



DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATICS

TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH

Bachelor's Thesis in Informatics: Games Engineering

**Smartphone-Assisted Virtual Reality  
Using Ubi-Interact**

Michael Lohr





DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATICS

TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH

Bachelor's Thesis in Informatics: Games Engineering

## **Smartphone-Assisted Virtual Reality Using Ubi-Interact**

## **Smartphone-gestützte Virtuelle Realität mit Ubi-Interact**

Author: Michael Lohr  
Supervisor: Prof. Gudrun Johanna Klinker, Ph.D.  
Advisor: Sandro Weber, M.Sc.  
Submission Date: October 15, 2019



I confirm that this bachelor's thesis is my own work and I have documented all sources and material used.

---

Munich, October 15, 2019

Michael Lohr

# **Abstract**

Virtual Reality is an emerging medium which enables immersive presence and interactivity in a three-dimensional space. Standard input devices like a mouse or keyboard are made for two-dimensional environments. Thus, new interaction devices have to be invented. This is not an easy task since the view is obscured by the headset, so all devices need a virtual representation. Most consumer-ready Virtual Reality peripherals, therefore, require an expensive tracking system.

Smartphones have a variety of different sensors built-in and also can run custom software. This makes them cheap general-purpose devices. Thanks to the orientational sensors and wireless capabilities, the phone can be represented in a virtual environment. Thus it is possible to use them as interaction devices for Virtual Reality.

To prove that the smartphone can be used as an input device for Virtual Reality, three interaction examples are presented. An orientation-based device, a pointing device and a virtual keyboard were implemented and evaluated in a SUS usability study. The UBI-Interact networking solution is used to make the system reusable and abstracted from device-specific environments.

# Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Motivation . . . . .	1
1.2. Problem Statement . . . . .	3
1.3. Outline . . . . .	3
<b>2. Related Work</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1. Deller et al. . . . .	4
2.2. Benzina et al. . . . .	4
2.3. Dias et al. . . . .	4
2.4. Steed et al. . . . .	5
<b>3. Implementation</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1. Ubi-Interact . . . . .	7
3.1.1. Architecture . . . . .	7
3.1.2. Interactions . . . . .	9
3.2. Technology Stack . . . . .	11
3.3. Smart Device . . . . .	12
3.3.1. Topic Data . . . . .	13
3.3.2. UBII Device Definition . . . . .	14
3.4. Experiments . . . . .	15
3.4.1. Model Viewer . . . . .	16
3.4.2. Laser Pointer . . . . .	18
3.4.3. Virtual Keyboard . . . . .	20
<b>4. Evaluation</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1. Overview . . . . .	23
4.2. Results . . . . .	24
4.2.1. Model Viewer . . . . .	26

*Contents*

---

4.2.2. Laser Pointer . . . . .	28
4.2.3. Virtual Keyboard . . . . .	31
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>A. User Evaluation Devices</b>	<b>37</b>
A.1. Testing Environment A: Home . . . . .	37
A.2. Testing Environment B: University . . . . .	38
<b>B. User Evaluation Form</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>44</b>

# Abbreviations

**API** Application Programming Interface

**DOF** Degrees Of Freedom

**HMD** Head-Mounted Display

**IMU** Inertial Measurement Unit

**JS** JavaScript

**PC** Personal Computer

**Protobuf** Google Protocol Buffers

**SUS** System Usability Scale

**SD** Standard Deviation

**UBII** UBI-Interact

**UI** User Interface

**UID** Unique Identifier

**VE** Virtual Environment

**VR** Virtual Reality

**WLAN** Wireless Local Area Network

**2D** Two-dimensional

**3D** Three-dimensional

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Motivation

Virtual Reality (VR) is an emerging technology, which provides new ways to present and interact with digital information. Best practices are not yet defined, which leaves much room for new methods and research. Viewing three-dimensional (3D) Virtual Environments (VEs) using a VR headset (or Head-Mounted Display (HMD)) is a great experience. But VR shines when interactivity comes into play. Since consumer HMDs are now available, the development of consumer tracked hand controllers (also known as VR/3D/hand/motion controllers) has begun. By mapping the “interaction devices” of the human body to a VE, the user is given a natural way of controlling and interacting with the virtual world. While common consumer VR headsets are rather similar to each other, motion controllers differ a lot from each other, as seen in Figure 1.1.1.



Figure 1.1.1.: A collection of different VR controllers. From left to right, top to bottom: HTC VIVE Controllers, Valve Index Controllers (“Knuckles”), VIVE Tracker, Oculus Touch Controllers, Samsung Odyssey Controllers.

**Source:** Lawrence Yang, [www.steamcommunity.com/games/.../announcements/...](http://www.steamcommunity.com/games/.../announcements/...)

---

## 1. Introduction

---

As of now, most controllers try to map the movement of our real fingers to the virtual world. The Leap Motion<sup>1</sup> sensor uses multiple infrared cameras to track hand poses, which is only possible in front of the sensor. Newer generations of VR controllers do this, too. The Oculus Touch<sup>2</sup> controllers track the distance of the fingers from the controller and the Valve Index<sup>3</sup> controllers even have pressure sensors built-in. However, for many interactions, hand inspired controllers are not ideal. This applies especially to productive VR applications, which require interactions like inputting text for labeling. Since conventional VR controllers are designed for some specific tasks (like hand movements), they are tedious to use for other tasks. They also require complex tracking systems.

The Google Cardboard<sup>4</sup> uses a smartphone as a display and for tracking. This makes it an inexpensive VR headset, but also demonstrates the versatility of a smartphone. Most people already have a smartphone, since they are general-purpose devices and not very expensive anymore. Thanks to Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) and Bluetooth<sup>5</sup> it is easy to connect the smartphone to other devices. They have input devices like buttons, a touch screen as well as sensors and systems like a Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU)<sup>6</sup>. Also, output devices like vibration motors and speakers are present. This makes them similar to VR controllers.

One significant difference between smartphones and common VR controllers is that smartphones do not have positional tracking built-in. The position can be estimated using an IMU, but since the error accumulates over time, other tracking methods have to be used to correct the drift [Zha+15]. Sophisticated approaches using the phone camera are computationally expensive and still not as good as complete tracking systems. Besides the missing positional tracking, the advantages lead to the assumption that the smartphone can be used as an alternative VR controller.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Leap Motion controller is a hand tracking device, which is often used to display a hand avatar.  
Website: [www.leapmotion.com](http://www.leapmotion.com)

<sup>2</sup>The Oculus Touch controllers are hand tracking devices included with the Oculus Rift HMD. Website: [www.oculus.com/rift](http://www.oculus.com/rift)

<sup>3</sup>The Valve Index is a HMD which includes its own set of controllers, called "Knuckles". Website: [store.steampowered.com/valveindex](http://store.steampowered.com/valveindex)

<sup>4</sup>The Google Cardboard is a HMD made out of cardboard, which uses a smartphone as a display and for tracking. Website: [vr.google.com/cardboard](http://vr.google.com/cardboard)

<sup>5</sup>Bluetooth is a wireless standard for exchanging data over short ranges between mobile devices.

<sup>6</sup>An IMU is an electronic component which is part of most smartphones and allows to measure a specific force, angular rate, and magnetic field.

## **1.2. Problem Statement**

This thesis aims to explore the possibilities of using the smartphone as an interaction device in VR experiences. Different methods of implementing the phone as an alternative input device for typical VR interactions are going to be presented and evaluated. They are going to be implemented in experiments using the UBI-Interact (UBII) architecture, to create an abstracted and reusable system. The goal of those experiments is not to create a better system, but rather show that the smartphone can be used as well as common VR controllers for certain interactions. Additional tasks, to complete in the experiments, are going to be implemented to evaluate the presented methods in a usability study.

## **1.3. Outline**

In the next chapter, previous work on this topic is presented. Before discussing the implementation of the experiments in the following chapter, UBII and the technology used to make the experiments possible, is introduced. The user study and its approach are presented afterward. After discussing the results of the study, the conclusion is drawn.

## 2. Related Work

### 2.1. Deller et al.

Deller and Ebert propose a modular framework to enable interactions between smartphones and large-screen applications. They use a typical client-server architecture with an XML<sup>2</sup>-based protocol. One difference to the system presented in this thesis in terms of networking is that they differentiate between application clients (the large screen) and interaction clients (the smartphones). They provide different modules for the client app. Some modules offer similar functionality like the ones implemented in the experiments of this thesis: The text module enables the user to enter a text; The accelerometer/magnetometer module sends IMU data like acceleration and magnetic field data in the background to the server. They also implemented their framework into an application where users can navigate a map and toggle display settings [DE11].

### 2.2. Benzina et al.

A similar problem is solved by Benzina, Toennis, Klinker, and Ashry. They introduce a system for flying through VEs in VR. A VR headset is used, which means the phone display cannot be used to display information because the sight is occluded by the HMD. Different methods of controlling the flight movement are presented. They concluded that the most accurate method for controlling the flight uses an approach, where an airplane metaphor (four Degrees Of Freedom (DOF)) is simulated [Ben+11].

### 2.3. Dias et al.

Dias, Afonso, Eliseu, and Santos propose a solution, where the smartphone has a visual representation in VR. The visual representation also shows information and User Interface (UI) on its virtual screen. The camera in the smartphone tracks a marker on

---

<sup>2</sup>XML is a standardized data exchange format, that uses human-readable text.

the HMD to track itself. Because the user interacts with the UI using the touch screen of the phone as he would in real life, the fingers have to be tracked. Otherwise, the user would not know where his fingers hit the touch screen because the sight is occluded by the HMD. To solve this problem, they attached a Leap Motion sensor to the HMD, which displays a hand avatar [Dia+18]. The setup is shown in Figure 2.3.1.




Figure 2.3.1.: The tracking system by Dias, Afonso, Eliseu, and Santos [Dia+18, pp. 4, 5].

## 2.4. Steed at al.

The approach by Steed and Julier also uses a smartphone and a VR headset. They implemented a visual representation of the phone. However, since they do not have positional tracking for the smartphone, the position is fixed relative to the position of the HMD. There are two different possible positions, one in front of the HMD and the other one in front of the stomach. The position is switched if a hand raise gesture with the phone in the hand is detected. Gestures and orientation of the smartphone are detected using the data of the IMU. On the virtual phone screen, a virtual UI is displayed as seen in Figure 2.4.1b. This UI has control elements like buttons, which amongst others, can be used to toggle a selection mode. In the selection mode, the phone casts a ray out of the top (similar to a laser pointer) as seen in Figure 2.4.1a. The ray direction can be changed by rotating the smartphone. As soon as a UI button is pressed, the objects intersecting with the ray are selected [SJ13].

## 2. Related Work

---



(a) The virtual device in selection mode.



(b) The virtual UI and the cursor.

Figure 2.4.1.: The virtual smartphone representation by Steed and Julier [SJ13, p. 43].

# 3. Implementation

## 3.1. Ubi-Interact

UBII<sup>1</sup> is a framework for distributed applications, which allows to connect different devices. A centralized server is used to manage the system in a local network. The abstraction into devices, topics, and interactions allows decoupling the implementation of software from device-specific environments.

### 3.1.1. Architecture

The main components of the UBII framework are:

**UBII Clients** describe a basic network participant. For every UBII client registered on the server also exists one network socket address. Clients are an abstraction of a physical network device. They are defined by a Unique Identifier (UID).

**UBII Devices** can be registered by clients. A UBII-device groups different input and output UBII devices together. It is defined by a UID and a list of UBII components.

**UBII Components** contain the UBII topic name, UBII message formats for input/output UBII devices and whether it publishes input or receives output data. A data source for such an input UBII device, could be any sensor, for example, a button or a camera. Data output examples for input UBII devices are lamps and displays.

**UBII Message Formats** define the format of data published to a UBII topic. Even though it is possible to implement custom ones, most common data types are available. For example, `Vector4×4` (a four by four matrix), `Vector2` (a two-dimensional vector) or `boolean` (a binary value) are built-in.

**UBII Topics** are data channels which are addressed by a name. UBII Clients can publish messages to UBII topics, which are registered by a UBII device. They can receive messages, after subscribing to a UBII topic. Such messages (also called

---

<sup>1</sup>UBII is currently developed and maintained by Sandro Weber, who is also the advisor for this thesis.

### 3. Implementation

---

“UBII topic data”) are formatted as JSON<sup>1</sup>-string, whose structure is defined by the device.

**UBII Sessions** operate on the server but can be specified by the UBII client. They are defined by a UID as well as a list of interactions and **input/output mappings**. The mappings are defined by a UBII message format and UBII topic name.

**UBII Interactions** are reactive components. They operate on UBII topics and are defined by a source code snippet<sup>2</sup>. UBII Interactions are executed in a fixed interval on the UBII server. They can subscribe to UBII topics and use the received topic data as input, given an input/output mapping description. The output of the UBII interaction is published into another UBII topic. It is also possible to keep data to use in future executions (persistent state).

**UBII Services** are channels, used to send commands or requests to the UBII server. For example, they are used to subscribe to a UBII topic or list all available UBII topics.

The Figure 3.1.1 visualizes the relationships of the different components.



Figure 3.1.1.: Relationships of the core components in an entity relationship diagram.

<sup>1</sup>JSON is a standardized data exchange format, that uses human-readable text. It is often used for web-based data communication [ECM17, p. iii].

<sup>2</sup>Currently only JavaScript is supported as a script language.

### 3.1.2. Interactions

A powerful but optional core feature of UBII are interactions. As explained in the component overview (see 3.1.1), they are reactive components, which operate on UBII topics and regularly execute given code snippets (processing functions) on the UBII server. Interactions are isolated components, which depend on topic data. This abstraction introduces the possibility to reuse logic in other applications in a similar context. The data flow from a device to the interaction is visualized in the Figure 3.1.2.



Figure 3.1.2.: UBII interaction processing overview. This graphic gives a rough overview of the dataflow when using an UBII interaction. Figure created with the help of Sandro Weber.

UBII Interactions should be designed generalized so that they are easy to reuse. They can be used to discretize data, converting data to other formats or to outsource logic from the application. Concrete examples include detecting button presses, transforming coordinates, and evaluating data. An example implementation which detects position changes can be seen in Figure 3.1.3.

They are also useful if two UBII topics with different formats should be connected. An example of such a scenario could be an application, which consumes a rotation given in Euler angles. However, some input UBII devices publish Euler angles in degrees. A UBII interaction, which takes Euler angles in degrees from one UBII topic and publishes Euler angles in radians to another one, could be implemented.

### 3. Implementation

---

```
1 // detect intentional movement by comparing the current position with a previous one
2 function (inputs, outputs, state) {
3     const threshold = 0.05;
4
5     if (state.lastPosition) {
6         const vector = {
7             x: inputs.position.x - state.lastPosition.x,
8             y: inputs.position.y - state.lastPosition.y,
9         };
10
11     const squaredDistance = Math.pow(vector.x, 2) + Math.pow(vector.y, 2);
12
13     outputs.moved = squaredDistance < threshold;
14 } else {
15     outputs.moved = true;
16 }
17
18 state.lastPosition = inputs.position;
19 }
```

Figure 3.1.3.: An example for an UBII interaction written in JavaScript. This UBII interaction calculates the squared distance of two points. One of the points is provided through the input, while the other one is stored in the state variable. To achieve this, the Euclidean vector norm of the subtraction of both vectors without the square root is calculated and compared with a threshold constant. The result is then written into the output as a boolean data type. This is used to detect intended changes in the input position.

The code snippet has to define a function, which accepts three parameters: `inputs` is a collection of values, which contains values which were published into a UBII topic. The UBII topic, which was used, is defined by the input mappings of the UBII session. `outputs` is an empty collection, where values can be added. Those values are then published into a UBII topic, defined by the output mappings of the UBII session. `state` stores a persistent collection of values, which can be used in later executions of the same UBII interaction.

## 3.2. Technology Stack

Since most of the existing software for UBII was written in JavaScript (JS)<sup>1</sup> using a web-based architecture, the proposed application was also implemented this way. This has the notable advantage of platform independence. Most modern devices can run web-based software, which means they can also run this application. Also, the application is served by a web server, which means the user does not have to install the software onto his device.



Figure 3.2.1.: A screenshot of the UBII front end rendering a 3D cube.

A web interface with some UBII content (the UBII front end), demos and debugging tools were already written<sup>2</sup>, so I included my experiments in this application as well. The technology stack of the front end was built with the following technologies:

**Web APIs** are Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) available in modern web browsers to provide access to functionality or data outside the browser. The WebAPI is an additional layer of abstraction of the APIs of an operating system. While this has the advantage that the API is the same on every device, this also

---

<sup>1</sup>JS is a just-in-time compiled scripting language, widely used in web technology. It is a dynamic prototype-based language, which supports object-orientated programming [ECM18, pp. 43, 47].

<sup>2</sup>The front end was developed by Sandro Weber, Daniel Dyrda and me.

prevents the access to the raw sensor data<sup>1</sup>. In this thesis, the WebVR API and the device orientation API were used. The former enables to render to external VR headsets. The latter gives access to the data of the Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU).

**Vue.js** is a modern open-source JavaScript web framework<sup>2,3</sup> [You19]. Being released in 2014 and developed by Evan You, it is a relatively young framework [Koe16, p. 17]. However, it quickly gained traction and is quite popular now [Koe16, pp. 12 sq.]. Packages like Vue.js itself, Vue.js plugins and other JavaScript libraries are managed using the package manager npm<sup>4</sup>.

**Three.js** is a lightweight open-source library which utilizes WebGL to render 3D computer graphics<sup>5</sup> [Cab19]. It can be used to render scenes to the display as well as to a VR headset using WebVR. This high-level library comes with a lot of features, similar to a game engine, like scenes, effects, lights, animation, geometry, and more.

**UBII Client** is an JavaScript client for the UBII system. It abstracts the protocol and provides high-level functions to register devices as well as send and receive UBII topic data. The UBII system uses Google Protocol Buffers (Protobuf)<sup>6</sup> to serialize the data.

Figure 3.2.1 displays a test view, which uses Vue.js to manage the views and Three.js to render a cube.

### 3.3. Smart Device

The “Smart Device” is a part of the UBII front end. Because it is web-based, only data which is available through the **Web APIs** can be obtained. Since it was not designed for a specific use case, it is thought as a general-purpose or testing device. Only touch positions, touch events, orientation, and acceleration are sent to different UBII topics using the **UBII Client**. For more specific scenarios, the smart device can not be used,

---

<sup>1</sup>The specification is available on [www.w3c.github.io/deviceorientation](http://www.w3c.github.io/deviceorientation)

<sup>2</sup>A web framework is a software framework which provides a standard way to build web applications. It comes with tools and libraries to automate and make the development of web applications easier.

<sup>3</sup>Vue.js: Website: [www.vuejs.org](http://www.vuejs.org); Source code: [www.github.com/vuejs/vue](http://www.github.com/vuejs/vue)

<sup>4</sup>“NPM” stands for “Node Package Manager” and is also used in the UBII server itself. Website: [www.npmjs.com](http://www.npmjs.com)

<sup>5</sup>Three.js: Website: [www.threejs.org](http://www.threejs.org), Source code: [www.github.com/mrdoob/three.js](http://www.github.com/mrdoob/three.js)

<sup>6</sup>Protobuf is a mechanism to serialize data. The data is defined in a platform-neutral language, which compiles as a library to all commonly used programming languages [Goo19b]. Website: [www.developers.google.com/protocol-buffers/](http://www.developers.google.com/protocol-buffers/)

and a custom interface has to be implemented. For the experiments in this thesis, though, the smart device client was sufficient, after implementing some improvements.

The data which is published is also displayed on the screen for debugging purposes. It is possible to set the view to full-screen mode, to prevent unintentional interactions with control elements of the web browser or the operating system. Since the reference system for the orientation is fixed to the earth [Dev19, Chapter 4.1], a calibration system was implemented. With the press of the “Calibrate” button, the device is calibrated to the new orientation.

### 3.3.1. Topic Data

The orientation is provided by the **Web API** through the `DeviceOrientation` event. It is defined by three Euler angles named `alpha`, `beta` and `gamma`, as seen in Figure 3.3.1. While `alpha` returns values in the range  $[0, 360)$ , `beta` only returns the range  $[-180, 180)$  and `gamma`  $[-90, 90]$  [Dev19, Chapter 4.1]. This limitation entails that no full orientation tracking is possible with this event.




Figure 3.3.1.: The specification of the orientation values visualized. The  $x$  and  $y$  axes are inverted for the sake of clarity in this graphic.

The **Web API** also provides the `MotionEvent` which returns multiple vectors, one being the acceleration with the gravity (`accelerationIncludingGravity`). Since the gravity vector always points down, this vector can be used as a reference vector. Together with the values from the `DeviceOrientation` event, the full orientation can be derived. The resulting orientation, then has to be smoothed, because the acceleration vector uses the raw IMU acceleration output.

The data from the `DeviceOrientation` event already provides all three euler angles and is smoothed. Implementing the same for the data from the `MotionEvent`, would be outside

### 3. Implementation

---

the scope of this thesis. Because of this consideration, the `DeviceOrientation` event data is used in the experiments.

The touch position on the display is normalized to a range from zero to one. This removes the influence of display resolution and size. Events for starting and stopping touching are sent on different UBII topics. The acceleration of the smartphone is also sent to a UBII topic but is not used in the experiments of this thesis.

#### 3.3.2. UBII Device Definition

The smart device is registered as a device in the UBII network. The definition in JS can be seen in Figure 3.3.2. The structure of a UBII device was described in Chapter 3.1.1.

```
1 const ubiiDevice = {
2   name: 'web-interface-smart-device',
3   components: [
4     {
5       topic: clientId + '/web-interface-smart-device/touch_position',
6       messageFormat: 'ubii.dataStructure.Vector2',
7       ioType: ProtobufLibrary.ubii.devices.Component.IOType.INPUT
8     },
9     {
10       topic: clientId + '/web-interface-smart-device/orientation',
11       messageFormat: 'ubii.dataStructure.Vector3',
12       ioType: ProtobufLibrary.ubii.devices.Component.IOType.INPUT
13     },
14     {
15       topic: clientId + '/web-interface-smart-device/linear_acceleration',
16       messageFormat: 'ubii.dataStructure.Vector3',
17       ioType: ProtobufLibrary.ubii.devices.Component.IOType.INPUT
18     },
19     {
20       topic: clientId + '/web-interface-smart-device/touch_events',
21       messageFormat: 'ubii.dataStructure.TouchEvent',
22       ioType: ProtobufLibrary.ubii.devices.Component.IOType.INPUT
23     }
24   ]
25 };
```

Figure 3.3.2.: The smart device definition in JavaScript. It is defined by a name and a list of UBII components. The structure of a UBII device is further described in Chapter 3.1.1.

### 3. Implementation

---

A UBII device and all UBII topics must be registered with a UID for each client because it should be possible to read the data from different devices. This allows for using multiple devices at the same time so that they can be differentiated in UBII interactions. If the UBII topic names did not include the `clientId`, each connected device would publish to the same UBII topic, which would make the data unusable.

The touch position is published multiple times per second, but only sends the current position of the first touch on the smartphone display. Using this data, it is not possible to detect whether the display was just touched or released. A new UBII topic using the `Boolean`-type could have been used, but the position has to be obtained from the touch position UBII topic. To remove this dependency on the other UBII topic, the new type `TouchEvent` was implemented. The Protobuf definition can be seen in Figure 3.3.3. It contains the two-dimensional position and the binary type `ButtonEventType`, which can be reused in other events, too. `ButtonEventType` is an enumerated type which defines whether the touch interface was just touched or released.

```
1 syntax = "proto3";
2 package ubii.dataStructure;
3
4 import "proto/topicData/topicDataRecord/dataStructure/vector2.proto";
5
6 enum ButtonEventType {
7     UP = 0;
8     DOWN = 1;
9 }
10
11 message TouchEvent {
12     ButtonEventType type = 1;
13     ubii.dataStructure.Vector2 position = 2;
14 }
```

Figure 3.3.3.: The definition of the touch event, sent by the smart device client when a user touches or releases the touch screen. It is defined by a position and whether the touch pad was touched or released.

## 3.4. Experiments

Three main experiments were implemented to demonstrate how the smartphone can help with common interactions when using VR software. To achieve consistency amongst all experiments in terms of look and basic functionality, a parent class was

implemented. The parent class implements utilities, which are required by each experiment. It also sets up a basic scene, which contains a sky, a floor, and lights. Also, the connection to the UBII server is handled.

### **3.4.1. Model Viewer**

Virtual Reality offers a new way of experiencing 3D content. It is more convenient to view a model from different angles and gives a feel of a real presence of the object. Model viewers like Sketchfab<sup>1</sup> have implemented VR support a while ago [Den16]. However, this experience can be enhanced with a smartphone. Models can be rotated without changing the position of the headset or using an expensive hand motion tracking system.

Katzakis and Hori implemented this without VR. His approach uses a smartphone to rotate a model which is displayed on a conventional display. He uses a similar setup, in which the phone is wirelessly connected to a computer where the model is rendered. The orientation data comes from the magnetometer and, once calibrated to the screen position, is directly mapped to the model [KH10, p. 139]. In the evaluation of a mouse, a touch pen and the smartphone, the latter wins in terms of the time it takes to rotate the model to a certain pose [KH10, p. 140]. Since this approach turned out to be very successful, it was used in this experiment as well.

To feature how easy it is to view a more complex model using VR and the smartphone as a manipulator, a human skeleton model is used. This experiment is the only one supporting more than one smartphone client at the same time. For every client that connects, a new skeleton is created. The position is fixed and arranged around the position of the VR headset. A scene with multiple connected clients is shown in Figure 3.4.1.

---

<sup>1</sup>Sketchfab is an online platform to publish and view 3D content. Website: [www.sketchfab.com](http://www.sketchfab.com)

### 3. Implementation

---




Figure 3.4.1.: A screenshot of three devices being connected and controlling the rotation of the models.

The implementation of this experiment listens for new clients. As soon as one connects, a new UBII interaction is published and the resulting UBII topic subscribed. Since the smart device (see Section 3.3) publishes the orientation data in a different format than ThreeJS needs for rendering, a reusable UBII interaction was created. The UBII interaction converts the angles from radian to degrees, changes the coordinate system and publishes them to the `[client id]/SAVLaserPointer/orientation` topic. The code for the UBII interaction is shown in Figure 3.4.2.

```
1 function (input, output, state) {
2     if (!input) {
3         return;
4     }
5
6     const deg2Rad = function(v) {
7         return v * Math.PI / 180;
8     };
9
10    output.orientation = {
11        x: deg2Rad(input.orientation.y),
12        y: deg2Rad(input.orientation.x),
13        z: deg2Rad(-input.orientation.z)
14    };
15 }
```

Figure 3.4.2.: This UBII interaction is used to convert the orientation data sent by the smart device to the format ThreeJS needs for rendering. The values are converted by multiplying with an approximate of the number  $\Pi$  ("PI") and dividing by 180.

As in Section 3.3.1 described, the current implementation does not provide full 360-degree angles. This means that the model cannot be rotated upside down, which is very impractical for a model viewing application, but can be fixed and is not critical for a proof-of-concept.

### 3.4.2. Laser Pointer

Selecting elements in a virtual world is an essential interaction most VR applications use. The selection of elements in a two-dimensional (2D) environment with standard input devices like a mouse or touch screen is trivial. However, the selection of elements in a 3D environment is problematic because the element might be too far away from the user or the cursor. Ray casting<sup>1</sup> is used to solve this problem: A ray, with the tracked device as origin, is created. Then, the element first hit by the ray is selected. Implementations without a tracked device, often use the position and orientation of the headset. The ray is fixed to the head of the user and cast along his viewing direction [Kam18, p. 23]. This forces the user to keep the head still and look at a particular object to select it until a button is pressed or a specific time has passed.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ray casting describes a technique to determine the objects which intersect with a ray, cast from a given point into a given direction.

### 3. Implementation

---

A better solution is the use of handheld controllers, where the position of the controller is used as origin for the ray. Since the smartphone provides orientation data, it can be used for this task, too. However, most handheld controllers also have positional tracking, which allows them to represent the hand of a user by displaying a virtual phone. This emulates the use of a handheld laser pointer in the real world. Since a smartphone does not have positional tracking, the origin has to be somewhere else. Again, the head could be used, but then the user would have no visual representation of the rotation of the phone. To give the user a better feel for the direction he is pointing, a visual representation is needed. The user has to see where the ray is going, even when rotating it in the opposite direction of the view direction.

To work around the missing position data of the device, the approach by Pietroszek, Kuzminykh, Wallace, and Lank is used: The ray origin is set to a fixed location relative to the users head where the phone could be in the real world [Pie+14, Figure 3]. The ray origin is represented by a 3D phone model, which orientation is synchronized with the one from the last connected smart device (see Section 3.3) client, similar to the first experiment (3.4.1). To keep the virtual phone inside the view frustum of the user, it rotates relative to the user on the  $y$ -axis. A line is attached to the front of the phone (the “laser”) to indicate the direction of the ray.




Figure 3.4.3.: A screenshot of the virtual laser pointer and selectable cubes.

In addition to the orientation UBII topic, this implementation subscribes to the touch

events topic. The `touch down` event is needed to trigger the actual selection. To illustrate a selection task with this system, cubes float in front of the user. If he points the laser at one and touches the display, the cube will change its color. This works not only with cubes but with any mesh. Also, the system can trigger any kind of event or action. A screenshot of this setup can be seen in Figure 3.4.3.

### 3.4.3. Virtual Keyboard

Text input is not an easy task to perform in VR. However, it is often required for labeling, annotation, entering filenames for saving operations, and setting parameters in visualizations and other productive VR software [RBP02, p. 2154]. This is why many applications try to avoid it.

Tilt Brush<sup>1</sup> solves this by identifying their scenes with a screenshot of the scene rather than a filename. To save a scene, the users get a virtual camera attached to his hand motion controller, which he then uses to make a thumbnail of the current scene [Goo19a]. Others use a laser pointer either attached to a hand controller or to the headset to select keys on a 2D image of a keyboard [Wee17]. A more recent approach is the frequently called “drum keyboard”, which attaches drum sticks to the hand controllers which are then used to hit the keys [Wei17]. There are also approaches which do not use hand controllers, like hand gloves [ESV99; RBP02], a real keyboard [McG+15; Wal+17] or other peripherals [Gon+09, pp. 111 sq.]. Other experimental methods are speech recognition [RBP02, pp. 2154 sqq.] and handwritten character recognition [Gon+09, p. 113].

Similar to the approach by Dias, Afonso, Eliseu, and Santos to implement user interfaces using a real smartphone and a virtual representation visible in the VR headset [Dia+18, p. 5], this experiment displays a virtual keyboard in VR as seen in Figure 3.4.4. The surface of the virtual keyboard is mapped to the touchscreen of the smart device (see Section 3.3). The cursor, represented by a blue circle, visualizes the position of the finger on the touchscreen. The cursor is only visible when the smartphone sends touch position data, which is only the case when the user is touching the screen. To select a key, the user has to move the cursor on top of a key and then keep the finger there for roughly a second. As long as the user is holding his finger on a key to select it, the blue circle fills up with another circle to indicate the running selection progress. When executing the key press on the first touch and without a cursor, the user would not know which key he is going to hit with his finger, because his sight is obscured by the VR headset. Dias, Afonso, Eliseu, and Santos work around this problem by using a

---

<sup>1</sup>Tilt Brush by Google is a tool for three-dimensional painting in VR. Website: [www.tiltbrush.com](http://www.tiltbrush.com)

### 3. Implementation

---

Leap Motion sensor to visualize the finger positions [Dia+18, p. 4].



Figure 3.4.4.: A screenshot of the virtual keyboard with the blue cursor and the previously typed text.

Three components were implemented as JavaScript classes for this experiment. The `SmartphoneCursor` component uses the touch events and position data to display a blue circle (the cursor) on a given area in the scene. The cursor is only shown when the touch screen is pressed. If it is pressed, the position of the circle is synchronized with the position of the finger on the touch screen. To detect intentional movements, the current position (vector) is subtracted by the position (vector) of the previous frame. If the length of the resulting vector is smaller than a specific threshold value, it is assumed that this was not an intended movement. This calculation depends on the current framerate, which is not a good practice because the threshold value will behave differently depending on the current framerate. However, as the target framerate is 60 frames per second, and the testing system does not have issues in reaching this target, it is not a critical problem. As long as intentional movements are not detected, a timer counts up to a specific value (with the default settings, roughly one second). After this, the counter and a select event containing the cursor position is sent to the main program. To visualize this, a second blue circle gets larger until it fills up the whole cursor and finally disappears again.

### 3. Implementation

---

The second component renders a virtual QWERTY<sup>1</sup> keyboard to the scene. The keyboard layout can be changed pretty easily, as shown in Figure 3.4.5. Every key has a character or an action assigned as well as properties which influence the look. Special keys like the caps, caps lock, enter and delete key are fully functional as known from a real keyboard. If caps lock is activated, the key is drawn in blue and all characters are displayed in upper case. The `VirtualKeyboard` class draws the keyboard with just the keyboard layout, height, and width as input. If the `onPress(coordinates)` function is called, for example by the cursor component, the pressed key is calculated and returned using the provided position. The main program then applies the key to a string and sends the result to the third component.

```
1 // rows
2 [
3   // columns
4   ...
5   [
6     // keys
7     ...
8     {
9       key: '=', // the returned character if no action is present otherwise just a label
10      keyCaps: '+' // the returned character if in caps mode
11    },
12    {
13      key: '←',
14      action: KEY_ACTIONS.DELETE_ONE, // a special key action; in this case, it deletes
15        the last character
16      width: 2, // width of the key
17      align: KEY_ALIGNMENT.RIGHT // the alignment of the label on the key
18    }
19  ],
20  ...
21 ],
```

Figure 3.4.5.: The definition of the virtual keyboard layout in JS. It is defined as a 2D array, where the first dimension corresponds to the key rows and the second one to the keys column wise.

The `TextDisplay` component renders a given text inside a given area to a texture. If the text is changed, it automatically updates and redraws the texture.

---

<sup>1</sup>The name QWERTY describes the US layout for computer keyboards.

## 4. Evaluation

### 4.1. Overview

To show that the smartphone is a suitable interaction device in use with VR, the results of the usability study of the three experiments are presented. Tasks were implemented into the experiments, to measure the usability. After completing the task, they have to answer System Usability Scale (SUS) questions. Before starting with the experiment a consent form had to be filled out and preliminary questions had to be answered. The whole user evaluation form can be found in Appendix B.

The general procedure of the experiment is as follows:

1. Introduce the user to the topic
2. Let the user fill out the consent form
3. Let the user fill out the preliminary questions
4. Randomly choose an order for the experiments
5. Hand the user the HMD and Smartphone
6. For each experiment:
  - a) Brief the user for the experiment
  - b) Let the user play around in the experiment
  - c) Start the task as soon as the user feels confident with the interactions
  - d) Save the anonymized task results
  - e) Question the user the usability questions

The evaluation was conducted in two different locations. Before starting the study, the WLAN connection and network performance were tested and evaluated as appropriate. The specifications of the Personal Computer (PC), HMD and Smartphone of the different evaluation setups, is listed in the Appendix A. The PC was able to run the application smoothly with an average of 60 frames per second, which is enough to run a smooth VR experience. The WLAN connection and devices were capable of 20

#### 4. Evaluation

---

Mbps<sup>1</sup>, which is enough for synchronizing data without a visible lag.

After each experiment, a SUS survey was conducted. The System Usability Scale (SUS) uses a set of 10 questions, which are rated from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), to assess the usability of a system [Bro96, p. 3]. Finstad's suggestions to change the eighth question to make it easier understandable for non-native speakers was implemented [Fin06, p. 188].

A final score, ranging from zero to 100, is then calculated from the individual answers [Bro96]. Bangor, Kortum, and Miller proposes a grade system for SUS scores, which maps a value to a letter of the typical American school grading scale [BKM09].

## 4.2. Results

23 persons participated in the evaluation. 2 stated, they identify as female and 21 identify as male. The average age is 23 years.

Degree	Count	Percentage	Discipline	Count	Percentage
High school degree	13	56.52%	Informatics	7	30.43%
Bachelor's degree (BA)	6	26.09%	Physics	2	8.70%
Diploma's degree (Dipl.)	1	4.35%	Automation and Robotics	1	4.35%
Master's degree (MA)	2	8.70%	Chemistry	1	4.35%
Approbation	1	4.35%	Computational Biology	1	4.35%
(a) The answers to question A3: "What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?"			Economics	1	4.35%
			Electrical Engineering	1	4.35%
			Law	1	4.35%
			Medicine	1	4.35%
			Musicology	1	4.35%
			Pharmacy	1	4.35%
			Public Service	1	4.35%
			Publishing	1	4.35%
			Statistics	1	4.35%
			Technical Engineering	1	4.35%
			Technology Management	1	4.35%
(b) The answers to question A4: "What is your main discipline?"					

Table 4.2.1.: Highest degree (question A3) and main discipline (question A4) of the participants.


---

<sup>1</sup>Mbps stands for megabits per second. This unit is often used in reference to internet speeds.

#### 4. Evaluation

---

The main disciplines and degrees are shown in Table 4.2.1. As seen in Table 4.2.1a, the highest degree of half of the participants was a high school degree or equivalent. Table 4.2.1b shows that the main discipline is quite spread amongst different disciplines.



- (a) The answers to the question A5: "Please rate how much you used computer games in the last six months."
- (b) The answers to the question A5: "Please rate how much you used virtual reality headsets in the last six months."

Figure 4.2.1.: The results of the question A5 about the computer games and virtual reality headset usage.

All participants (100.00%) used their smartphone multiple times a day during the last six months. Most participants (78.26%) used their computer for work or studies more than once per day during the last six months. 17.39% state that they used it daily and only one participant used his computer one to three times a week for work or studies during the last six months. As seen in Figure 4.2.1a, most participants (60.87%) played computer games more than three times a month during the last six months. Figure 4.2.1b shows that most participants (91.30%) used VR less than once per month during the last six months. A huge portion (39.13%) did not use VR at all in the last six months.

#### 4. Evaluation

---




Figure 4.2.2.: The results of the question A6 about the experience of the participants with VR. The questions are rated with values ranging from one (“none”) to five (“a lot”).

The participants were asked three questions regarding their experience with VR which could be answered with values ranging from one (“none”) to five (“a lot”). The first questions asked about the knowledge the user had about VR. As can be seen in the box plots<sup>1</sup> in Figure 4.2.2, the general knowledge about VR seems to be rather low (Mean: 2.83; Standard Deviation (SD): 1.03). The second question asked about the interest in VR, to which not one participant answered with the value one (Mean: 3.48; SD: 0.99). The last question asked about the experience with motion controllers. It was explicitly mentioned that the Wii remote counts as motion controller, which might be the reason for the average, which is higher than the one from the first question (Mean: 3.30; SD: 1.22).

##### 4.2.1. Model Viewer

The model viewer experiment, described in Section 3.4.1, allows users to view a 3D model from different angles. To benchmark extensive usage, a second model

---

<sup>1</sup>The boxes indicate the range from the 25<sup>th</sup> to the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. The bars outside the box indicate the 90<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> percentile. The median is marked by the line in the center. Outliers are marked with diamond shapes.

#### 4. Evaluation

---

instance in another color (the target) is spawned after starting the task. Since in the current implementation, the model cannot be rotated upside down (as mentioned in Section 3.3.1), the target is spawned with random reachable orientations. As soon as the task is started, the user has 30 seconds to match as many orientations as possible. Similar to the implementation by Katzakis and Hori, the target is rotated to a new random orientation, after one orientation was matched [KH10, p. 140]. Because it is hard to match the rotation exactly on all three axes, it is enough to pose the model in a similar orientation to the target. A similar pose is reached, when the smallest angle between the two rotations is less than 20 radians.





Figure 4.2.3.: The time in seconds it took to match a correct pose in the model viewer experiment.

As seen in Figure 4.2.3, the average time it took to match a correct poses is roughly 2.83 seconds. Katzakis and Hori tracked the time it takes to match a pre-defined pose with a Smartphone, a mouse and a touch panel. The lowest time in average to match one pose, 6.5 seconds, was achieved using the Smartphone as input device [KH10, p. 140]. The average time to match a pose of the model viewer (2.83 seconds) experiment presented in Chapter 4.2.1 is lower than the average of the evaluation of Katzakis and Hori (6.5 seconds). This can be due to the fact that users never had to turn the smartphone completely upside down, since rotations were chosen to be always upside up, because of the previously mentioned limitation. Another advantage of the presented implementation is, that the target and the controlled model are not displayed

#### 4. Evaluation

---

in two separate locations like in “Mobile devices as multi-DOF controllers”, but rather with the same origin in the same coordinate space, which makes it easier to see the difference between both rotations [KH10, p. 140]. Also the fact that a skeleton model instead of a multi-colored cube was used, could play a role.



(a) The results of question one to ten.

(b) The overall SUS score.

Figure 4.2.4.: The results of the SUS user study for the model viewer.

Also the SUS study results indicate a useable implementation, as seen in Figure 4.2.4. A score of 83.04 is considered “Good” and mapped to the grade B, according to Bangor, Kortum, and Miller [BKM09, pp. 120 sq.].


#### 4.2.2. Laser Pointer

Section 3.4.2 introduces the laser pointer experiment. To test the performance of participants using this interaction, three cubes (the targets) are spawned at random locations in front of the user. The cubes are always spawned in sight of the user so that he does not have to actively look for the targets. The participant has to select as much cubes as possible in 30 seconds. He was told to be as fast and especially as accurate as possible, since miss-hits are counted.

To trigger a selection, the user has to touch the smartphone display. This counts as a click. If no cube was selected, a miss is counted. The total selection (click) count is the sum of hits and miss-clicks. If one cube was hit, another one is spawned, so that always three cubes are visible. This is important, because the user can plan to hit the next target while currently aiming for the current one. Otherwise the task would test the users reaction time, which is not desired.

#### 4. Evaluation

---



- (a) The count of clicks, hits and misses per 30 seconds. Clicks are the sum of hits and misses.  
(b) The Hit/Miss ratio per click speed. The line visualizes the linear regression with a 95% confidence interval.

Figure 4.2.5.: The results of the laser pointer experiment.

Figure 4.2.5a visualizes the total click count (Mean: 31.83; SD: 6.89), the actual hit count (Mean: 26.13; SD: 5.52) and the count of miss hits (Mean: 5.70; SD: 4.37) per 30 seconds. Participants were able to successfully point to and select objects with a speed of nearly one click per second. As seen in Figure 4.2.5b the hit/miss ratio is very high for slightly lower speeds but decreases fast with higher click speeds.

The performance of this experiment is hard to compare with other implementations, without a standardized experiment setup. For example the size, shape, position and distance of the targets but also the spawn area and whether distracting elements are present or not, varies between different task evaluations of other research. However a comparison should still give a rough estimate whether the performance is similar, much better or really bad. Often the hit count is measured in different time intervals. To compare the results, the average hit count per second is calculated.

Kamm tested his implementation in a similar VR scenario with a wrist band as input device. To compare his implementation, he also tested a laser pointer approach using a VR motion controller [Kam18, p. 39]. A major difference to his experiment setup is, that only one target is displayed at a time. Another difference is, that the user has to rotate his head more in order to see the targets, since they are placed in a 90 degrees radius. An arrow, which always points to the next target, is displayed to prevent wasting time while searching for the next one. Also the distance from the user to the targets is randomized [Kam18, p. 45].

Ji-Young Oh compared a real-world laser pointer for large screen interactions to a

#### 4. Evaluation


---

Research	Average Hits per Second	Standard Deviation
[Kam18]	0.6	0.11
[JiY02]	0.85	-
Chapter 4.2.2	0.87	0.18

Table 4.2.2.: Comparison of the average hits per second from similar laser pointer experiments of other research.

computer mouse. The application is displayed through a projector and the laser is detected by a camera. The pointer-device also has a button, which is pressed down to select an object, similar to the laser pointer implementation presented in Chapter 4.2.2. All targets are always visible and their is a pre-determined order. Also the fact that all objects are on the same plane, makes the task similar to the one presented in this thesis [JiY02, pp. 3 sq.].

As seen in Table 4.2.2, the technique presented in Chapter 4.2.2 is the one with the best results. But due to the different conditions and task setups, it is not possible to draw a strong conclusion. Still, the result is similar to a real-world pointing technique, which is a good sign.



(a) The results of question one to ten presented as box plots. (b) The overall SUS score presented in a box plot.

Figure 4.2.6.: The results of the SUS user study for the laser pointer.

However, not only the measured interaction times but also the SUS study results indicate a useable implementation, as seen in Figure 4.2.6. A score of 91.41 is considered “Excellent” and mapped to the grade A, according to Bangor, Kortum, and

#### 4. Evaluation

---

Miller [BKM09].

##### 4.2.3. Virtual Keyboard





Figure 4.2.7.: TO DO



(a) The results of question one to ten.

(b) The overall SUS score.

Figure 4.2.8.: The results of the SUS user study for the virtual keyboard.

#### *4. Evaluation*

---

However, not only the measured interaction times but also the SUS study results indicate a useable implementation, as seen in Figure 4.2.4. A score of 71.63 is considered “Ok” and mapped to the grade C, according to Bangor, Kortum, and Miller [BKM09].

## **Acknowledgments**

Foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor Prof. Gudrun Klinker, at Technical University of Munich for giving me the opportunity to write my bachelor's thesis at her chair Forschungsgruppe Augmented Reality.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Sandro Weber for the close supervision and helpful advice.

A special thank goes to all my friends who took the time to participate in the evaluation.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family for their continuous support during my studies and the writing of this thesis.

# List of Figures

1.1.1. Collection of VR controllers . . . . .	1
2.3.1. Tracking setup by Dias et al. . . . .	5
2.4.1. Virtual smartphone representation by Steep et al. . . . .	6
3.1.1. UBII components diagram . . . . .	8
3.1.2. UBII communication diagram . . . . .	9
3.1.3. Basic UBII interaction in JavaScript . . . . .	10
3.2.1. Screenshot of the UBII front end . . . . .	11
3.3.1. Device coordinate system and orientation values . . . . .	13
3.3.2. Protobuf definition of the smart device . . . . .	14
3.3.3. Protobuf definition of the touch event . . . . .	15
3.4.1. Screenshot of the model viewer experiment . . . . .	17
3.4.2. UBII interaction of model viewer . . . . .	18
3.4.3. Screenshot of the laser pointer experiment . . . . .	19
3.4.4. Screenshot of the virtual keyboard experiment . . . . .	21
3.4.5. Virtual keyboard layout definition . . . . .	22
4.2.1. Computer games and virtual reality headset usage . . . . .	25
4.2.2. VR experience of the participants . . . . .	26
4.2.3. Model viewer experiment results . . . . .	27
4.2.4. User study results of the model viewer experiment . . . . .	28
4.2.5. Laser pointer experiment results . . . . .	29
4.2.6. User study results of the laser pointer experiment . . . . .	30
4.2.7. TO DO . . . . .	31
4.2.8. User study results of the virtual keyboard experiment . . . . .	31

## **List of Tables**

4.2.1. Degree and discipline of participants . . . . .	24
4.2.2. Comparison of laser pointer task results from other research. . . . .	30

# **Appendices**

# A. User Evaluation Devices

## A.1. Testing Environment A: Home

- Smartphone
  - Type: ONEPLUS A6013
  - Operating System: Android 9
  - RAM: 8 GB
  - CPU: Snapdragon(TM) 845
- PC
  - Operating System: Windows 10
  - RAM: 32 GB
  - CPU: Intel® Core™ i7-6700K
  - GPU: NVIDIA GeForce GTX 1080
  - Storage: Intel® SSD 535 Series, 480GB
- HMD
  - Oculus Rift, Consumer Version 1

## **A.2. Testing Environment B: University**

- Smartphone
  - Type: ONEPLUS A6013
  - Operating System: Android 9
  - RAM: 8 GB
  - CPU: Snapdragon™ 845
- PC
  - Operating System: Windows 10 Enterprise
  - RAM: 32 GB
  - CPU: Intel® Core™ i5-8600K
  - GPU: NVIDIA GeForce GTX 1080 Ti
  - Storage: Samsung SSD 860 EVO, 500GB
- HMD
  - HTC Vive Pro with SteamVR 2.0 Lighthouse

## B. User Evaluation Form



This evaluation is part of the Bachelor's thesis

„Smartphone-Assisted Virtual Reality Using Ubi-Interact“

of Michael Lohr.

If you have any questions, feel free to ask.

### Section A: Preliminary Questions

A1. What is your age?

A2. To which gender identity do you most identify?

- Female   
Male   
Other

Other

## B. User Evaluation Form



### A3. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?

If you are currently enrolled in school, please select the highest degree you have received.

- High school degree or equivalent
- Bachelor's degree (BA)
- Diploma's degree (Dipl.)
- Master's degree (MA)
- Doctorate (PhD)
- Other

Other

### A4. What is your main discipline?

If you are a student, please select your current field of study. If you are employed, please select your area of work.

- Informatics
- Mathematics
- Law
- Medicine
- Other

Other

### A5. Please rate how much you used the following technologies in the last six months.

	Not once	Less than one to three times a month	One to three times a month	One to three times a week	More than three times a week	Daily	More than once per day
Smartphone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Computer for Work/Studies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Computer Games	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Virtual Reality Headset	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## B. User Evaluation Form



### A6. Please rate the following statements in a range from none (1) to a lot (5).

1 = Nothing/none, 5 = A lot

1      2      3      4      5

How much do you know about Virtual Reality?

How large is your interest in Virtual Reality?

How much experience do you have with motion controllers (WII Remote, Oculus Touch)?

## Section B: Experiment: Model Viewer

System Usability Scale study regarding the model viewer experiment.

Tips: Record your immediate response to each item. Do not think too long. Select one answer to each statement. If you cannot respond to a particular item, mark the center one.

### B1. Please rate the following statements in a range from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree

1      2      3      4      5

I think that I would like to use this system frequently.

I found the system unnecessarily complex.

I thought the system was easy to use.

I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system.

I found the various functions in this system were well integrated.

I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system.

I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly.

I found the system very cumbersome/awkward to use.

I felt very confident using the system.

I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system.



## Section C: Experiment: Laser Pointer

System Usability Scale study regarding the laser pointer experiment.

Tips: Record your immediate response to each item. Do not think too long. Select one answer to each statement. If you cannot respond to a particular item, mark the center one.

### C1. Please rate the following statements in a range from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree

	1	2	3	4	5
I think that I would like to use this system frequently.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I found the system unnecessarily complex.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I thought the system was easy to use.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I found the various functions in this system were well integrated.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I found the system very cumbersome/awkward to use.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I felt very confident using the system.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

## Section D: Experiment: Virtual Keyboard

System Usability Scale study regarding the virtual keyboard experiment.

Tips: Record your immediate response to each item. Do not think too long. Select one answer to each statement. If you cannot respond to a particular item, mark the center one.

### D1. Please rate the following statements in a range from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree

	1	2	3	4	5
I think that I would like to use this system frequently.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I found the system unnecessarily complex.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

## B. User Evaluation Form



	1	2	3	4	5
I thought the system was easy to use.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I think that I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use this system.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I found the various functions in this system were well integrated.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I thought there was too much inconsistency in this system.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I found the system very cumbersome/awkward to use.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I felt very confident using the system.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with this system.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

### Section E: Final Questions

- E1. **If you have further critical or positive feedback or just a comment, please fill it in here:**

**Thank you for participating in this study!**

# Bibliography

- [Ben+11] A. Benzina, M. Toennis, G. Klinker, and M. Ashry. “Phone-based motion control in VR.” In: *CHI ’11 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Ed. by D. Tan. ACM Digital Library. New York, NY: ACM, 2011, p. 1519. ISBN: 9781450302685. DOI: 10.1145/1979742.1979801.
- [BKM09] A. Bangor, P. Kortum, and J. Miller. “Determining What Individual SUS Scores Mean: Adding an Adjective Rating Scale.” In: *J. Usability Studies* 4.3 (2009), pp. 114–123. ISSN: 1931-3357.
- [Bro96] J. Brooke. “SUS - A quick and dirty usability scale.” In: *Usability Evaluation in Industry* (1996).
- [Cab19] R. Cabello. *Three.js: JavaScript 3D library*. 2019. URL: <https://github.com/mrdoob/three.js/> (visited on 06/17/2019).
- [DE11] M. Deller and A. Ebert. “ModControl – Mobile Phones as a Versatile Interaction Device for Large Screen Applications.” In: *Human-computer interaction - INTERACT 2011*. Ed. by P. Campos, N. Graham, J. Jorge, N. Nunes, P. Palanque, and M. Winckler. Vol. 6947. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Berlin: Springer, 2011, pp. 289–296. ISBN: 978-3-642-23770-6. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-23771-3\_22.
- [Den16] A. Denoyel. *Virtual Reality evolved: Sketchfab VR apps and WebVR support: New on Sketchfab - 16 May 2016*. 2016. URL: <https://sketchfab.com/blogs/community/announcing-sketchfab-vr-apps-webvr-support/> (visited on 06/23/2019).
- [Dev19] Devices and Sensors Working Group. *DeviceOrientation Event Specification: Editor’s Draft, 15 April 2019*. Ed. by Devices and Sensors Working Group. 2019. URL: <https://w3c.github.io/deviceorientation/#dom-deviceorientationevent-alpha> (visited on 06/17/2019).
- [Dia+18] P. Dias, L. Afonso, S. Eliseu, and B. S. Santos. “Mobile devices for interaction in immersive virtual environments.” In: *AVI ’18: Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Advanced Visual Interfaces*. Ed. by T. Catarci, F. Leotta, A. Marrella, and M. Mecella. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2018. ISBN: 978-1-4503-5616-9. DOI: 10.1145/3206505.3206526.

## Bibliography

---

- [ECM17] ECMA International. *Standard ECMA-404: The JSON Data Interchange Syntax*. 2nd ed. 2017.
- [ECM18] ECMA International. *Standard ECMA-262: ECMAScript 2018 Language Specification*. 9th ed. 2018.
- [ESV99] F. Evans, S. Skiena, and A. Varshney. "VType: Entering Text in a Virtual World." In: (1999).
- [Fin06] K. Finstad. "The System Usability Scale and Non-native English Speakers." In: *J. Usability Studies* 1.4 (2006), pp. 185–188. ISSN: 1931-3357.
- [Gon+09] G. González, J. P. Molina, A. S. García, D. Martínez, and P. González. "Evaluation of Text Input Techniques in Immersive Virtual Environments." In: *New Trends on Human-Computer Interaction*. Ed. by P. M. Latorre, A. Granollers Saltiveri, and J. A. Macías. London: Springer-Verlag London, 2009, pp. 109–118. ISBN: 978-1-84882-351-8. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-84882-352-5\_11.
- [Goo19a] Google LLC. *Protocol Buffers*. 2019. URL: <https://developers.google.com/protocol-buffers/> (visited on 06/19/2019).
- [Goo19b] Google LLC. *Tilt Brush Help: Saving and sharing your Tilt Brush sketches*. 2019. URL: <https://support.google.com/tiltbrush/answer/6389651?hl=en> (visited on 06/26/2019).
- [JiY02] W. S. Ji-Young Oh. "Laser Pointers as Collaborative Pointing Devices." In: *Proc. GI2002-Graphics Interface, Calgary, Canada, May* (2002).
- [Kam18] C. Kamm. "Precision of Pointing with Myo: A Comparison of Controller- and Gesture-Based Selection in Virtual Reality." Master's Thesis. Munich: Technische Universität München, 2018.
- [KH10] N. Katzakis and M. Hori. "Mobile devices as multi-DOF controllers." In: *IEEE Symposium on 3D User Interfaces (3DUI), 2010 ; Waltham, Massachusetts, USA, 20 - 21 March 2010*. Ed. by M. Hachet. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE, 2010, pp. 139–140. ISBN: 978-1-4244-6846-1. DOI: 10.1109/3DUI.2010.5444700.
- [Koe16] J. Koetsier. "Evaluation of JavaScript frame-works for the development of a web-based user interface for Vampires." PhD thesis. 2016.
- [McG+15] M. McGill, D. Boland, R. Murray-Smith, and S. Brewster. "A Dose of Reality: Overcoming Usability Challenges in VR Head-Mounted Displays." In: *CHI 2015 crossings*. Ed. by J. Kim. New York, NY: ACM, 2015, pp. 2143–2152. ISBN: 9781450331456. DOI: 10.1145/2702123.2702382.

## Bibliography

---

- [Pie+14] K. Pietroszek, A. Kuzminykh, J. R. Wallace, and E. Lank. "Smartcasting: A Discount 3D Interaction Technique for Public Displays." In: *Proceedings of the 26th Australian Computer-Human Interaction Conference on Designing Futures - the Future of Design, OZCHI '14, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, December 2-5, 2014*. Ed. by Tuck Wah Leong. ACM, 2014, pp. 119–128. ISBN: 978-1-4503-0653-9. doi: 10.1145/2686612.2686629.
- [RBP02] C. J. Rhoton, D. A. Bowman, and M. S. Pinho. "Text Input Techniques for Immersive Virtual Environments: an Empirical Comparison." In: *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society: 46th Annual Meeting, Baltimore, Maryland, September 30 - October 4, 2002 : Bridging Fundamentals & New Opportunities*. Ed. by Human Factors and Ergonomics Society. Annual meeting. Santa Monica, Calif.: SAGE Publications, 2002, pp. 2154–2158.
- [SJ13] A. Steed and S. Julier. "Design and implementation of an immersive virtual reality system based on a smartphone platform." In: *2013 IEEE Symposium on 3D User Interfaces (3DUI)*. Ed. by A. Lécuyer. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE, 2013, pp. 43–46. ISBN: 978-1-4673-6098-2. doi: 10.1109/3DUI.2013.6550195.
- [Wal+17] J. Walker, B. Li, K. Vertanen, and S. Kuhl. "Efficient Typing on a Visually Occluded Physical Keyboard." In: *Explore, innovate, inspire*. Ed. by G. Mark, S. Fussell, C. Lampe, m. schraefel m.c, J. P. Hourcade, C. Appert, and D. Wigdor. New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery Inc. (ACM), 2017, pp. 5457–5461. ISBN: 9781450346559. doi: 10.1145/3025453.3025783.
- [Wee17] Weelco Inc. *Unity Asset Store: Keyboard VR Pro*. 2017. URL: <https://assets-store.unity.com/packages/tools/input-management/keyboard-vr-pro-83708> (visited on 06/26/2019).
- [Wei17] M. Weisel. *An open-source keyboard to make your own – Normal*. 2017. URL: <http://www.normalvr.com/blog/an-open-source-keyboard-to-make-your-own/> (visited on 06/26/2019).
- [You19] E. You. *Vue.js*. 2019. URL: <https://vuejs.org/> (visited on 06/17/2019).
- [Zha+15] K. Zhang, H. Hu, W. Dai, Y. Shen, and M. Z. Win. "Indoor Localization Algorithm For Smartphones." In: *CoRR* abs/1503.07628 (2015).