Tangible User Interfaces... (TODO)

Christian Prossenitsch*
Vienna University of Technology

Karin Pfattner†
Vienna University of Technology

Abstract

In this paperl compare and analyze different Tangible User Interfaces. TUIs move away from the common input devices like mouse and keyboard and towards a direct interaction with physical objects in order to make the operation with devices more natural. This includes for example the handling of physical objects on tabletops, projections of information onto pieces of paper [?] or using additional devices to get more detailed data. The examples we are going to cover in this paper include applications in architecture, information visualization and learning tools.

CR Categories: K.6.1 [Management of Computing and Information Systems]: Project and People Management—Life Cycle; K.7.m [The Computing Profession]: Miscellaneous—Ethics

Keywords: radiosity, global illumination, constant time TODO

1 Introduction

In common user interfaces the ineraction is limited to indirect input methods such as mouse and keyboard. A more natural way of interaction would be to be able to directly touch and manipulate the objects of interest. One of the main goals in using Tangible User Interfaces is to combine visualization of data with direct interaction.

In this paper we first give a general overview on how Tangible User Interfaces (TUI) work and what the main challenges are.

In the next section we will give some examples of TUI and describe how some of the challenges can be solved.

2 Typical designs of Tangible User Interfaces

3 Examples of Tangible User Interfaces

There is a wide variety of Tangible User Interfaces (TUIs). Possible applications for TUIs are literally endless. Many systems of TUIs have been explored and published in the past, but still a lot of new a ideas are coming up and new applications for TUIs are going to be explored. In this section, we will give examine some examples of TUIs and give an overview of different domains where TUIs have been successfully deployed.

---

*e-mail: e0925433@student.tuwien.ac.at
†e-mail: insert email here

Figure 1: The reacTable in action (compare [?])

3.1 Table-top environments

Many TUIs rely on table-top environments as their interaction technique. In these environments, a IR camera is set underneath the table-top to track fiducial markers placed onto the table. The camera can also track touch interactions of users. Marker and touch-based interactions are used as user input to the TUI system. The system responds to the user interactions by projecting visual feedback onto the table-top.

3.1.1 reacTable

The reactAble, presented by [?], is a musical instrument based on a table-top TUI. Fiducial Markers represent musical objects, which generate sound according to their relation to each other. The markers are tracked by an IR camera. According to their attached symbol, each object has a dedicated function. The objects can be categorized in six different functional groups: audio generators, audio filters, controllers, control filters, mixers and global objects. [?] ReacTIVision, the computer vision system behind reactAble, tracks the fiducial markers and sends the output data to an audio synthesizer. The waveforms generated by the synthesizer, as well as the data from the ReacTIVision tracker are sent to a visual synthesizer. The visual synthesizer projects visual feedback back onto the table-top. The audio lines that connect objects show the real resulting waveforms. Visual feedback is also used to monitor the objects state and internal parameters. Fingers can be used to either modify the objects parameters, or to cut (i.e. mute) audio connections between objects. [?]

Modular synthesis is used for the sound generation process. Modular synthesis is based on the interconnection of sound generators and sound processor units. In reactAble, automatic connections between objects are made depending on the type of objects involved and the proximity between them. By moving objects around and bringing them into relation to each other, performers construct and play instruments at the same time. reactAble is also a collaborative tool for interactive live music. Because of the rather big size of the table-top, multiple artists can perform together on a single reacTable. [?]

3.1.2 TARboard

TARBoard is a tangible augmented reality system designed for table-top game environment. The purpose of TARboard is is to let users enjoy games in a more interactive and intuitive way and to make games more realistic and immersive. [**?**]

Markers are attached to objects or cards used in a game. Similar to reactAble, these markers are tracked on a table-top environment by a camera underneath it. The augmenting camera is placed above the table-top. It provides the video stream for augmenting a game with virtual objects. [**?**]

[**?**] implemented a card game as a prototype for TARboard. Each player has cards which represent mystic creatures. The marker on the bottom of each card is tracked by the tracking camera. When the players flip a card and place it near the battle zone, the creatures get augmented on the battle zone and fight against each other.

3.2 Urban planning workbenches

In urban planning, designers usually employ three forms of representation: Two-dimensional drawings on sheets of papers, three-dimensional physical models and computer models, which can be two and three-dimensional. Each of these representations are created and displayed independently. Urban planning workbenches try to bridge the gap between these forms of representation, by simultaneously layering 2D drawings, 3D physical models, and digital simulation over each other. First, the 2D drawings and sketches are laid out on a table. Next, the 3D models are placed on top of the drawings. Finally, video projectors project digital simulations onto the surface. Video cameras capture the activity on the table and adjust the dynamic representation according to the position of the drawings and models with optical tags. [**?**]

3.2.1 The Luminous Table

3.2.2 Urp

4 Tangible User Interfaces in Visualization

5 discussion

References

ALMGREN, J., CARLSSON, R., ERKKONEN, H., FREDRIKS-SON, J., MØLLER, S., RYDGÅRD, H., ÖSTERBERG, M., AND FJELD, M. 2005. Tangible user interface for chemistry education. In *Visualization, Portability, and Database. Proc. SIGRAD 2005*.

AVRAHAMI, D., WOBBROCK, J. O., AND IZADI, S. 2011. Portico: tangible interaction on and around a tablet. In *Proceedings of the 24th annual ACM symposium on User interface software and technology*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, UIST '11, 347–356.

HERMANN, T., BOVERMANN, T., RIEDENKLAU, E., AND RITTER, H. 2007. Tangible computing for interactive sonification of multivariate data.

HOLMAN, D., VERTEGAAL, R., ALTOSAAR, M., TROJE, N., AND JOHNS, D. 2005. Paper windows: interaction techniques for digital paper. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, CHI '05, 591–599.

HORNECKER, E., AND BUUR, J. 2006. Getting a grip on tangible interaction: a framework on physical space and social interaction. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, CHI '06, 437–446.

ISHII, H., UNDERKOFFLER, J., CHAK, D., AND PIPER, B. 2002. Augmented urban planning workbench: Overlaying drawings, physical models and digital simulation. 203–211.

JORDÀ, S., GEIGER, G., ALONSO, M., AND KALTENBRUNNER, M. 2007. The reactable: exploring the synergy between live music performance and tabletop tangible interfaces. In *Proceedings of the 1st international conference on Tangible and embedded interaction*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, TEI '07, 139–146.

JUN LEE, YOUNGTAE ROH, J.-I. K., AND WOOHYUN KIM, SUNGPIL HONG, H. K. 2009. A steerable tangible interface for multi-layered contents played on a tabletop interface. In *DVD of ITS '09*, ACM.

KOIKE, H., SATO, Y., KOBAYASHI, Y., TOBITA, H., AND KOBAYASHI, M. 2000. Interactive textbook and interactive venn diagram: natural and intuitive interfaces on augmented desk system. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, CHI '00, 121–128.

LAPIDES, P., SHARLIN, E., AND SOUSA, M. C. 2008. Three dimensional tangible user interface for controlling a robotic team.

SHAER, O., AND HORNECKER, E. 2010. Tangible user interfaces: Past, present, and future directions. *Found. Trends Hum.-Comput. Interact. 3*, 1–2 (Jan.), 1–137.

SHAER, O., KOL, G., STRAIT, M., FAN, C., GREVET, C., AND ELFENBEIN, S. 2010. G-nome surfer: a tabletop interface for collaborative exploration of genomic data. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, CHI '10, 1427–1436.

SPINDLER, M., TOMINSKI, C., SCHUMANN, H., AND DACHSELT, R. 2010. Tangible views for information visualization. In *ACM International Conference on Interactive Tabletops and Surfaces*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, ITS '10, 157–166.

ULLMER, B., AND ISHII, H. 1997. The metadesk: models and prototypes for tangible user interfaces. In *Proceedings of the 10th annual ACM symposium on User interface software and technology*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, UIST '97, 223–232.

ULLMER, B., ISHII, H., AND JACOB, R. J. K. 2003. Tangible query interfaces: Physically constrained tokens for manipulating database queries. In *Proceedings of Interact'03*, 279–286.

UNDERKOFFLER, J., AND ISHII, H. 1999. Urp: a luminous-tangible workbench for urban planning and design. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, CHI '99, 386–393.