the position that the opposite of virtual reality is simply reality and that ubiquitous computing does not constitute an alternate reality but rather a different model of human-computer interaction (that can be implemented in

either reality or augmented reality, depending upon how the computing infrastructure presents information to the user). A ubiquitous computing system is necessarily a real environment, as it is by definition the integration and dissemination of computational infrastructure into our real surrounds [11]. However whether this real environment is augmented by virtual objects is not restricted by the concept.

Finally the modified matrix removes the central mixed reality section from the original matrix, as its position is misleading. As the boundaries formed between the categories by the different colours could be construed as meaning that there are discrete boundaries between the different categories, the reader could be led to believe that a purely virtual reality environment can be considered mixed reality, which is incorrect. If one wished to picture the position of mixed reality in relation to the modified matrix, it would cover the same area as enclosed by the union of the augmented virtuality and augmented reality regions.

### 3.1.3 Steve Mann's Venn Diagrams

Steve Mann, the “*father of wearable computing*” [12] & one of a group of researchers at MIT that became known as ‘cyborgs’ for their body-worn computers & always-on Internet connections [13], presented a Venn diagram to illustrate the relationships between the different categories of alternate realities when reviewing the problems that arise with existing taxonomies when discussing reality-modifying devices. Mann clarifies the use of the term ‘mediated reality’ as “... *a general framework for artificial modification of human perception by way of devices for augmenting, deliberately diminishing, and more generally, for otherwise altering sensory input*” [14]. Mediated reality thus encompasses all of mixed reality, but also the group of *modulated reality* which covers devices such as eyeglasses that use lenses/mirrors to invert the wearer’s view, but do not apply computer mediation.

Mann’s Venn diagram (figure 3.4) places augmented reality at a subset of mixed reality, but then further places virtual reality at a subset of augmented reality & in turn mixed reality. A modified version of this diagram (figure 3.5) removes virtual reality from this position, as although virtual reality is by definition mediated, it is not necessarily always presented as part of an augmented or mixed reality, as purely virtual environments can & do exist - Mann himself states that “*mixed reality exists in many forms along a continuum from augmented reality ... to more recent efforts at augmented virtuality*”, which is contrary to the diagram’s representation of virtual reality as necessarily a subset of augmented reality & in turn of mixed reality. Furthermore the modified diagram introduces augmented virtuality, mentioned by Mann in his prose but not included in the original diagram. An overlap is also introduced between those modulated reality environments that are also classified as mixed reality, as it is perplexing to think of a mixed reality environment that is neither augmented reality nor augmented virtuality (at least when considering a wholly real environment & a wholly virtual environment as the logically possible extremes, as in Milgram et al.’s continuum).

Visualising the position of the basic classes of reality & virtual reality using this same method requires more drastic alteration to the Venn diagram, but is diagnostic in further revealing the relationships between the terms covered in Mann’s literature. The further modified Venn diagram (figure 3.6) shows that;

- mixed reality is the intersection of reality & virtual reality;
- mediated reality can be comprised from purely real or purely virtual content;
- all virtual reality is necessarily mediated;
- modulated reality can comprise only mediated real, or both real & virtual aspects in a mixed reality;
- augmented reality & augmented virtuality can feature in modulated reality systems.

This final iteration of the Venn diagram still contains ambiguity, however it is more diagnostic for categorising the majority of alternate reality systems than the previous two diagrams, whilst also avoiding over-complication. There are two ambiguities to recognise. First, this diagram maintains from the original diagram positions in which a system can exist that is both mixed & modulated, but which is neither augmented reality nor augmented virtuality. Second, this diagram does not accommodate a purely virtual environment that is then modulated: whether such a system would ever be created is arguable though, as




Figure 3.4: Original Mann Venn diagram.




Figure 3.5: Modified Mann Venn diagram.

any modulation that could be performed by modulators external to the virtual environment software could almost certainly be better performed by the software itself.

### 3.2 Summary of Alternate Reality Definitions

<b>Reality</b>	An environment that is entirely unmodelled, with the viewport containing no virtual objects and with no computer-based quantitative information associated with any of the (necessarily real) objects.
<b>Alternate Reality</b>	Any environment in which the environmental stimuli received by a subject have been somehow mediated or modulated. That is, alternate reality is a term that encompasses everything that isn't purely 'reality'.

<b>Virtual Reality (VR)</b>	The polar opposite of reality, an environment that consists solely of virtual objects, with computer-based quantitative information associated with and between all of them, creating a completely synthetic world entirely discrete and separate from the real world; a new world that exists solely within the data structures of a computer [7, 8, 10]. While traditional definitions of virtual reality require the environment to be completely immersive, such that when involved with the environment the user is completely unaware of the real environment that surrounds them (such as by using Head Mounted Displays & body tracking techniques to remove logical anchors to the real world [15]) the criteria adopted herein are less drastic, classifying the virtual environments presented by video games viewed via 2D monitors as rudimentary implementations of virtual reality; they are after all completely modelled environments that exist entirely separate to the real world.
<b>Distributed Virtual Reality (DVR)</b>	Multi-user VR where telecommunications are employed to allow multiple (geographically distributed) users to occupy the same VR environment, allowing cooperation [16].
<b>Mixed Reality (MR)</b>	The broad range of environments that arise from the merging of real and virtual environments to some extent, such that the result is neither entirely real nor entirely virtual, with real and virtual objects co-existing. Both augmented reality and augmented virtuality are included under the broader classification of mixed reality.
<b>Augmented Reality (AR)</b>	A mixed reality environment comprising a real environment that has had virtual objects added to or overlain upon it. A common approach for achieving this addition/overlay is superimposing virtual objects over a direct or indirect view of the real environment using Head Mounted Displays &/or cameras [17].
<b>Augmented Virtuality (AV)</b>	A virtual environment upon which sampled real objects are overlaid, perhaps through the use of cameras [18].
<b>Mediated Reality</b>	<i>“A general framework for artificial modification of human perception by way of devices for augmenting, deliberately diminishing, and more generally, for otherwise altering sensory input”</i> [14]. Encompasses all of mixed reality & modulated reality.
<b>Modulated Reality</b>	Platforms that aim to modify the user’s view, by multiplicative, diminishing, rotational, etc. techniques, where the user’s view can be wholly real, or a mix of real & virtual content.

### 3.3 Additional Alternate Reality Terms

In addition to the range of alternate realities covered in the previous section, there are several less commonly used terms that do not feature or fit well into the previously identified frameworks.

#### 3.3.1 HyperReality

HyperReality (HR) is the term given to a hypothetical communications infrastructure that allows the seamless commingling of reality & virtual reality, human intelligence & artificial intelligence. In terms of the previously




Figure 3.6: Further modified Mann Venn diagram.

explored alternate reality terms, a HR system is most accurately described as facilitating the creation of mixed reality environments that bring virtual reality content into real world locations – “*It seeks to make virtual reality something that is experienced as part of physical reality, so that virtual and real phenomena appear to interact with each other: HR is VR as well as, not instead of, PR*” [16].

HR is an abstract, high level term that refers to a category of mixed reality environments that combine VR content with views of the real world in a manner that arguably falls under the moniker of augmented reality, however HR places emphasis on the integration of the virtual reality content into the real world in a seamless manner, such that HR enables hyperreality (this latter non-capitalised term referring to the postmodern usage of the word wherein an observer is unable to distinguish reality from a simulation of reality [19]).

### 3.3.2 PolySocial Reality

PolySocial Reality (PoSR) describes situations in which people multiplex their physical reality, where they engage in face-to-face social interaction, with Web-based social networks & apps for Internet mediated social interaction. Instead of defining a new type of alternate reality in terms of the provenance of the audiovisual stimuli received by a subject, PoSR is concerned with the provenance of the multiple, simultaneous social interactions that are mediated through various telecommunications media [20]. It has been shown that “*effective interaction among participants is a contributing factor to presence*” [16], so it should not come as much surprise to observe people maintain PolySocial interactions between their real environment & a virtual one.

\*\*\* Mention place vs non-place?

### 3.4 Cross Reality

#### \*\*\*Briefly mention standards, mainly ISO/IEC 23005 (MPEG-V)

Cross Reality (XR) is the ubiquitous mixed reality situation that arises from the fusion of real-world sensor/actuator infrastructure with virtual environments, such that augmented reality and augmented virtuality manifest simultaneously and facilitate synchronous bidirectional exchange of media and control information between real and virtual environments. Sensors collect and tunnel dense real-world data into virtual environments where they are interpreted and displayed to dispersed users, whilst interaction of virtual participants simultaneously incarnates into the real world through a plenitude of diverse displays and actuators [21].

The principle features that distinguish XR from the other alternate realities covered so far are;

1. a shift from single- to bi-directional information flow between real and virtual environments [22];
2. that both environments are complete unto themselves (but are enriched by their ability to mutually reflect, influence and merge into one another). [23]

XR as an alternate reality paradigm has its roots in work undertaken by the IBM Virtual Universe Community [24–26], described in personal correspondence by Ian Hughes;

*“The control mechanisms worked two ways generally. There was a physical lab that had devices that were controlled by a pub/sub mechanism ... Those devices subscribed to various messages. So initially web pages controlled them ... Equally the objects generated messages when they were physically switched on and off. As SL<sup>1</sup> had an RPC interface it was possible ... to subscribe to the same messages and send requests into SL to change states of object ... So there were lights, blinds, proximity detectors and even the tilt sensors on the laptops that were instrumented with these messages.”*

It was the work of the Responsive Environments Group at MIT’s Media Lab, centred around the research of Joshua Lifton in combining the Plug sensor/actuator platform [27] with a Second Life hosted virtual model of the physical Lab in the ‘Shadow Lab’ project, that truly launched XR as a research area. The Shadow Lab project did not allow for tandem visual engagement with both constituent environments of the cross reality platform, focussing instead on the interplay of sensor data & actuator commands exchanged between the environments. The visual aspect was addressed in part by the subsequent Ubiquitous Sensor Portal project, which situated 45 I/O rich ‘portals’ (figure 3.8) throughout the Lab, each with a corresponding extension in Second Life. However in stark contrast to the Dual Reality Lab, the virtual portals were not situated in a simulation of the real Media Lab in situations corresponding to their physical location, but instead used a more abstract virtual representation with a geometric layout reflecting intellectual affiliation as opposed to real-world location.

One of the driving motivations behind this work was what Lifton dubbed ‘the vacancy problem’;

*“the noticeable and profound absence of a person from one world, either real or virtual, while they are participating in the other. Simply put, the vacancy problem arises because people do not currently have the means to be in more than one place (reality) at a time.”* [28]

Which the Shadow Lab addressed via the sensor/actuator infrastructure to more closely link the real & virtual environments, such that actions & events in one could manifest & be observed by users in the other even if they could not directly visually observe both environments in tandem. The vacancy problem was previously observed by HR researchers, touching on an observation of the PoSR situations observed among mobile phone users of the time as a manifestation of the problem before virtual environments were introduced to the picture;

---

<sup>1</sup>Second Life.



Figure 3.7: Side view of the virtual Shadow Lab.



Figure 3.8: A Ubiquitous Sensor Portal.

*“One of the main problems with … virtual reality is what to do about the body that is left behind in physical reality … In HyperReality a person by definition is perceptually aware of the physical world around them, yet part of the attention normally given to the physical reality is given to interacting with virtual reality. It is difficult as yet to see how much this matters, but the increasing use of the mobile phone, which is a primitive form of HR, gives us some feel for the issues. People using a mobile phone can walk busy streets … while talking to someone who is not there.” [16]*

### 3.4.1 Alternate Reality Definitions from Cross Reality

Lifton’s use of alternate reality terminology does not conclude that MR is a broad term encompassing both AR & AV, but defines it as an environment ;

*“… which would be incomplete without both its real and virtual components. For example, the walls and windows of a mixed reality house might be real, but the view out the windows might be virtual, either generated by a projector or as a blue screen effect in a head-mounted display. Without both the real house and the virtual views out the windows, the illusion of a consistent reality is broken” [28]*

The diagram Lifton presents (figure 3.9) alludes to Milgram’s continua but places MR, under the above definition, as a separate classification of alternate reality between AR & VR. Lifton does not mention AV, even though the XR systems he presents arguably cause it to manifest. Figure 3.10 is the result of modifying this diagram to match the definitions adopted by this chapter in section 3.2.



Figure 3.9: The “virtual worlds taxonomy as viewed on the real-virtual axis” presented by Lifton.

Lifton does however explain that while such a taxonomy can be successfully applied to most alternate realities, with each falling into a different singular category, it does not well address those that feature two




Figure 3.10: Lifton's taxonomy as modified by this review.

complete realities, one real & one virtual, which is one of the defining & distinguishing characteristics of a XR system & instead prefers figure 3.11 to show how sensor/actuator infrastructure can cause the real & a virtual environment to merge into a cross reality.




Figure 3.11: Sensor/actuator infrastructure merging a real & a virtual environment, creating XR.

### 3.4.2 Position of Cross Reality

The position of XR in relation to other alternate realities can be visualised using Milgram et al.'s virtuality continuum. As one of the defining characteristics of a XR system is that it features two environments, both complete unto themselves, the explanation herein distinguishes between environments themselves (depicted in figures 3.12 to 3.16 by solid ellipses) & where the stimuli that the user is perceiving originate from (depicted by dashed ellipses).

Of particular importance is to appreciate the distinction between a XR system & an AR system<sup>2</sup>, as both concepts involve user engagement with both real & virtual content. Whilst an AR system features a single environment, comprised of the user's RW overlain by some virtual content, with the user perceiving stimuli from this single augmented environment (figure 3.12), a XR system instead features two discrete environments, one real & the other virtual, each complete unto itself (figure 3.13), with the user attending either to the stimuli originating from the real environment (figure 3.14) or to the stimuli originating from the virtual environment (figure 3.15).

A HR environment likewise constitutes a single physical environment, formed by the seamless introduction of VR content into the real world, rather than two complete environments;

*“... virtual people, virtual objects & virtual settings can interact & thereby communicate with real people, real objects & real settings as though they were all part of the same world.” [16]*

<sup>2</sup>This discussion over the relationship between AR & XR also stands for the relationship between AV & XR, however as AV has received less attention in the literature & in commercially available implementations, the discussion uses AR as its example.

Although a XR system as a whole should definitely be considered a case of MR, whether each of its constituent environments should be considered outwith or within the realm of MR (especially when visualised upon the continuum) is open to debate. Taking the real environment as an example, one could argue that the use of actuators to produce physically observable effects on behalf of controls from the virtual environment constitutes an AR environment. However in adhering to the definition of AR adopted earlier (see section 3.2) we would not label this an AR environment as we do not have *virtual* objects overlain upon our view of the real environment, but rather *real* objects controlled by the actions & events of a discrete virtual environment. So whilst an AR environment falls within the realms of MR, the constituent environments of a XR system when considered individually are considered as occupying the two extremes of the continuum, outwith the MR region & thus their depiction as such in figures 3.14 & 3.14.




Figure 3.12: AR visualised using the virtuality continuum.




Figure 3.13: The two environments that comprise a XR system.




Figure 3.14: A XR system with the user attending to RW stimuli.

### 3.5 Parallel Reality

The discussion in the previous section highlighted that the first distinguishing factor of XR, that differentiates it from other alternate realities such as AR & AV, is that XR features two discrete environments, one real & one virtual. The second distinguishing factor is the presence of a bidirectional flow of information




Figure 3.15: A XR system with the user attending to VR stimuli.

between these two environments (figure 3.16, an integration of figure 3.11 with Milgram & Kishino's virtuality continuum).




Figure 3.16: The two environments that comprise a XR system, plus the bidirectional information flow between them.

Whilst the system developed by this thesis features two discrete environments, one real & one virtual, that users can transition between visually observing (figures 3.14 & 3.15), it does not feature this bidirectional information flow between the environments (other than using sensed real position information to maintain the user's vantage point into the virtual environment).

Thus, the system developed in this thesis cannot be considered true a XR system as it does not meet both of the distinguishing criteria. The term **parallel reality** (PR<sup>3</sup>) is proposed to describe such a system. Parallel reality is thus defined as;

*A system comprising two environments, one real & the other virtual, each complete unto itself, wherein the user is granted the ability to transition between receiving stimuli from either.*

Should a bidirectional information flow be introduced to a PR system, or the ability to transition between receiving stimuli from either environment be introduced into a cross reality system, one would effect *parallel cross reality*.

### 3.5.1 Spatial Equivalence in Parallel Reality

When discussing a PR system that allows a user to transition between two environments, one real & the other virtual, one must consider the relationship between the two environments, namely whether (& if so,

<sup>3</sup>Note that the use of 'PR' in the quotation in section 3.3.1 is a reference to 'physical reality' (that author's term for what this thesis simply calls 'reality') & is not a reference to parallel reality.

to what extent) their layout, dimensions & content relate to each other – their *spatial equivalence*.

This distinction depends partly upon whether one adopts a dualistic concept of virtual space experience, wherein ‘cyberspace’ is a space in its own right with its own logic & metaphysics thus capable of playing host to any number of fantastical things & places, or whether one restricts the virtual environment by following a positivistic understanding of virtual space in which it serves only as a representation of real - using cyberspace for “*creating acceptable substitutes for real ... environments*” instead of for “*constructing imaginary worlds that are indistinguishable from the real world*” [9].

One may also wish to consider this distinction in relation to the different stages identified by Baudrillard between simulacra & simulation, with complete spatial equivalence occupying the first stage of a faithful image or copy of a profound reality (the positivistic position), zero spatial equivalence occupying the fourth stage of pure simulation with no relation to anything in reality (the dualistic position) & partial equivalence perhaps occupying the second stage, a perversion of reality [19].

However one treats virtual space, a PR system would be unrewarding if the real & virtual environments were identical<sup>4</sup>. However a virtual environment that shares roughly the same fundamental dimensions & layout as the real environment (representing the same ‘place’) but presents an *alternative* representation has been proven to be a useful modality in previous XR research (see section 3.4) & it is this arrangement that the system developed in this thesis focuses on, in particular those where the virtual environment represents the same place as the real environment but at an earlier moment in time.

One might consider the ‘Second Earth’ concept to be the ultimate realisation of this scenario of spatially equivalent real and virtual environments. The combination of virtual world technology (as in Second Life) with ‘mirror world’ technology (as in Google Earth), Second Earth theorises a virtual simulation/reconstruction of the entire physical world, such that for any location in the real world there is a corresponding location in the virtual world [30]. The system developed in this thesis focuses on a single small location, however it does not take a leap of imagination to understand the worth of such a system scaled to larger, even global, sizes.

Although the use cases for PR systems that feature completely unrelated real & virtual environments (including where the virtual environment is entirely fictitious) may seem limited in terms of possible benefits to understanding or knowledge gain when comparing & contrasting the environments, an educated approach to implementing transitions between these environments, that takes similar considerations as the system developed in this thesis, does conceivably have a purpose.

In the opening quote to this chapter, taken from Neal Stephenson’s cyberpunk novel *Snow Crash*, the protagonist enquires about the location of another character, called Y.T., both in the real world and in the ‘Metaverse’. For the sake of this discussion, the Metaverse can be considered analogous to a virtual world akin to Second Life, accessed via a head mounted display, and comprises an entirely synthetic virtual world whose locations have no counterparts in the real world. Y.T.’s response is that “*In the Metaverse, I’m on a plusbound monorail train. Just passed by Port 35.*” whilst in reality she is at a “*Public terminal across the street from a Reverend Wayne’s*”.

In this scenario there is no spatial equivalence between the real environment and the virtual environment - they are not the same ‘place’, however the protagonist still wishes to be able to experience both by transitioning between them, paying attention to one while travelling through the other. While this situation is currently science fiction, recent developments in mobile VR platforms such as Samsung Gear VR hint that we are not so far away from a time in which members of the general public will wish to multiplex their real environment with a virtual one while in public, in the same way that people commonly engage in computer-mediated communication (CMC) via their smartphones at the same time as walking through real environments & conversing with the people in them, in instantiations of PoSR. With the majority of players of popular Massively Multiplayer Online games (MMOs) wishing they could spend more time playing, over a fifth even wanting to spend all of their time in game [31], and with social roles and the community aspect constituting key aspects of these game’s popularity [31, 32], informing the implementation of transitions between real & virtual in such systems with the findings of the experiments in this thesis into spatially

<sup>4</sup> “*For virtual reality to be interesting it has to emulate the real. But you have to be able to do something in the virtual that you couldn’t in the real.*” [29]

equivalent PR systems promises to be beneficial to the further development of 3D social CMC.

### 3.6 Summary of Additional Alternate Reality Definitions

<b>HyperReality (HR)</b>	A hypothetical high level term referring to a category of mixed realities that combine VR content with views of the real world in a seamless manner such that the observer experiences <i>hyperreality</i> .
<b>hyperreality</b>	A postmodern term describing a situation wherein an observer is unable to distinguish between reality & a simulation of reality.
<b>PolySocial Reality (PoSR)</b>	Describes multiple simultaneous social interactions mediated via various CMC technologies. [20].
<b>Cross Reality (XR)</b>	Systems that feature two environments, one real & one virtual, both complete unto themselves [23] but enriched by their ability to mutually reflect, influence & merge into one another thanks to bidirectional information flow between them [22].
<b>Parallel Reality (PR)</b>	Systems comprising two environments, one real & the other virtual, each complete unto itself, wherein the user is granted the ability to transition between receiving stimuli from either.

### 3.7 Presence

Any investigation into alternate realities, virtual reality in particular, is likely to involve discussion of *presence* - the subjective experience of being in one place or environment, even when one is physically situated in another [33]. Presence is distinguished from the concept of *immersion*, an objective description of a technology describing the extent to which it is capable of delivering an illusion of reality to the senses of the user [34]. In current theoretical models, the sense of presence is seen as the outcome, or a direct function of, immersion; the more inclusive, extensive, surrounding & vivid the virtual environment is, or the more similar the transformations in the virtual environment are to those in the real world, the higher the sense of presence [35].

Related is the concept of *involvement*, defined in this context as the psychological state experienced as a consequence of focusing one's energy & attention on a coherent set of stimuli & it is theorized that both involvement & immersion are necessary for experiencing a sense of presence [33].

#### 3.7.1 Waterworth & Waterworth's three dimensions of virtual experience

This notion of the sense of presence depending upon multiple factors is explored further by Waterworth & Waterworth who present the *three dimensions of virtual experience* model [36]. In this model, the *locus of attention* axis represents the environment where the stimuli that the user is perceiving originate from; the *focus of attention* axis represents the balance between conceptual/abstract reasoning & perceptual/concrete processing, where complex conceptual reasoning results in little attention being paid to processing environmental percepts (whether originating from real stimuli, virtual stimuli, or a mix) thus reducing presence<sup>5</sup> in that environment toward its antithesis – absence<sup>6</sup>; and the *sensus of attention* axis represents the level of conscious arousal (or ‘wakefulness’ [37]) of the user, whether directed toward percepts originating from

<sup>5</sup>Presence in the context of this model is defined as a state of heightened perceptual processing of environmental stimuli (“*a psychological focus on direct perceptual processing*” [36]) accompanied by lessened conceptual reasoning, whether these environmental stimuli originate from a real environment, a virtual environment, a mixed reality environment, or even from multiple discrete environments.

<sup>6</sup>Absence is defined as “*a psychological focus on . . . conceptual processing*” [36].

real stimuli, virtual stimuli, or a mix, or not directed toward any percepts in the case of completely ‘absent’ conceptual reasoning.

In this model, the notion of *involvement* relates closely to the *focus of attention* axis; heightened involvement pertains to concentrating on environmental stimuli or meaningfully related activities & events, while heightened focus pertains to increased perceptual/concrete processing; lessened involvement pertains to a preoccupation with personal problems or activities occurring outwith the environment of interest, while lessened focus pertains to increased conceptual/abstract reasoning.

Similarly, a relationship can be drawn between this model & Milgram et al.’s virtuality continuum, with the latter considered here to be analogous to the *locus of attention* axis; the combination of these models is shown by figure 3.17.




Figure 3.17: The combined virtuality continuum/three dimensions of virtual experience model.

### 3.8 Transitions in Parallel Reality

The novel aspect of a PR system is the ability it imparts upon its user to switch their locus of attention between equivalent vantage points in RW & VR environments. In order to achieve the highest quality of experience with this style of interaction with a PR system, it is vital to determine how best to implement the transitions; that is, to mitigate the increased cognitive load (manifesting as increased conceptual reasoning & reduced perceptual processing) required to comprehend each transition, as increased cognitive load will detract from engagement with the environments & reduce the user's willingness to perform subsequent transitions.

Whilst some researchers support the notion that in systems where more than one environment competes for the user's locus of attention there is an 'all or nothing' Gestalt switch between awareness of one environment & the other [38], which would result in a substantial increase in cognitive load upon each transition, the system developed in this thesis supports the contrary opinion; that switching locus of attention from the stimuli of one environment to those of another does not completely overrule the user's awareness of the former, that both environments can be perceived at the same time (albeit one to a lesser extent) [39] & that when engaging with VR content a user's focus can even be said to typically be *shared* between VR & RW [36], leading to a notion of 'distributed' presence, or simultaneously experiencing a sense of presence in multiple environments.

This latter position is particularly apt for situations wherein the RW & VR environments share the same fundamental layout & dimensions (spatial equivalence), as those of the PR system developed in this thesis does, as inherent familiarity between two environments intuitively reduces the cognitive load associated with transitioning between them.

Furthermore, the notion of experience of presence as changing continually from moment-to-moment [40, 41] lends confidence to the successful mitigation of the cognitive load associated with these transitions to manageable levels. One might even liken this 'switching' between RW & VR to the 'cycling through' behaviour observed in users of virtual communities, which stemmed from the 'window' concept of modern computer operating systems [42] & accelerated with mobile devices to the point where for many users today rapid cycling stabilizes them into a sense of 'continual copresence', where even just a mobile phone brings them into a world of continual partial attention to any particular subject or environment [13]. The advent of mobile phones has previously been credited with allowing a person to "*be in many places at once*" & to play multiple roles [16].

However, no matter how smooth the transitions, the process is expected to nonetheless result in some heightened cognitive load, a temporary *break in presence*<sup>7</sup> (BIP), as the user comes to terms with the new environment presented to them & comprehends its relation to the other environment that they were just perceiving. Transitions can be implemented in multiple different manners & it is expected that users will prefer different implementations in different situations, surroundings & scenarios (where 'preference' toward a particular implementation is expected to correlate with a less severe BIP being experienced upon its execution). To this end, several different implementations are effected & investigated to identify & quantify preferences toward them, to infer which approaches to transitioning between RW & VR visual stimuli are more or less appropriate for the different situations that arise where a platform like that developed in this thesis may be deployed (moving, stationary, etc.).

<sup>7</sup>The definition of **break in presence** adopted herein is the second from Waterworth & Waterworth [36] (p205): a movement along the focus axis away from presence in the real or a virtual environment & toward absence, which also relates to a reduction in involvement. This differs to Slater & Steed's original definition in [43] as they considered presence only in terms of attending to stimuli from a virtual environment, with a break in presence as a Gestalt switch to instead attending to stimuli from the real environment. Waterworth & Waterworth's model considers presence in terms of attending to stimuli from either the real *or a virtual* environment, with a break in presence representing absence in the sense of heightened conceptual load & the resultant reduced perceptual processing of environmental stimuli originating from *either* the real or a virtual environment. This definition better fits the situation invoked by the system developed in this thesis, which is concerned with intentionally & willingly switching engagement between stimuli from both real & virtual environments, rather than engaging with stimuli from only a virtual environment in a scenario where stimuli from the real environment are considered a 'distraction'.

### 3.8.1 Transitions using the Combined Model

Visualised using the combined model (figure 3.18) these transitions are an oscillation along the locus axis, between a RW environment at one position & a VR environment at the other.

Heightened cognitive load required to comprehend a transition is a temporary movement upon the focus axis from presence toward absence (a BIP). With the ability of a wide FOV, stereoscopic 3D, head-tracked HMD (such as that used by the system developed in this thesis) to produce immersive VR visual stimuli that require fairly limited cognitive processing & our inherent ability to engage with our RW surroundings without significant cognitive load, focus is expected to be high (toward the presence extremum) when attending to stimuli from either RW or VR.

Sensus is expected to be largely task dependent, however when performing a task that involves actively engaging with the visual stimuli from either/both of RW or VR it is expected to be high (toward the conscious extremum). Upon triggering a transition, sensus is expected to increase, as the user centres their attention upon relating the visual stimuli from the new environment to those they were just perceiving from the other environment




Figure 3.18: Operation of a PR system represented upon the combined model.

### 3.9 The Case for Parallel Reality

A PR system that presents the user with the choice between visual stimuli from both its constituent environments (RW & VR) allows that user to engage with both real & virtual content in a manner that is similar to, but has a number of advantages over previous alternate reality systems, including traditional AR implementations & XR systems;

- a PR system is less critical of registration (the accurate positioning/alignment) between real & virtual, as virtual objects are seen as part of a larger virtual environment instead of being rendered atop a view of the real environment;
- a PR system can make use of existing VR content without the overhead of decanting/extracting a subset of the virtual components into an AR framework (e.g. manually selecting which objects within the VR environment are to be displayed over the RW environment);
- the use of a complete VR environment allows virtual content to be more encompassing & immersive, as presenting a complete VR environment allows total control over lighting, shadows, reflections, particle effects, etc. which would be difficult or impossible for an AR platform to render atop a view of a RW environment.
- the vacancy problem is further addressed, but instead of doing so by linking real & virtual environments by sensor & actuator infrastructure, vacancy in either environment is alleviated by furnishing users with the ability to transition between visual stimuli from each environment.

Thus, a PR platform is well suited to situations in which interaction with the visual stimuli of both real & virtual environments is required & where one or more of the following hold true;

- in lieu of accurate registration between real & virtual, there is a strong focus on the virtual environment's atmosphere & immersion [44];
- there is existing VR content;
- the visual differences between real & virtual environments are so substantial that an AR system would resort to augment (&/or diminish [45]) almost the whole RW view. While AR "*smears an informational coating over real space*" [46], PR presents a complete virtual environment. AR is beneficial where one wishes the juxtaposition of virtual objects upon what is already present in the RW environment, however PR is better suited to situations where one wishes to present a complete virtual alternative.

\*\*\*mention the redecorating/remodelling example, the ‘real world as canvas for artistic expression’ example, etc.

### 3.10 Conclusions

Decades of research into alternate realities has furnished us with a rich continuum of approaches & technologies for creating, combining, augmenting & diminishing real & virtual environments. Many of the alternate reality labels that are now becoming commonplace are concerned with presenting a different environment to the user’s real surroundings (as in telepresence & virtual reality) or mixing additional information into the user’s view of their real or virtual surroundings (as in augmented/diminished reality & augmented virtuality).

Although less thoroughly investigated, the concept of creating an alternate reality system by combining two environments, one real & the other virtual & both complete unto themselves, into a cross reality system presents an interesting avenue for furthering alternate reality techniques & applications, in particular to addressing the vacancy problem that affects users when trying to distribute their attention between two environments.

Previous cross reality research focussed on alleviating this vacancy problem by integrating sensor & actuator infrastructure into the constituent real & virtual environments of a system, such that actions & events in one environment could manifest into the other. However directly visually engaging with both environments was not often possible in these systems & only from predetermined, static locations.

This thesis serves to extend alternate reality research by developing a system that allows its user to visually engage with both a real & a virtual environment, transitioning between them at any point, whilst maintaining mobility to walk through the environments in tandem. In trading the sensor/actuator infrastructure of a cross reality system for direct visual engagement with both environments, the parallel reality concept is born.

Simply put in the terms of Lifton's original definition of the vacancy problem, this thesis aims to allow people to be in more than one place (reality) at a time.

# 4

## A Virtual Time Window

*“The sinister thing about a simstim construct, really, was that it carried the suggestion that any environment might be unreal, that the windows of the shopfronts she passed now with Andrea might be figments.”*

*Count Zero, William Gibson*

This chapter presents the development of a preliminary PR system that combined a tablet computer, GPS, accelerometer & magnetometer, with an OpenSim based virtual environment to allow exploration of the real world ruins of a 14th century cathedral with a virtual reconstruction of it as it stood in its prime. Cultural heritage is introduced as an ideal area for which PR systems can be applied to beneficial effect, while the accuracy of GPS tracking emerged as a constraint on this style of interaction.

### 4.1 Virtual Heritage

Alternate reality technologies have been used for over two decades [47] to aid in the investigation, understanding & dissemination of information pertaining to our past in the fields of archaeology & cultural heritage. Whilst archaeology studies human activity through the recovery of remains, heritage is also concerned with intangible attributes of society; tradition, art, narratives & other cultural evidences [47]. *Virtual heritage* is the name given to the application of advanced imaging techniques, including alternate reality techniques, to the synthesis, conservation, reproduction, representation, reprocessing & display of this cultural evidence [48].

These techniques provide access to locations & artefacts scattered about the world, that may reside in private collections inaccessible to scholars (much less interested amateurs) & outwith of their original context of creation [49]. They allow recreations to be made of the numerous cultural heritage objects that are deteriorating or are at risk of being lost, both due to natural causes such as weather & natural disasters but also due to acts of man such as civil war [50].

Virtual heritage techniques offer substantial benefits to collaborative investigation of sites, where multiple users are provided the ability to collaborate via a multitude of different visualization modalities including video see-through head-tracked head mounted displays, projected table surfaces, large screen displays & tracked hand-held displays, including the ability for experts physically located at a particular site to collaborate with those remote to it [51]. This combination of different techniques not only benefits experts, but has been used in the creation of contiguous platforms for building & managing exhibitions of 3D models of artefacts accessed in museums, galleries & via the Web via Web3D technologies [52], focussed not only on the digitization & subsequent interaction with such content to aid in its preservation & protection, but also with making these resources as widely available as possible to any interested parties (scientists, archaeologists, curators, historians & interested amateurs) [53].

Even traditionally two-dimensional visual resources associated with cultural heritage can be integrated into such state-of-the-art systems, visualized via immersive CAVE techniques as part of ‘information landscapes’ [54]. Such techniques are of particular benefit to young people as cultural heritage sites often arouse little involvement in them, especially if the site’s present day appearance bears few traces of its original stature & makes it difficult to appreciate its original splendour & importance [55].

#### 4.1.1 Alternate Reality Techniques in Virtual Heritage

Due to the number of combinations & diversity in approaches that have been used in the application of visualization techniques to the cultural heritage sector, attempting to comprehensively list them is impractical. Comparison via a taxonomical model that classifies approaches according to various characteristics is thus the approach adopted by Foni et al. [56] that produced the taxonomical space shown by figure 4.1.




Figure 4.1: Taxonomical space of visualization strategies used in cultural heritage.

This model classifies visualization strategies according to four continua, represented by the three physical dimensions of the 3D cube & the degree of shading of each point within the cube. The x axis represents the level of automatism, which refers to the span of the development cycle required to produce the visualization; the y axis represents the level of precision, referring not only to the amount of geometrical detail but to all elements that can contribute to or enhance reliability; & the z axis represents the level of interactivity, defined in this context as;

*“its capacity to contextually offer the possibility to subjectively experience an interactive behaviour in a synchronous way, thus enabling the user the opportunity to meaningfully contribute to a given experience or to affect in real time the visualized item” [56].*

The shading of each point within the cube represents its degree of virtuality, conceptually analogous to the reality-virtuality continuum of Milgram et al. (see section 3.1.1) with real world/world unmodelled represented as solid black, virtual reality/world completely modelled as completely white & positions in-between as various shades of grey. The position of 16 exemplar visualization techniques applied to cultural heritage are shown upon the cube & explained via the table figure 4.2, including both traditional techniques & state-of-the-art methodologies.

		Precision	Interactivity	Automatism	Virtuality
		R	G	B	V
1	Restitution drawings	0.1	0	0.7	0
2	Augmented pictures	0.1	0.1	0.8	0
3	Scale models	0.4	0.3	0.6	0
4	Physical reconstructions	0.8	0.6	0	0
5	Interactive scale models	0.4	0.8	0.5	0
6	Live experiments	0.5	0.7	0.4	0
7	Renderings	0.85	0	0.15	1
8	Digital catalogs	0.2	0.15	0.7	1
9	Digital panoramas	0.3	0.4	0.9	1
10	Real time VR simulations	0.8	0.9	0.4	1
11	Stereoscopic visualizations	0.7	0.7	0.3	1
12	Computer games	0.6	0.75	0.25	1
13	Real time AR simulations	0.5	0.85	0.25	0.5
14	Augmented movies	0.9	0	0.1	0.5
15	Semantically supplemented 2D	0.2	0.5	0.65	0.5
16	Semantically supplemented 3D	0.8	0.95	0.25	1

Figure 4.2: Coordinate sets for each approach within the taxonomical space (figure 4.1)

In terms of alternate reality techniques, real time AR simulations (category 13) have been used to add artefacts, actors & reconstructed architecture to views of present day sites that are still accessible & may bear traces of their original status, whilst real time VR simulations (category 10) have been used to host more complete reconstructions of entire buildings & settlements for interaction via screen, HMD & CAVE, including where the present day site bears no evidence of its past status or is inaccessible due to latter development, change in landscape, etc..

The ARCHEOGUIDE project (Augmented Reality-based Cultural Heritage On-site GUIDE) [57] aimed to provide a ‘personalized electronic guide & tour assistant’ to cultural heritage site visitors. On-site help & augmented reality reconstructions of on-site ruins were presented via a laptop, a tablet computer & a PDA, using GPS for location tracking & magnetometer to ascertain direction such that augmentations could be placed accordingly. The applications claimed to be supported by the platform range from archaeological research to education, multimedia publishing & cultural tourism. The platform was prototyped at the archaeological site of Olympia, Greece.

As well as being used for walking tours, AR has been combined with the concept of telepresence to create ‘augmented telepresence’, allowing participants to experience a ‘fly-through’ of the ancient Nara Heijo-kyo capital of Japan, by combining aerially captured omnidirectional video augmented with related information using AR techniques [58, 59].

Augmenting views of the real world with real-time animated virtual humans has been explored by several projects, including the LIFEPLUS EU IST project, which aimed to produce “an innovative 3D reconstruction of ancient frescos-paintings through the real-time revival of their fauna and flora, featuring groups of virtual animated characters with artificial life dramaturgical behaviors, in an immersive AR environment”. This project pushed established augmented reality applications to the field by exploring narrative design in fic-

tional spaces, with the aim of increasing immersion via realistic interaction, making use of captured/real-time video of a real scene [60], presenting the visitor with “an immersive and innovative multi-sensory interactive trip to the past” [61]. These realistic simulations of animated virtual human actors were employed in a mobile & wearable setup, in abandonment of traditional concepts of static cultural artefacts or rigid augmentations of real world features, making use of a markerless camera tracker & mixed reality illumination model for more consistent real-virtual & virtual-real rendering. This platform was demonstrated in a case study on the real site of ancient Pompeii & whilst initially targeted at the cultural heritage sector, the author(s) clarifies that as a platform it is not limited to such subjects [62]. This concept of extending rigid & static AR with character-based event representations hopes to recreate not just discrete artefacts but the entirety of ‘daily life’ at the scene [63]. Although many applications of AR to cultural heritage sites are mobile in nature, using a variety of tracking techniques to localise the user & determine their orientation, including GPS [57], visual tracking of robust features of the environment [64] & omnidirectional range sensing of a landmark database [65], there are also those that present a static interface similar to coin-operated telescopes situated at popular tourist attractions [66].

VR is not only useful where the real site is no longer accessible, too remote or does not bear any similarity to its original status, but also allows for more effective control over the atmospheric qualities of the environment being recreated; effects such as fog, sky, water & particles, exploiting the latest graphical hardware by making use of shaders to deliver high quality graphics [44]. The use of a head mounted display or CAVE [67, 68] that completely blocks stimuli from the user’s real world surroundings allows for this complete level of control. Unless an AR system employs various environmental monitoring techniques, the augmentations that it overlays upon the user’s view of the real world will often have differing illumination than their real surroundings which has an effect upon their perceived realism [69].

However whereas many heritage representations, architectural walkthroughs & simulations of artefacts & places have defined a practice where photorealism is considered an important measure of the representation’s success, there is an argument that whilst such an emphasis on realism & historical accuracy & authenticity is important, such photorealistic methods can limit the flexibility of the reconstructions with regards to how much they can be modified & altered to explore different reconstruction hypotheses [48].

Emphasis on photorealistic graphical quality also has considerations when it comes to real time performance & many intelligent techniques must be employed to maintain acceptable performance as complexity of reconstructions increases [70]. Particularly for dissemination to the public in museums & visitor centres, acceptable performance is usually considered more important than extreme historical accuracy.

## 4.2 Virtual Heritage at the University of St Andrews

**\*\*\*Include references to Kris Getchell’s thesis? Experiential learning, etc?**

The Open Virtual Worlds (OVW) research group at the School of Computer Science at the University of St Andrews has been employed in virtual heritage projects since 2007 [71], producing a number of reconstructions of cultural heritage sites in Scotland & further afield. These reconstructions have been produced through collaborations with academics from the university’s Art History, History & Archaeology departments, as well as with domain experts from heritage organisations including Historic Scotland & the National Trust for Scotland. These projects range from small reconstructions of a church to much larger reconstructions such as that of the cathedral at St Andrews (figure 4.3, 4.4) which represents several years of work [72]. Whilst the cathedral was completed as a research project, others were produced specifically for use in schools in Scotland (such as Linlithgow palace, figure 4.5, 4.6), others were produced for outreach purposes (Mosfell Viking farmstead, figure 4.7, 4.8) & still others were built specifically for installation into museums (Caen Township, figure 4.9, 4.10). Some of these reconstructions are inhabited with virtual humans that are scripted to perform certain actions specific to the role they depict at the site (figure 4.11, 4.12).

These reconstructions were made using OpenSim, an open source implementation & extension of the Second Life platform which is compatible with the numerous forks of the Second Life client program. This architecture allows straightforward construction & dissemination of the models, thanks to accessible modelling tools provided by the Second Life client itself & the client/server model that allows the models to



Figure 4.3: St Andrews cathedral today.



Figure 4.4: St Andrews cathedral reconstruction.



Figure 4.5: Linlithgow Palace today.



Figure 4.6: Linlithgow Palace reconstruction.



Figure 4.7: Mosfell Viking Longhouse.



Figure 4.8: Longhouse interior.

be accessed in various deployment scenarios including temporary deployments within controlled network & client conditions as well as via the Internet.

The reconstruction process involves the use of Geographic Information System (GIS) data from Ordnance Survey (OS) to accurately model the basic elevation of the ground. Where there is higher resolution elevation data, such as from Lidar laser surveying often employed on archaeological surveys, this is used to increase the accuracy of the resultant reconstruction. Where access to the site is possible & depending upon development surrounding the site prior to the date being reconstructed, 360° panoramic photographs are captured & then used to create a backdrop for the reconstruction, allowing identifiable aspects of the surrounding environment to improve the experience of the reconstruction. Buildings/structures are then reconstructed upon the ground layer, using numerous sources as input; satellite views, archaeological surveys, contemporary accounts, views



Figure 4.9: Caen Township.




Figure 4.10: Caen Township wireframe detail.



Figure 4.11: Virtual humans in cathedral reconstruction.



Figure 4.12: Conversing with virtual humans.

of the site itself if relics still exist, photographic evidence, etc. Domain experts are then brought in to iteratively improve the model, commenting on aspects of the reconstruction to be altered in order to visualise a different reconstructive hypothesis.

These reconstructions have been used to host workshops at 10 schools throughout Scotland, at both primary & secondary institutions, where all requisite computing infrastructure was taken, assembled at the school, then disassembled & removed at the end of the day. Students are split into groups of 4-5, sharing a computer with screen, keyboard, mouse & Xbox controller (a control modality instantly recognised by most school students). Worksheets with tasks are used to structure their interaction with the reconstructions & guide the experiential learning experience over 20-40 minute sessions (figure 4.13). Similar workshops have also been performed in museums, using the same approach of temporary setups of computing hardware (figure 4.16). In addition to traditional computer screens, larger LCD television screens & still larger projection screens, the Oculus Rift VR headset has started to be used with this same content 4.15.

In addition to these temporary workshops, the reconstructions have also been used in permanently installed exhibits in museums & visitor centres, including the Virtual Time Travel Project (VTTP), which combines multi-head projection with Natural User Interaction (NUI) via Microsoft Kinect, which has been installed at the Timespan Museum & Arts Centre in Helmsdale, allowing visitors to explore the reconstruction of the Caen Township by using simple gestures, instead of relying upon a keyboard, game controller or other traditional interface (figure 4.14).

### 4.3 Applying Parallel Reality to Virtual Heritage

Applications of alternate reality techniques within virtual heritage have thus far broadly fallen into the categories of AR, experienced at the site, or VR, experienced away from the site (in terms of space, time, or both). The dissemination of the OVW group's content has been no exception to this observation, falling into categories 10-12 of figure 4.2 with complete virtual environments that are experienced with both spatial



Figure 4.13: School students learning via a reconstruction.



Figure 4.14: VTTP installation at Timespan.



Figure 4.15: OVW via Oculus Rift.



Figure 4.16: Museum workshop.

& temporal separation from the real site that they represent.

Applying the concept of parallel reality to virtual heritage represents an opportunity to explore an exciting new modality of interaction that combines the complete virtual environments of categories 10-12 with the real time juxtaposition between real & virtual environments of AR systems from category 13. In terms of the four categories of the taxonomic space, such a PR system would take the high precision & interactivity of a VR system (category 10) & combine it with two values of viruality, as the user is provided the ability to observe either the complete virtual environment (virtuality = 1) or the unmodified real environment (virtuality = 0). The automatism of such a system will likely occupy a position between that of VR & AR; whilst the system will require a more involved development cycle than a purely VR one, the slackened requirements on registration accuracy of a PR system compared to an AR system promise higher automatism than a purely AR system.

## 4.4 The Virtual Time Window

The Virtual Time Window (VTW) is an application of parallel reality to virtual heritage, leveraging the OVW group's existing OpenSim virtual reconstructions of cultural heritage sites in a handheld package that allows tandem exploration of both the real cultural heritage sites & their spatially equivalent virtual reconstructions.

VTW manifests as a tablet computer which is capable of tracking its position via GPS, its compass heading via magnetometer ('electronic compass') & its pitch via accelerometer. Existing AR projects have proven through application the suitability of smartphones & tablets for mobile, position & orientation aware applications that present virtual content within a cultural heritage context. These devices are also entering ubiquity today & thus present a platform that can be quickly assimilated by most users. The tablet runs a modified version of the Second Life client in order to access, via wifi, a virtual reconstruction of a cultural heritage site hosted by an OpenSim server. The Second Life client is controlled entirely by the tablet's position & orientation - the user does not manually control any aspect. The modality of interaction offered is similar to that of using a smartphone to take a photograph, but whereas the screen of the smartphone shows the real environment as it is, the screen of the VTW tablet shows the environment as it was in the past - a Virtual Time Window. The user is free to explore the real cultural heritage site, observing it in its current state, whilst at any moment 'looking through' VTW to see what a particular vantage looked like in

the past.

In terms of the combined Milgram/Waterworth model, the displacement along the locus axis when the user switches their attention between their real environment & the virtual environment upon the tablet will displace less toward the VR extremum than shown in figure 3.18 which represents transitions between real & virtual environments when using a HMD that effectively blocks all stimuli from the real world when observing the virtual. When considering the environmental provision, VTw features two complete environments, one real & the other virtual. From the perspective of transitioning between receiving stimuli from each environment, there is an obvious difference between VTw's tablet based approach compared to a HMD approach, as the latter effectively forces all percepts to emanate from one environment whilst the former allows percepts emanating from both environments to be perceived simultaneously.

Whilst this will intuitively make transitions easier to perform & create less risk of a jarring Gestalt switch, it will also intuitively limit the intensity of the sense of presence attainable in the virtual environment as the sense of 'looking in to' the virtual environment will always leave the user readily aware of the real environment surrounding them. Whilst VTw classifies as a PR system, interaction with it may be likened more to that of an AR system.

#### 4.4.1 Adapting the Second Life Client

At the time of the VTw project (Summer 2012) the only fully-featured Second Life clients available were limited to x86 platforms. Whilst the Android client Lumiya was available, it was in its earliest stages & very limited in its features & usability. This limited the choice of tablet to those few x86 models that had reached market, with the MSI WindPad 110W presenting the most promising solution: a 10" tablet sporting an AMD Brazos Z01 APU (combining a dual-core x86 CPU with a Radeon HD6250 GPU) [73].

The Second Life client, intended for use on a desktop or laptop computer, provides provision for controlling the avatar's position & the camera orientation by keyboard, mouse & joystick. For the purposes of VTw, this position & orientation control must be tied to the physical position & orientation of the tablet itself. To this end, it is necessary to make use of various sensors connected to the tablet (either internally, or externally) & to interface these with the Second Life client in such a way that it can make use of their collected data to appropriately control the avatar's position & camera orientation.

The user's position was monitored using GPS, a solution which is well suited to applications of the system within the use case of cultural heritage; such sites often constitute outdoor ruins at which a clear view of the sky allows for good GPS connectivity. For use cases where a similar modality of interaction is desired whilst indoors then an indoor positioning system would be used; a roundup of such technologies is available in [74].

### 4.5 Orientation Control

In order to control Second Life's camera in the required fashion, sensor data is required both for the direction that the user is facing (in terms of magnetic compass bearing) as well as the vertical angle (pitch) at which they are holding the tablet. Magnetic compass bearing is sensed using a magnetometer while pitch is sensed by an accelerometer. Roll data is also captured by the accelerometer, however it was expected that users would keep the tablet in a roughly horizontal fashion when interacting with it, thus using these data to control the SL camera's roll was not deemed to be beneficial and was not implemented.

The 110W does not feature a magnetometer and only sports a rudimentary tilt sensor for differentiating between discrete cases of landscape and portrait orientation for screen rotation. Several alternative sensors were auditioned, including the MMA8452, ADXL335, HMC5883L and eventually the HMC6343 which was adopted for the experiments. The HMC6343 combines a 3-axis magnetometer, 3-axis accelerometer and hardware algorithms to internally apply the accelerometer's readings to tilt compensate the magnetometer's readings; tilt compensation is necessary for an accurate compass bearing when the device is not held in a perfectly level orientation, such as when the user tilts it up or down to view content above or below their eye level.

Magnetic declination information was entered into the HMC6343 for the position of the cathedral and the date of our experiments. The HMC6343's hard-iron offset calculation feature was used each time the hardware configuration was altered. The sampling frequency of the HMC6343 was set to its highest value of 10Hz. Orientation was set to 'upright front' to match the physical orientation of the IC in the experiments.

#### 4.5.1 Exploiting Second Life's Joystick Support

HMC6343 pin	Arduino Uno R3 pin
VCC/VDD	5V
GND	GND
SDA	A4
SCL	A5

Leveraging standard SL avatar/camera control interfaces was explored by programming the Arduino to mimic a standard USB HID joystick via the Lightweight USB Framework for AVR (LUFA), sending messages that the viewer interpreted as coming from a joystick and allowing the use of the standard joystick options.




Figure 4.17: Example wiring for Arduino with HMC6343 for joystick operation.

However the granularity of control attainable via this method was not sufficient.

## 4.6 Position Control

### \*\*\*Include HEX whatnot from Arduino code

Translating real world positions, obtained via the GPS receiver as latitude and longitude pairs, into corresponding OpenSim (X,Y) region coordinates is achieved using the haversine formula [75] from spherical trigonometry. The prerequisites for this approach are that the OpenSim model is aligned correctly to the OpenSim compass as the real location is aligned to real bearings (although provision to specify an 'offset' within the Pangolin viewer for non-aligned models would be a trivial addition), that the model was created to a known and consistent scale and that a single 'anchor point' is known for which both the real world latitude/longitude and corresponding OpenSim (X,Y) region coordinates are known.




Figure 4.18: Assembled Arduino + HMC6343 ‘joystick’.

Using the haversine formula the great-circle (or orthodromic) distance between the latitude of the anchor point and the latitude of the new GPS reading is calculated, then applying the scale of the model results in the equivalent distance in OpenSim metrics between the Y coordinate of the anchor point and the Y coordinate of the position corresponding to the new GPS reading. Repeating the same calculations with the longitude of the new GPS reading provides the distance between the X coordinate of the anchor point and the X coordinate of the position corresponding to the new GPS reading. Adding or subtracting these distances as appropriate to the OpenSim coordinates of the anchor point provides the OpenSim coordinates that correspond to the new GPS reading, to which the avatar is then instructed to move.

The anchor point is specified using global coordinates, not local coordinates. This allows navigation to operate across region boundaries and within mega regions (it is not limited to a single 256x256 meter OpenSim region) and there are no restrictions for the placement of the OpenSim component of the anchor point (it can be anywhere in any region, movement of the avatar can be in any direction from it (positive and negative), it does not have to be at the center of the model or even in a region that the model occupies).

Calculating a global coordinate is simply a case of multiplying the position of the region by 256 and then adding the local coordinate. For example, for an anchor at local coordinate (127, 203, 23) within a region that is at (1020, 1042) the global X coordinate is calculated as  $(1020 * 256) + 127 = 261247$  and the global Y coordinate as  $(1043 * 256) + 203 = 267211$ . Elevation (Z) is ignored due to a combination of the relatively low accuracy of these data attainable via GPS (when compared to the longitudinal/latitudinal accuracy) and as the case study explored involved users navigating outdoor ruins remaining at ground level.

#### 4.6.1 OpenSim RegionModule

### 4.7 Modifying Second Life for Orientation & Position Control

**\*\*\*Include code & structure of modifications from Second Life client itself**

The 110W features an AzureWave GPS-M16 [76] GPS receiver; however poor API provision and meager documentation lead to use of a separate u-blox MAX-6 GPS receiver [77] outfitted with a Sarantel SL-1202 passive antenna [78]. The MAX-6 is of higher operational specification than the GPS-M16 and supports Satellite Based Augmentation Systems (SBAS) which improve the accuracy of location data by applying additional correction data received from networks of satellites and ground-based transmitters separate to



Figure 4.19: Configuration in Second Life client for Arduino + HMC6343 ‘joystick’.

those of the GPS system. These networks include the European Geostationary Navigation Overlay Service (EGNOS) that covers the UK where the experiments took place.

The product summary for the MAX-6 claims accuracy of 2.5m Circular Error Probable (CEP) without SBAS corrections and 2m CEP with SBAS corrections “demonstrated with a good active antenna” [79]. This means that, in an ideal situation with SBAS correction data available, there would be 50% certainty that each position reported by the GPS receiver would be within 2m of its actual position. The SL-1202 antenna used is passive, however as the distance between antenna and the MAX-6 IC itself in the hardware application is only a few millimeters there would have been negligible benefit from using an active antenna. However whether the SL-1202 constitutes ‘good’ for achieving the headlining performance characteristics of the MAX-6 is debatable as the definition of ‘good’ was not provided in the product summary.

The MAX-6 was operated in ‘pedestrian’ dynamic platform model, use of SBAS correction data was enabled and frequency of readings was set to the maximum of 5Hz.

To determine the real world accuracy attainable with the MAX-6 outfitted with the SL-1202 in situations akin to those of the cultural heritage case study, a walking route around the St Andrews cathedral ruins, akin to the route that an individual visitor or school group might take, was planned and then walked with the MAX-6 connected to a laptop computer via an Arduino operating as a Universal Asynchronous Receiver/Transmitter (UART) feeding the raw National Marine Electronics Association (NMEA) messages

into the ‘u-center’GPS evaluation software version 7.0 which logged the messages for later evaluation. Simultaneously for comparative purposes a mid-range consumer Android smartphone was used to record the same track; a HTC One S [80] containing a gpsOne Gen 8A solution within its Qualcomm Snapdragon S4 processor [81] and using Google’s ‘My Tracks’ app version 2.0.3 to record the data. The three sets of positional data (planned route, MAX-6 recorded route and smartphone recorded route) were entered into a PostgreSQL database [82, 83] and the PostGIS database extender’s ST\_HausdorffDistance algorithm [84] was used to calculate the Hausdorff distances between the recorded routes and the planned route and between the recorded routes themselves. In this scenario, the Hausdorff distance represents the furthest distance needed to travel from any point on the route recorded by the GPS receiver to reach the nearest point on the planned route. Because of the substantially greater inaccuracies identified in the latter part of the recorded tracks, separate Hausdorff distances were calculated both for the complete tracks and also for truncated first and second sub-tracks.

Whilst SL/OpenSim encapsulates many of the desirable architectural features for 3D PoSR experiments it does not support execution upon familiar mobile platforms (Android/iOS) nor does it provision for avatar control from sensor data. However the open source nature of the SL viewer allowed modifications to be effected, enabling control of the avatar and camera from real time data collected from position and orientation sensors connected to a tablet computer. This ability to control navigation within the 3D virtual environment without explicit conscious input of keyboard/mouse/touch commands is integral to reducing the cognitive load required to maintain a presence within a virtual environment which is a key requirement for overcoming the vacancy problem and achieving successful mobile cross reality.

To reduce computational load on the 110W, the OpenSim server was run on a separate Lenovo ThinkPad X61s laptop computer during the experiments. Due to the limited range of the laptop’s wireless interface, the laptop was connected by RJ45 ethernet cable to a Linksys WRT54G wireless router to allow the 110W to access the OpenSim server wirelessly from anywhere within the experiment area. The router was powered from a 12V sealed lead-acid battery. This setup is shown in figure ??.

The TinyGPS library [85] was used to abstract processing of NMEA messages from the MAX-6 to obtain the required latitude and longitude values.

HMC6343 SDA A4 HMC6343 SCL A5

ublox TX digital 5 ublox RX digital 4

LED on digital 12

5v & gnd where appropriate (boards used have step downs to 3.3v where required)

Go through Arduino sketch & talk about things like magnetic declination, etc.

the viewer was modified (giving rise to the Pangolin viewer) to make use of the Boost.Asio C++ library to support receiving data via serial port and to use these data to control the movement of the avatar and camera by directly interfacing with the control functions at a lower level of abstraction. Receipt of messages is performed in an asynchronous non-blocking fashion, with the viewer’s main loop processing the most recently received message in each iteration. Messages follow the format

$\langle bearing \rangle \langle pitch \rangle \langle roll \rangle \langle latitude \rangle \langle longitude \rangle$

The viewer’s GUI was modified with the addition of a dialogue that allows the user to specify the path of the serial device, separately enable or disable sensor-driven camera and movement control, as well as providing numerous controls for fine-tuning its behavior, including the ability to specify high-pass filters for avatar movement and specify the smoothing applied to camera control. This GUI also presents the necessary fields for input of the anchor point details and fields for diagnostic output of the received information. Figure ?? shows this GUI within the Pangolin viewer.

## 4.8 Using the Virtual Time Window

Two plausible modalities of interaction were identified for this system, with each presenting different requirements with regards to accuracy of position tracking.

The first modality is one in which a number of locations that represent points of particular interest are identified. This is already a common practice at cultural heritage sites, with such locations often bearing




Figure 4.20: Example wiring for Arduino with HMC6343 + u-blox MAX-6.




Figure 4.21: Assembled Arduino/sensors.



Figure 4.22: Arduino/sensors attached to tablet.

signs or placards presenting text and/or images explaining what can be observed from the position. With Pangolin, when a user walks within a certain range of such a point, their avatar can be moved to the corresponding location within the reconstruction (and a sound played to alert the user to the fact that there is something of interest to observe) from which they can then move the tablet around them to examine their surroundings in the reconstruction. This modality is similar to audio tours employed by many museums and cultural heritage sites, but replaces the requirement to follow a static route or type in numbers of locations with the ability to freely navigate the real environment with access to additional information being triggered automatically once within the required range of a point of interest.

The second modality is one of free roaming exploration, in which the movements of the user's avatar within the reconstruction mimic the user's movements within the real world as closely as possible. The first modality can be scaled to function with different accuracies of position tracking; as long as the distance between any two points of interest is at least as much as the worst case performance of the position tracking




Figure 4.23: Config pane in modified Second Life client for HMC6343 + MAX-6.



Figure 4.24: OpenSim Server & wireless AP.



Figure 4.25: VTw at the cathedral.

then distinguishing correctly between different points will always succeed. The second modality requires extremely accurate position tracking, arguably surpassing the capabilities of mainstream GPS technology even in ideal situations.

During the experiments the MAX-6 was unable to maintain reception of the additional correction data required for SBAS operation; when left stationary for several minutes reception was possible however sub-

sequent movement of only a few meters at walking pace broke the connection. This reduced the theoretical maximum performance of the unit to 2.5m CEP, with observed performance being lower. Figure ?? depicts an aerial view of the St Andrews cathedral ruins; the blue line represents the planned route, red the route recorded by the MAX-6 receiver and green the route recorded by the smartphone for comparative purposes, both while walking the planned route.

The Hausdorff distance between the planned route and that recorded by the MAX-6 was  $1.02e^{-04^\circ}$ . The ‘length’ of a degree of latitude and a degree of longitude depends upon location upon the Earth; around the location of the St Andrews cathedral  $1^\circ$  of latitude is equivalent to 111347.95m and  $1^\circ$  of longitude to 61843.88m. Thus the Hausdorff distance of  $1.02e^{-04^\circ}$  can be visualized as  $\pm 11.3$ m of North/South inaccuracy or  $\pm 6.3$ m of East/West inaccuracy (or a combination of both N/S and E/W inaccuracy not exceeding a total displacement of  $1.02e^{-04^\circ}$  from the planned route).

The MAX-6 did achieve better performance than the smartphone, which recorded a Hausdorff distance of  $1.33e^{-04^\circ}$  ( $\pm 14.8$ m N/S,  $\pm 8.2$ m E/W). The Hausdorff distance between the routes logged by the MAX-6 and the smartphone was  $1.14e^{-04^\circ}$  ( $\pm 12.7$ m N/S,  $\pm 7.0$ m E/W), which represents a low correlation between the inaccuracies recorded by the two receivers even though they are of similar magnitudes from the planned route.

The maximum inaccuracies were recorded when walking along the South wall of the cathedral’s nave. This wall is one of the most complete sections of the building with stonework reaching some 30ft above ground level and providing an effective obstruction to line-of-sight to half of the sky (and substantially impairing reception of signals from GPS satellites) when in close proximity to it. When considering just the sub-route shown in figure ??, which terminates before this wall begins to significantly obstruct view of the sky, the Hausdorff distances are notably smaller; the MAX-6 achieved a Hausdorff distance of  $7.23e^{-05^\circ}$  ( $\pm 8.05$ m N/S,  $\pm 4.47$ m E/W) throughout this sub-route, with the smartphone still behind with  $8.99e^{-05^\circ}$  ( $\pm 10.01$ m N/S,  $\pm 5.56$ m E/W). Again the Hausdorff distance between the receivers showed low correlation between the inaccuracies, at  $6.43e^{-05^\circ}$  ( $\pm 7.12$ m N/S,  $\pm 3.98$ m E/W).

When analyzing the tracks in the vicinity of the nave (see figure ??) it is shown that although the MAX-6 outperformed the smartphone in terms of Hausdorff distance this relationship can be considered misleading as the smartphone track corresponded more closely in shape to the planned route even if it did stray further at its extreme. The discrepancy in the behavior of the two receivers in this situation is attributed to different implementations of dead-reckoning functionality between the receivers. Dead-reckoning is the process used when a GPS receiver loses reception of location data from satellites and extrapolates its position based upon a combination of the last received position data and the velocity of travel at the time of receiving these data.

Pangolin’s camera control from orientation data does not have as stringent performance criteria as the movement control from position data. Unlike augmented reality where sparse virtual content is superimposed upon a view of a real environment and the virtual objects must be placed accurately in order for the effect to work well, cross reality presents a complete virtual environment that is viewed ‘separately’ or side-by-side with the real environment and thus discrepancies between orientation of real and virtual environments have a less detrimental effect to the experience. Although the accuracy of the camera control during the experiments was reported as being sufficient, the speed at which the camera orientation moved to match physical orientation was reported as being too slow, resulting in having to wait for the display to ‘catch up’ to changes in orientation. This is attributed to the 10Hz sampling rate of the orientation sensors which, particularly after readings are combined for smoothing purposes to reduce jerky movement, resulted in too infrequent orientation updates. Frame rates within Pangolin whilst navigating the route averaged between 15 and 20 frames per second with the viewer’s ‘quality and speed’ slider set to the ‘low’ position.

The style of explorative interaction with virtual content that this system employs is more resilient to input lag and low frame rates than other scenarios of interaction with virtual content such as fast paced competitive video games including First Person Shooters (FPS) [20], but overall user experience would nonetheless be improved by a faster sampling of orientation data and a higher frame rate. Additionally it should be noted that the cathedral reconstruction was created with relatively powerful desktop computers in mind as the primary deployment platform and has not been optimized for use on less powerful mobile platforms such as

Pangolin. Performance of Pangolin on a less graphically complex OpenSim region (Salt Pan 2 [17]), that also depicts a reconstruction of a cultural heritage site, was better at 20 to 25 frames per second at the ‘low’ position and between 15 and 20 frames per second at ‘high’ (see figure 7).

The positional accuracy of  $1.02e^{-04^\circ}$  attained by the MAX-6 is sufficient for the first modality of interaction (that of distinguishing and navigating between multiple points of interest). This value of  $1.02e^{-04^\circ}$  (analogous to a combination of  $\pm 11.3$ m of North/South inaccuracy or  $\pm 6.3$ m of East/West inaccuracy) represents a constraint on the granularity of the content; it is the minimum distance required between any two points of interest for them to be correctly differentiated between. This same value is not sufficient for the second modality of interaction (that of free roaming exploration with avatars mimicking their users’ movements as closely as possible). This modality would require the use of additional position tracking techniques to improve accuracy to around 1m CEP (analogous to  $8.98e^{-06^\circ}$  latitude or  $1.62e^{-05^\circ}$  longitude around the location of the St Andrews cathedral).

Use of a GPS receiver that is lower performance than the MAX-6 used by Pangolin, but more common due to being of the calibre integrated into smartphones and tablets such as that used in the experiments, is still sufficient for the first modality but with a larger minimum distance required between any two points of interest. The Hausdorff distance of  $1.33e^{-04^\circ}$  recorded by the smartphone used in the experiments is analogous to  $\pm 14.8$ m N/S or  $\pm 8.2$ m E/W around the location of the cathedral.

Observed accuracy of the orientation tracking is sufficient for both modalities of interaction; the accuracy of orientation tracking required does not change with different positional accuracy and the accuracy of orientation attained in the experiments is sufficient for an acceptable user experience, however the experience would benefit from better graphical quality and higher responsiveness to changes in user orientation.

# 5

## Mirrorshades - Development

*“A vacant-eyed clerk glanced up at me . . . He was wearing a bifocal visor, which gave him a semitransparent view of the OASIS while also allowing him to see his real-world surroundings.”*

*Ready Player One, Ernest Cline*

\*\*\*Mention first Mirrorshades test with single webcam providing small floating window in corner of virtual view (video is on youtube/Mirrorshades repo).

\*\*Show lens comparison picture from blog & a (new?) screenshot showing FoV of the camera feeds compared to that of Rift & explain why the discrepancy doesn't matter, especially when the Rift is fully extended.

\*\*\*This chapter has none of the actual design/development really, it just presents the finished platform.

### 5.0.1 Case Study - St Salvator's Chapel

Founded in 1450 but internally stripped of its medieval fittings during the Protestant Reformation (1517 - 1648), St Salvator's chapel in St Andrews looks markedly different in the present day than it did upon its completion. An existing VR reconstruction of the chapel as it stood in the period 1450-1460 & the marked differences between the internal appearance of the VR building & the current building (including the replacement of the original stone roof with a wooden one & drastically different dividing of the internal space) make this chapel an ideal candidate within the context of cultural heritage for a mobile XR system to be applied. Figure 5.1 shows the 1450-1460 layout of the chapel (including the paths that the IPS has been prepared upon).




Figure 5.1: Floor plan of St Salvator's chapel, with IPS routes.

## 5.1 The Mirrorshades Platform

Figure 5.2 presents a high level architectural overview of our mobile XR platform, dubbed Mirrorshades<sup>1</sup>.




Figure 5.2: Overview of the Mirrorshades platform.

### 5.1.1 Implementation

Figure 5.3 presents an overview of the implementation of the Mirrorshades platform design for use in the chapel investigations.




Figure 5.3: Implementation of Mirrorshades platform.

<sup>1</sup>**Mirrorshades: The Cyberpunk Anthology** (1986) is a defining cyberpunk short story collection, edited by Bruce Sterling.

### 5.1.2 Hardware Components

The hardware of the implementation comprises;

- an Oculus Rift DK1 HMD, including a 9-axis (3dof rotational) head tracker sampling at 1000Hz & mounted with a stereo camera solution comprising 2x Logitech C310 webcams modified with M12 lens mounts & 2.1mm lenses to provide approximately 87 degrees horizontal FOV of the RW environment (see figure 5.4);
- a USB battery pack, to power the HMD;
- a small laptop computer, with an Intel i7-3632QM processor, Nvidia GT 650M graphics card & 16GiB system memory;
- an Android smartphone, running Android 4.4.4;
- an Xbox 360 wireless controller, with USB receiver.



Figure 5.4: HMD with stereo camera solution.

### 5.1.3 Software Components

The software of the implementation comprises;

- an Android application that runs on the smartphone, determines the location of the phone within the building that it is in using the IndoorAtlas IPS [86] (figure 5.1 shows the paths within the chapel upon which the IPS has been configured) & submits these location data via PHP to a database server;
- a MySQL database server that stores location data for the phone & allows these data to be accessed both by the Unity application running upon the laptop & by a web visualisation;
- a Unity application that runs on the laptop.

#### **5.1.4 Integration of Components**

The Unity application hosts the VR representation of the chapel & takes in feeds from both webcams, the HMD head tracker & the Xbox controller. It also polls the database server for the most recent position data. All of these inputs are combined together to form the visual output for the HMD to display to the user.

As the user moves their head, the visuals that are presented to them upon the HMD's display change accordingly; the RW visuals change due to the webcams being physically fixed to the HMD & the VR visuals change due to data from the head tracker being used to change the orientation of the in game 'cameras' accordingly.

As the user changes their position by walking, the visuals that are presented to them upon the HMD's display also change accordingly; again the RW visuals change due to the webcams' position upon the HMD whilst the VR visuals change due to the user's position, as reported by the smartphone & the IndoorAtlas solution, being used to move the position of the in game cameras to the equivalent position within the VR representation.

As the user presses buttons or pulls triggers upon the Xbox controller, the visuals that are presented to them upon the HMD's display transition between RW & VR in different styles depending upon which button/trigger was activated.

## **5.2 Investigation 1 - The Case for Mobile XR**

This first investigation will compare interaction with the RW & VR chapel using Mirrorshades to interaction with the same content separately, the latter being the approach usually adopted for dissemination of VR content in cultural heritage contexts. Participants will complete a task that will promote active comparison & contrast of the RW & VR environments, whilst navigating a set route. This investigation will gauge through experimentation whether the Mirrorshades platform provides any value over the traditional manner in which the same VR content might be disseminated at a cultural heritage site.

### **5.2.1 Setting & Task**

This investigation comprises two phases;

1. Participants will experience the RW & VR chapels separately. They will navigate the VR chapel from a stationary position, as one might expect to see a VR installation at a cultural heritage site, using the Xbox controller to move around the VR environment observed via the HMD. The HMD will obscure their view of the RW chapel around them. Subsequently, they will navigate the RW chapel without the HMD or any associated equipment.
2. Participants will experience the RW & VR chapels in tandem using the Mirrorshades platform. They will wear the HMD, holding the Xbox controller in their right hand & the smartphone in their left, with the laptop & battery pack in a satchel worn over one shoulder. One style of transition will be available to the participants during this phase.

In all 3 scenarios (phase 1 VR, phase 1 RW, phase 2 RW + VR) the participant will navigate the same route & will be instructed to identify a particular feature/object within the chapel (see figures ?? & ??), situated somewhere upon the set route, that differs in its appearance &/or location between the RW & VR chapels. The order in which the two phases are completed will be randomised between participants, as will the features that they are told to observe in each phase. Participants will have a maximum length of time to navigate the route & will be allowed to stop before this time has elapsed should they wish.

### **5.2.2 Evaluation Techniques**

Evaluation will be performed via a short structured interview & completion of the System Usability Scale (SUS) [87].

### 5.2.3 Hypothesis

SUS responses are expected to average fairly low due to the cumbersome nature of the platform's implementation. Participants who are able to overcome this cumbersomeness are expected to respond favourably to the platform, with those who cannot overcome it responding in favour of the traditional 'separate' approach instead.

### 5.2.4 Transition Methods

Attending to visual stimuli from the RW environment via the webcams is required for the user to safely move around. Delay in the IPS reporting their position & inaccuracies in these position data (see figure 5.5 for a set of example position data) mean that moving around while attending only to visual stimuli from the VR environment would not be safe for the user, even with unchanging RW obstacles with perfectly accurate representations in the VR environment. Furthermore it is actually likely that RW obstacles will not have equivalent VR representations, such as in a scenario where XR is used to compare & contrast changes to a building's interior over extended periods of time (such as with the chapel investigations).




Figure 5.5: Positions (black circles) reported whilst walking a slow lap ( $< 1\text{ms}^{-1}$ , following gray path) of a departmental building. The building is approximately 40m wide by 30m tall.

Thus the HMD displays the feeds from the webcams as default & the user must trigger transitions to view the VR environment by pressing a button or pulling a trigger on the controller. Releasing the button/trigger causes the webcam feeds to be displayed again.

### Hard switch

The user presses & holds the [A] button on the controller to switch the visual stimuli displayed by the HMD from RW to VR. When the [A] button is released, the visual stimuli displayed by the HMD switch back from VR to RW. This is a ‘hard’ or ‘immediate’ switch with no fading or transition effect. Figure 5.6 illustrates this scenario.




Figure 5.6: Hard switch.

### Switch with linear interpolation

The user presses & holds the [B] button on the controller to switch the visual stimuli displayed by the HMD from RW to VR. When the [B] button is released, the visual stimuli displayed by the HMD switch back from VR to RW. This switch fades between RW & VR visual stimuli using linear interpolation on the opacity of the game objects that the webcam feeds are rendered upon. Figure 5.7 illustrates this scenario.




Figure 5.7: Switch with linear interpolation.

### Analogue selectable opacity

The user pulls the right analogue trigger ([RT]) on the controller, where the position of the trigger maps directly to the opacity of the game objects that the webcam feeds are rendered upon. The user can choose to stop at any intermediary position that suits their needs, keeping the level of opacity of the webcam feeds at that position, as well as controlling the rate at which the visual stimuli from the RW environment fade (by changing how quickly they change their depression of the trigger). Pulling the trigger all the way in displays only visual stimuli from the VR environment, while releasing it completely displays only visual stimuli from the RW environment. The number of intermediary positions is limited only by the resolution of the trigger & the encoding of the value.

This method allows the user to superimpose VR visual stimuli upon RW visual stimuli. This is similar, but not identical, to AR, as instead of displaying a small number of virtual objects upon the user's view of their RW environment, a complete VR environment is superimposed upon the user's view of their RW environment. Figure 5.8 illustrates this scenario.




Figure 5.8: Analogue selectable opacity.

### Periodic hard switches

Independent or in addition to any of the previous scenarios, the visual stimuli displayed by the HMD switch from RW to VR at a set interval & for a set amount of time. For example, every 3 seconds the stimuli switch from RW to VR for 0.2 of a second before switching back from VR to RW. Any user triggered transitions cause the interval timer to be reset, such that an 'automated' switch will never occur after less time from a user triggered switch than the set interval. Automated transitions are disabled whilst [RT] is at all depressed. Figure 5.9 illustrates this scenario, where  $i$  represents the interval between switches &  $d$  represents the duration of the switch from RW to VR.




Figure 5.9: Periodic hard switches.

### Reduced maximum opacity

Independent or in addition to any of the previous scenarios, the maximum opacity of the game objects that the webcam feeds are rendered upon is reduced, such that the ‘default’ position at which a transition has not been triggered (either by a button press, trigger movement or by a periodic switch) displays VR superimposed upon RW. Figure 5.10 illustrates this scenario in combination with a hard switch (from section 5.2.4) in which the user triggers hard switches between the default position of a superimposition of VR upon RW & a position where only VR stimuli are present.




Figure 5.10: Hard switch from reduced maximum opacity.

### 5.2.5 Experimental Task & Setting

For these experiments, the HMD is worn upon the head of the participant & is connected to the laptop computer, battery pack & wireless receiver worn in a satchel. The smartphone is held in the left hand & the Xbox controller is held in the right hand (all of the buttons & triggers used for these experiments are on the right hand side of the controller, designed to be activated with only the right hand).

A task similar to that employed in the first investigation (see section 5.2 will be employed, encouraging participants to encounter multiple different scenarios of moving, remaining stationary, etc.

### 5.2.6 Evaluation

Evaluating users’ preferences toward different methods of transitioning between visual stimuli in different situations pertains to studying their reactions & responses to ascertain the effect upon their focus of attention, concepts which are largely psychological in nature & highly subjective [39]. Thus, subjective measures will produce the bulk of the data for evaluation. However, objective data will also be collected & cross referenced with the subjective data in attempts to support or contradict any relationships that are identified.

It is hypothesized that a manner of transitioning between visual stimuli which results in a less severe BIP will be preferable to a manner of transitioning which results in a worse BIP. As focus in the Waterworth model is most closely related to presence in the VR literature [36], one of the subjective measures that will be used in this evaluation will be an established presence measure, to try to capture the behaviour of the user’s position upon the focus axis.

#### Subjective Quantitative - Post-Task Questionnaire

After completing the task, participants will respond to the Igroup Presence Questionnaire (IPQ) [88] (see appendix ?? for the items of the IPQ) which will provide subjective quantitative insight into their experiences

with the system, in particular in relation to their position upon the focus axis of the combined model. The IPQ represents a useful questionnaire for evaluation of users' subjective experiences of using the Mirrorshades platform because its terms, especially in the 'spatial involvement' scale, question about the RW environment in a manner that does not explicitly present it as a 'distraction' from the VR interaction as many other presence questionnaires do.

Whilst a traditional VR experience would hope to elicit high SP1 & SP4 results combined with low INV1 & INV3 results, Mirrorshades participants are expected to report high SP1 & SP4 combined with *high* INV1 & INV3. The results from participants in this investigation will be compared against those who partook in a 'traditional' VR experience wherein RW stimuli were considered a distraction.

### **Subjective Qualitative - Interview**

A structured interview will be performed after the IPQ has been completed.

### **Objective Quantitative - Automatic Data Logging**

The Unity app logs the following quantitative data each frame to a tab separated variable (.tsv) file;

- <frame\_number>
- <timestep> - according to the laptop's internal clock
- <original\_position> - the position as a Unity Vector3 where the user begins the experiment
- <position> - the position as a Unity Vector3 where the user is on this frame
- <delta\_x> & <delta\_z> - the difference in the x & z axes between <original\_position> & <position> on this frame
- <left\_rotation> & <right\_rotation> - the orientations as Unity Quaternion of the two Unity camera game objects
- <base\_opacity> - the maximum opacity of the game objects upon which the webcam feeds are rendered (see section 5.2.4)
- <left\_opacity> & <right\_opacity> - the opacity on this frame of the game objects upon which the webcam feeds are rendered
- <auto\_tick> - whether a periodic switch is in progress (see section 5.2.4)
- <auto\_duration> & <auto\_spacing> - the interval & duration values of the periodic hard switching
- <framerate> - an estimate of the current frame rate (frames per second)
- <A\_button>, <B\_button> & <right\_trigger> - the current values of these inputs on the controller

An example line of this output;

```
420 08-05-2014 12-34-36-257 (3.4, 1.0, -8.3) (0.3, 1.0, -8.3) 3.153522 0.0001955032
(-0.1, -0.7, -0.1, 0.7) (-0.1, -0.7, -0.1, 0.7) 1 1 1 False 0 0 39.57977 False False 0
```

These data are expected to reveal relationships between various different metrics & the choice of transition methods. For example, it is expected that participants will perform short transitions to VR or transitions to a mix of RW & VR when moving & perform longer transitions to VR when stationary. This kind of relationship will support or contradict the subjective data collected through questionnaire & interview.

### **Objective Qualitative - Video Recording**

During experiments, the video feed being displayed by the HMD will be recorded & the user will be recorded using a video camera (both video & audio). The video of the HMD graphics will be used in comparison with the quantitative data, while the video & audio recording of the user will provide objective insight into their behaviour.

# 6

## Mirrorshades - Evaluation

Studies are split into three parts; Phase 1, Phase 2.1 & Phase 2.2.

### 6.1 The Case for Mobile XR

This investigation compares two scenarios for interaction with a real location & a corresponding virtual location.

1. **Stationary scenario** - interacting with the virtual location from a fixed real location, then subsequently interacting with the real location.
2. **Mobile scenario** - using the Mirrorshades platform to interact with both the real location & the corresponding virtual location in tandem, whilst moving around both environments.

The locations in question are St Salvator's chapel & a virtual reconstruction of the chapel as it stood in 1450-1460. The stationary scenario is representative of how virtual reality technologies, including both CAVEs & HMDs, have previously been used for dissemination of virtual reality content in cultural heritage contexts [47] & thus this investigation serves to compare Mirrorshades with previous applications virtual reality content to these contexts.

### 6.2 Process

- Participants complete a pre-task questionnaire, which provides calibration for their subsequent responses by enquiring about age, gender identity, previous experience with VR hardware & previous interactions with either the real or virtual chapel. This questionnaire is included as Appendix ??.
- Participants familiarise themselves with the experience of using the Oculus Rift DK1 HMD & the Xbox 360 controller by interacting with the 'Tuscany demo' prepared & maintained by the Oculus VR team. This is performed from a seated position.
- Participants complete the stationary scenario.
- After completing the stationary scenario, participants complete the System Usability Scale (SUS) [87] questionnaire, included as Appendix 6.2 & a 12-item questionnaire, included as Appendix ??.
- Participants complete the mobile scenario.
- After completing the mobile scenario, participants complete the SUS questionnaire & the 12-item questionnaire again.

- Finally, the participant is engaged in a short structured interview. Interview prompts are included as Appendix ??.

In addition to SUS, the 12-item questionnaire & the structured interview, quantitative data is logged by the Mirrorshades platform when a participant is interacting with virtual content in the first scenario & at all times during the second scenario.

### 6.3 The Scenarios

Both scenarios that participants complete for this investigation are designed to mimic the style of exploration & interaction that visitors to the chapel display, which was observed over several occasions. Visitors enter the chapel from the North/West corner then proceed to walk Eastwards along the nave, pausing to look around after passing through the rood screen, before continuing along the nave toward the altar. Visitors pause in front of the alter upon reaching the end of the pews & then walk North toward the tomb where they pause again to inspect it. Participants are instructed to imagine that they are performing a similar visit to the chapel & to follow a similar path, pausing after the rood screen, at the end of the pews & in front of the tomb. Participants are shown the map included as figure 6.1 to explain the scenario better.

In the stationary scenario, participants interact with the virtual chapel using the Rift & Xbox controller, whilst in a sitting position. After completing the path, they remove the headset & then walk the same path in the real chapel. This scenario alludes to how virtual reality technologies have previously been applied to cultural heritage situations, allowing visitors to experience a virtual reality reconstruction or reimagination of the real environment from a fixed position & with their view of the real environment wholly occluded by their view of the virtual environment.

In the mobile scenario, participants wear the HMD, hold the Xbox controller in their right hand & the smartphone in their left, with the laptop & battery pack in a satchel worn over the right shoulder. They then walk the same path, but this time with the ability to transition at any time between viewing the real environment & the virtual environment from the same vantage point.

In this first investigation phase, only one transition is available to participants. Preliminary experiments involving the researchers' colleagues that allowed hard transitions, linear interpolated transitions & analogue selectable opacity, indicated that the linear interpolated transition was preferred to either the hard transition or the analogue selectable opacity & thus this is the transition available to participants in this first phase investigation.

### 6.4 Hypotheses

The aim of the mobile scenario is to improve participant engagement with & understanding of the relationships between the real & virtual environments, by addressing the problems of spatial & temporal separation inherent with the 'traditional' stationary scenario, by imparting upon the participant the ability to transition between equivalent vantage points within the real & virtual environments at will.

While we expect participants to report that the mobile scenario does indeed allow them to better compare & contrast the real & virtual environments, identify differences between the real & virtual environments & gain a better understanding of how the real & virtual environments relate to each other, we expect some participants to report that having to 'split' their attention between the two environments in the mobile scenario leads to lessened engagement & understanding & that the visual quality of the real view through the headset/cameras leads to some participants preferring to interact with the real environment without the headset.

We expect the cumbersome nature of the mobile scenario & the reduced quality of viewing the real environment via the headset/cameras to have a noticeable effect upon participants movement (both position & head orientation) in the mobile scenario.

Addressing these issues, such that participants don't find viewing the real through the headset to be such a reduction in quality compared to just seeing real, such that participants feel as though they can move &




Figure 6.1: The path & positions within the chapel that participants are instructed to attend to.

look around themselves as much in the mobile scenario as in the stationary scenario & such that participants transition between real & virtual at any time instead of avoiding transitions in situations in which they think that they will be unpleasant/jarring, is key & what the next stage will focus on.

## 6.5 SUS

SUS scores for the mobile scenario are expected to average lower than those for the stationary scenario, due to the cumbersome nature of the platform when performing the mobile scenario; during the stationary scenario, participants are seated, whilst during the mobile scenario they are required to carry a satchel over one shoulder & hold a smartphone in their left hand. Participants who are able to overcome this cumbersomeness are expected to respond more favourably to the mobile scenario than those who cannot overcome it.

## 6.6 12-item Questionnaire

- Participants will find it easier to compare & contrast real & virtual environments in the mobile scenario than in the stationary scenario (q2)
- Participants will experience a greater sense of ‘being in’ the virtual environment in the mobile scenario than in the stationary scenario (q4, due to physical movement/embodiment)
- Participants will have a greater sense of ‘being in the past’ in the mobile scenario than in the stationary scenario (q7)
- Participants will maintain greater awareness of both real & virtual environments in the mobile scenario than in the stationary scenario (q5)

- Participants will gain a better understanding of what the chapel was like in the past in the mobile scenario than in the stationary scenario (q12)

## 6.7 Log data

- Head movement (pitch & yaw) will be more restricted in the mobile scenario compared to the stationary scenario
- Aversion to looking around (even at real) when moving in the mobile scenario
- Head movements will be larger discrete changes in the stationary scenario compared to the mobile scenario
- Tendency to only look at virtual when looking around

## 6.8 Interviews

- mobile scenario makes it easier to spot differences
- mobile scenario reveals differences that stationary didn't
- stationary does not reveal differences that mobile doesn't
- mobile scenario is preferred & is user-reported as 'more engaging'

## 6.9 Phase 1 Results

### 6.9.1 Pre-task Questionnaire

For n=5 ages ranged from 21-26, 3x female & 2x male, all reported previous experience using a games console controller, 1x reported previous use of a HMD, 2x reported having previously visited the chapel, none had previously interacted with the virtual chapel model.

## 6.9.2 SUS




Figure 6.2: SUS results.

As expected, the SUS scores for the mobile scenario are lower than those of the stationary scenario, although not drastically so. Furthermore, although scoring lower on SUS, the mobile scenario came out above the stationary scenario when looking at the results of q8 in the 12-item questionnaire which asked participants if they thought they would have preferred a conventional computer monitor.

### 6.9.3 12-item Questionnaire




Figure 6.3: 12-item questionnaire results.

The hypotheses seem to hold, in particular;

- *Participants will maintain greater awareness of both real & virtual environments in the mobile scenario than in the stationary scenario* is supported by the responses to q5
- *Participants will have a greater sense of 'being in the past' in the mobile scenario than in the stationary scenario* is supported by q7 (thanks to embodiment?)
- *Participants will gain a better understanding of what the chapel was like in the past in the mobile scenario than in the stationary scenario* is supported by q12

It is worth highlighting the responses to q10 in relation to those to q2. Participants reported finding it easier to compare features from the past & present (q2) during the mobile scenario, however did not report a difference between not noticing differences between the real & virtual environments (q10).

#### 6.9.4 Participant 1




Figure 6.4: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.



Figure 6.5: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

### 6.9.5 Participant 3




Figure 6.6: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.7: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

### 6.9.6 Participant 4




Figure 6.8: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.9: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

### 6.9.7 Participant 5




Figure 6.10: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.11: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

### 6.9.8 Participant 6




Figure 6.12: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.13: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

## 6.10 Phase 2.1 Results

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetur id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

Nam dui ligula, fringilla a, euismod sodales, sollicitudin vel, wisi. Morbi auctor lorem non justo. Nam lacus libero, pretium at, lobortis vitae, ultricies et, tellus. Donec aliquet, tortor sed accumsan bibendum, erat ligula aliquet magna, vitae ornare odio metus a mi. Morbi ac orci et nisl hendrerit mollis. Suspendisse ut massa. Cras nec ante. Pellentesque a nulla. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Aliquam tincidunt urna. Nulla ullamcorper vestibulum turpis. Pellentesque cursus luctus mauris.

Nulla malesuada porttitor diam. Donec felis erat, congue non, volutpat at, tincidunt tristique, libero. Vivamus viverra fermentum felis. Donec nonummy pellentesque ante. Phasellus adipiscing semper elit. Proin fermentum massa ac quam. Sed diam turpis, molestie vitae, placerat a, molestie nec, leo. Maecenas lacinia. Nam ipsum ligula, eleifend at, accumsan nec, suscipit a, ipsum. Morbi blandit ligula feugiat magna. Nunc eleifend consequat lorem. Sed lacinia nulla vitae enim. Pellentesque tincidunt purus vel magna. Integer non enim. Praesent euismod nunc eu purus. Donec bibendum quam in tellus. Nullam cursus pulvinar lectus. Donec et mi. Nam vulputate metus eu enim. Vestibulum pellentesque felis eu massa.

### 6.10.1 Participant 7




Figure 6.14: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

## 6.10.2 Participant 8




Figure 6.15: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.16: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

### 6.10.3 Participant 9




Figure 6.17: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.18: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

#### 6.10.4 Participant 10




Figure 6.19: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.20: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

### 6.10.5 Participant 11




Figure 6.21: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.22: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

## 6.10.6 Participant 12




Figure 6.23: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.24: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

### 6.10.7 Participant 13




Figure 6.25: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.26: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

## 6.11 Phase 2.2 Results

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetur id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

Nam dui ligula, fringilla a, euismod sodales, sollicitudin vel, wisi. Morbi auctor lorem non justo. Nam lacus libero, pretium at, lobortis vitae, ultricies et, tellus. Donec aliquet, tortor sed accumsan bibendum, erat ligula aliquet magna, vitae ornare odio metus a mi. Morbi ac orci et nisl hendrerit mollis. Suspendisse ut massa. Cras nec ante. Pellentesque a nulla. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Aliquam tincidunt urna. Nulla ullamcorper vestibulum turpis. Pellentesque cursus luctus mauris.

Nulla malesuada porttitor diam. Donec felis erat, congue non, volutpat at, tincidunt tristique, libero. Vivamus viverra fermentum felis. Donec nonummy pellentesque ante. Phasellus adipiscing semper elit. Proin fermentum massa ac quam. Sed diam turpis, molestie vitae, placerat a, molestie nec, leo. Maecenas lacinia. Nam ipsum ligula, eleifend at, accumsan nec, suscipit a, ipsum. Morbi blandit ligula feugiat magna. Nunc eleifend consequat lorem. Sed lacinia nulla vitae enim. Pellentesque tincidunt purus vel magna. Integer non enim. Praesent euismod nunc eu purus. Donec bibendum quam in tellus. Nullam cursus pulvinar lectus. Donec et mi. Nam vulputate metus eu enim. Vestibulum pellentesque felis eu massa.

### 6.11.1 Participant 14




Figure 6.27: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.28: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

### 6.11.2 Participant 15




Figure 6.29: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.30: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

### 6.11.3 Participant 16




Figure 6.31: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.32: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

#### 6.11.4 Participant 17




Figure 6.33: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.




Figure 6.34: Some images, yah.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

## Conclusions & Discussion

- **Content** - More in-depth explanation of contributions, identify future work (but don't dwindle).
  - **What has been done** - Nothing.
  - **What is left to do/how long should it take** - Should probably be written towards the end, after all design & implementation, evaluation & discussion has been completed. Should be a short section, 10 pages is probably far too long, shouldn't take long to write if the evaluation & discussion section is done properly.
-

# Appendices

DRAFT

# Bibliography

- [1] Steven Warburton. Second Life in higher education: Assessing the potential for and the barriers to deploying virtual worlds in learning and teaching. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 40(3):414–426, 2009.
- [2] Beth Coleman. Using Sensor Inputs to Affect Virtual and Real Environments. *Pervasive Computing, IEEE*, 8(3):16–23, July 2009.
- [3] Raymond P Ten Eyck. Simulation in emergency medicine training. *Pediatric Emergency Care*, 27(4):342–344, 2011.
- [4] Hang Qiu and Leiting Chen. Real-Time Virtual Military Simulation System. In *2009 First International Conference on Information Science and Engineering*, number 2007, pages 1391–1394. Ieee, 2009.
- [5] Camille Scherrer, Julien Pilet, Pascal Fua, and Vincent Lepetit. The haunted book. In *Proceedings - 7th IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality 2008, ISMAR 2008*, pages 163–164, 2008.
- [6] Thomas Sheridan. Musings on Telepresence and Virtual Presence. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 1(1):120–126, 1992.
- [7] Paul Milgram and Fumio Kishino. A Taxonomy of Mixed Reality Visual Displays. *IEICE Trans. Information Systems*, E77-D(12):1321–1329, 1994.
- [8] Paul Milgram and Herman Colquhoun Jr. A Taxonomy of Real and Virtual World Display Integration, 1999.
- [9] Lars Qvortrup. Cyberspace as Representation of Space Experience: In Defence of a Phenomenological Approach. In Lars Qvortrup, editor, *Virtual Space: Spatiality in Virtual Inhabited 3D Worlds*, chapter 1, pages 5–24. Springer-Verlag, 2002.
- [10] Roy Want. Through Tinted Eyeglasses. *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, 8(3):2–4, July 2009.
- [11] Judy York and Parag C Pendharkar. Humancomputer interaction issues for mobile computing in a variable work context. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 60(5-6):771–797, 2004.
- [12] Jack Schofield. Google Project Glass: will we really wear digital goggles?, 2012.
- [13] Sherry Turkle. *Alone Together: Why We Expect More From Technology And Less From Each Other*. Basic Books, 2011.
- [14] Steve Mann. Mediated Reality with implementations for everyday life, 2002.
- [15] Aaron Druck. When Will Virtual Reality Become a Reality?, 2006.
- [16] Nobuyoshi Terashima and John Tiffin, editors. *HyperReality: Paradigm for the Third Millenium*. Routledge, 2001.

- [17] D W F Van Krevelen and R Poelman. A Survey of Augmented Reality Technologies, Applications and Limitations. *The International Journal of Virtual Reality*, 9(2):1–20, 2010.
- [18] María Caballero, Ting-Ray Chang, María Menéndez, and Valentina Occhialini. Behand: augmented virtuality gestural interaction for mobile phones. In *Proceedings of the 12th international conference on Human computer interaction with mobile devices and services*, MobileHCI ’10, pages 451–454, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM.
- [19] Jean Baudrillard. *Simulacra and Simulation*, volume 29 of *The Body, in theory*. University of Michigan Press, 1994.
- [20] Sally A Applin. PolySocial Reality : Prospects for Extending User Capabilities Beyond Mixed , Dual and Blended Reality. *Policy*, (February), 2012.
- [21] Joseph A. Paradiso and James A. Landay. Cross-Reality Environments. *Pervasive Computing, IEEE*, 8(3):14–15, July 2009.
- [22] Marie Kim, Hwang Jae Gak, and Cheol Sig Pyo. Practical RFID + sensor convergence toward context-aware X-reality. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Interaction Sciences: Information Technology, Culture and Human*, ICIS ’09, pages 1049–1055, New York, NY, USA, November 2009. ACM.
- [23] Joshua Lifton and Joseph Paradiso. Dual Reality: Merging the Real and Virtual. In *Proceedings of the First International ICST Conference on Facets of Virtual Environments (FaVE)*, July 2009.
- [24] Ian Hughes. Lessons from second life, 2006.
- [25] Ian Hughes. Second Life Outside in, 2006.
- [26] Ian Hughes. Well it got my attention Second Life, 2006.
- [27] Joshua Lifton, Mark Feldmeier, Yasuhiro Ono, Cameron Lewis, and Joseph A. Paradiso. A platform for ubiquitous sensor deployment in occupational and domestic environments. In *Proceedings of the 6th international conference on Information processing in sensor networks - IPSN ’07*, page 119, New York, New York, USA, April 2007. ACM Press.
- [28] Joshua Lifton. *Dual Reality: An Emerging Medium*. Ph.d. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Media Arts and Sciences, September 2007.
- [29] Sherry Turkle. *Life on the Screen*. Simon & Schuster, 1st touchs edition, 1997.
- [30] Wade Roush. Second Earth, 2007.
- [31] Edward Castranova. *Synthetic Worlds: The Business and Culture of Online Games*. University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- [32] Richard Bartle. *Designing Virtual Worlds*, volume p of *New Riders Games Series*. New Riders Games, 2004.
- [33] Bob G Witmer and Michael J Singer. Measuring Presence in Virtual Environments: A Presence Questionnaire. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 7(3):225–240, 1998.
- [34] Mel Slater and Sylvia Wilbur. A framework for immersive virtual environments (FIVE). *Presence Teleoperators Virtual Environments*, 6(6):603, 1997.
- [35] Corina Constantin. Virtual Environments and the Sense of Being There: An SEM Model of Presence, 2003.

- [36] E L Waterworth and J A Waterworth. Focus, locus, and sensus: the three dimensions of virtual experience. *Cyberpsychology & behavior : the impact of the Internet, multimedia and virtual reality on behavior and society*, 4(2):203–213, 2001.
- [37] S Laureys, M Boly, G Moonen, and P Maquet. Two Dimensions of Consciousness: Arousal and Awareness. 2:1133–1142, 2009.
- [38] Mel Slater. Presence and The Sixth Sense. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 11(4):435–439, August 2002.
- [39] Wijnand Ijsselsteijn. Understanding Presence. In *Proceedings of the AIIA 2002 'Workshop sulla percezione della presenza in ambienti virtuali o remoti'*, 2001.
- [40] Carrie Heeter. Reflections on Real Presence by a Virtual Person, 2003.
- [41] Wijnand Ijsselsteijn, Huib de Ridder, Roelof Hamberg, Don Bouwhuis, and Jonathan Freeman. Perceived depth and the feeling of presence in 3DTV, 1998.
- [42] Sherry Turkle. Our Split Screens. In Andrew Feenberg and Darin Barney, editors, *Community in the Digital Age: Philosophy and Practice*, chapter 6, pages 101–117. Rowman & Littlefield, 2004.
- [43] Mel Slater and Anthony Steed. A Virtual Presence Counter. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 9(5):413–434, October 2000.
- [44] Raffaele De Amicis, Gabrio Girardi, Michele Andreolli, Giuseppe Conti, and Raffaele De Amicis. Game based technology to enhance the learning of history and cultural heritage. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Advances in Computer Entertainment Technology*, ACE '09, page 451, New York, NY, USA, October 2009. ACM.
- [45] Steve Mann and James Fung. EyeTap Devices for Augmented, Deliberately Diminished, or Otherwise Altered Visual Perception of Rigid Planar Patches of Real-World Scenes, 2002.
- [46] Peter Bøgh Andersen. Tangible Objects : Connecting Informational and Physical space.
- [47] Maria Roussou. Virtual Heritage : From the Research Lab to the Broad Public. In *VAST 2000 Euroconference*, pages 93–100. BAR International Series 1075, Oxford, Archaeopress, 2002.
- [48] Maria Roussou, George Drettakis, and George Drettakis Maria Roussou. Photorealism and Non-Photorealism in Virtual Heritage Representation. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Virtual Reality, Archeology and Cultural Heritage (VAST)*, 2003.
- [49] Stephen M. Griffin. Recovering the past through computation: new techniques for cultural heritage. In *Proceedings of the international conference on Multimedia information retrieval*, MIR '10, pages 13–14, New York, NY, USA, March 2010. ACM.
- [50] Katsushi Ikeuchi, Atsushi Nakazawa, Kazuhide Hasegawa, and Takeshi Ohishi. The Great Buddha Project: Modeling Cultural Heritage for VR Systems through Observation. page 7, October 2003.
- [51] Hrvoje Benko, Edward W Ishak, and Steven Feiner. Collaborative Mixed Reality Visualization of an Archaeological Excavation. In *Proceedings of the 3rd IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality*, ISMAR '04, pages 132–140, Washington, DC, USA, 2004. IEEE Computer Society.
- [52] Rafal Wojciechowski, Krzysztof Walczak, Martin White, and Wojciech Cellary. Building Virtual and Augmented Reality museum exhibitions. In *Proceedings of the ninth international conference on 3D Web technology - Web3D '04*, page 135, New York, New York, USA, April 2004. ACM Press.

- [53] Krzysztof Walczak and Martin White. Cultural heritage applications of virtual reality. In *Proceedings of the eighth international conference on 3D Web technology*, Web3D '03, pages 182–183, New York, NY, USA, March 2003. ACM.
- [54] Emanuele Ruffaldi, Chiara Evangelista, Veronica Neri, Marcello Carrozzino, and Massimo Bergamasco. Design of information landscapes for cultural heritage content. In *Proceedings of the 3rd international conference on Digital Interactive Media in Entertainment and Arts - DIMEA '08*, page 113, New York, New York, USA, September 2008. ACM Press.
- [55] Carmelo Ardito, Maria Francesca Costabile, Rosa Lanzilotti, and Adalberto Lafcadio Simeone. Combining multimedia resources for an engaging experience of cultural heritage. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM workshop on Social, adaptive and personalized multimedia interaction and access*, SAPMIA '10, pages 45–48, New York, NY, USA, October 2010. ACM.
- [56] Alessandro E Foni, George Papagiannakis, and Nadia Magnenat-Thalmann. A taxonomy of visualization strategies for cultural heritage applications. *Journal on Computing and Cultural Heritage*, 3(1):1–21, 2010.
- [57] Vassilios Vlahakis, Nikos Ioannidis, John Karigiannis, Manolis Tsotros, Michael Gounaris, Luis Almeida, Didier Stricker, Tim Gleue, Ioannis T. Christou, and Renzo Carlucci. Archeoguide: first results of an augmented reality, mobile computing system in cultural heritage sites. In *Proceedings of the 2001 conference on Virtual reality, archeology, and cultural heritage*, VAST '01, pages 131–140, New York, NY, USA, November 2001. ACM.
- [58] Fumio Okura, Masayuki Kanbara, and Naokazu Yokoya. Fly-through Heijo Palace Site : Augmented Telepresence Using Aerial Omnidirectional Videos. *Computer*, 1:4503–4503, 2006.
- [59] Fumio Okura, Masayuki Kanbara, and Naokazu Yokoya. Fly-through Heijo Palace Site: Historical Tourism System Using Augmented Telepresence. In *International Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques, SIGGRAPH 2011, Vancouver, BC, Canada, August 7-11, 2011 , Poster Proceedings*, 2011.
- [60] George Papagiannakis, Sebastien Schertenleib, Michal Ponder, Marlène Arévalo-Poizat, Nadia Magnenat-Thalmann, and Daniel Thalmann. Real-time virtual humans in AR sites. In *1st European Conference on Visual Media Production CVMP*, number 4, pages 273–276. IET, 2004.
- [61] George Papagiannakis, Sbastien Schertenleib, Brian O'Kennedy, Marlene Arevalo-Poizat, Nadia Magnenat-Thalmann, Andrew Stoddart, and Daniel Thalmann. Mixing virtual and real scenes in the site of ancient Pompeii. *Computer Animation And Virtual Worlds*, 16(1):11–24, 2005.
- [62] George Papagiannakis and Nadia Magnenat-Thalmann. Mobile Augmented Heritage: Enabling Human Life in Ancient Pompeii. *International Journal of Architectural Computing*, 5(2):396–415, 2007.
- [63] George Papagiannakis and Nadia Magnenat-Thalmann. Recreating Daily Life in Pompeii. *Arqueologica 2.0*, 1:16–20, 2009.
- [64] Kangsoo Kim, Byung-Kuk Seo, Jae-Hyek Han, and Jong-II Park. Augmented reality tour system for immersive experience of cultural heritage. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Virtual Reality Continuum and its Applications in Industry - VRCAI '09*, page 323, New York, New York, USA, December 2009. ACM Press.
- [65] Takafumi Taketomi, Tomokazu Sato, and Naokazu Yokoya. AR Cultural Heritage Reconstruction Based on Feature Landmark Database Constructed by Using Omnidirectional Range Sensor. In *Computer Vision ACCV 2010 Workshops*, pages 265–275. 2011.

- [66] Dongdong Weng, Dewen Cheng, Yongtian Wang, and Yue Liu. Display systems and registration methods for augmented reality applications. *Optik - International Journal for Light and Electron Optics*, 123(9):769–774, 2012.
- [67] Marcio Cabral, Marcelo Zuffo, Silvia Ghirotti, Olavo Belloc, Leonardo Nomura, Mario Nagamura, Fernanda Andrade, Regis Faria, and Leandro Ferraz. An experience using X3D for virtual cultural heritage. In *Proceedings of the twelfth international conference on 3D web technology*, Web3D ’07, pages 161–164, New York, NY, USA, 2007. ACM.
- [68] Chris Christou, Cameron Angus, Celine Loscos, Andrea Dettori, and Maria Roussou. A versatile large-scale multimodal VR system for cultural heritage visualization. In *Proceedings of the ACM symposium on Virtual reality software and technology - VRST ’06*, page 133, New York, New York, USA, November 2006. ACM Press.
- [69] Ann McNamara, Alan Chalmers, Tom Troscianko, and Iain Gilchrist. Comparing Real & Synthetic Scenes using Human Judgements of Lightness. In *Proceedings of the Eurographics Workshop on Rendering Techniques 2000*, pages 207–218, London, UK, June 2000. Springer-Verlag.
- [70] J. Willmott, L. I. Wright, D. B. Arnold, and A. M. Day. Rendering of large and complex urban environments for real time heritage reconstructions. In *Proceedings of the 2001 conference on Virtual reality, archeology, and cultural heritage*, VAST ’01, pages 111–120, New York, NY, USA, November 2001. ACM.
- [71] K Getchell, J Nicoll, C Kerbey, A Miller, R Sweetman, and R Michaelson. Evaluating exploratory learning in LAVA. In *WBED’07 Proceedings of the sixth conference on IASTED International Conference Web-Based Education*, pages 561–567, 2007.
- [72] S. Kennedy, R. Fawcett, A. Miller, L. Dow, R. Sweetman, A. Field, A. Campbell, I. Oliver, J. McCaffery, and C. Allison. Exploring canons & cathedrals with open virtual worlds: The recreation of St Andrews Cathedral, St Andrews day, 1318. In *Proceedings of the DigitalHeritage 2013 - Federating the 19th Int'l VSMM, 10th Eurographics GCH, and 2nd UNESCO Memory of the World Conferences, Plus Special Sessions fromCAA, Arqueologica 2.0 et al.*, volume 2, pages 273–280, 2013.
- [73] Ltd. Micro-Star Int'l Co. MSI Global Notebook - WindPad 110W.
- [74] Rainer Mautz. *Indoor Positioning Technologies*. PhD thesis, ETH Zurich, 2012.
- [75] W Gellert, M Gottwald, H Hellwich, H Kästner, and H Küstner. *The VNR Concise Encyclopedia of Mathematics*. Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 2 edition, 1989.
- [76] AzureWave. GPS-M16.
- [77] u-blox AG. MAX-6 series.
- [78] Sarantel. SL1200.
- [79] u-blox AG. MAX-6 Product Summary, 2012.
- [80] HTC Corporation. HTC One S Overview - HTC Smartphones, 2013.
- [81] Qualcomm Incorporated. Snapdragon Processors — Qualcomm, 2013.
- [82] C J Davies. Database as plain-text SQL script file.
- [83] C J Davies. Database as tar archive suitable for input into pg\_restore.
- [84] PostGIS. ST\_HausdorffDistance.

- [85] Mikal Hart. TinyGPS.
- [86] IndoorAtlas Ltd. Ambient magnetic field-based indoor location technology. 2012.
- [87] John Brooke. SUS-A quick and dirty usability scale. *Usability evaluation in industry*, 189:194, 1996.
- [88] Thomas Schubert, Frank Friedmann, and Holger Regenbrecht. The Experience of Presence: Factor Analytic Insights, 2001.