



## Perception of Mechanically and Optically Simulated Bumps and Holes

Journal:	<i>Transactions on Applied Perception</i>
Manuscript ID:	TAP-2007-0040.R2
Manuscript Type:	Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	van Mensvoort, Koert; Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, Industrial Design Vos, Peter; Technische Universiteit Eindhoven,, Mathematics and Computer Science Hermes, Dik; Technische Universiteit Eindhoven,, Department of Technology Management van Liere, Robert; Technische Universiteit Eindhoven,, Mathematics and Computer Science
Computing Classification Systems:	Information Systems, User Interfaces, Haptic I/O, Interaction styles, Input devices and strategies

# Perception of Mechanically and Optically Simulated Bumps and Holes

KOERT VAN MENSVOORT\*, PETER VOS,  
DIK J. HERMES, ROBERT VAN LIERE

---

## Abstract

In this contribution we investigate the perception of optically simulated haptic feedback. The perception of optically and mechanically simulated bumps and holes was tested experimentally. In an earlier paper we have described the active cursor technique, a method to simulate haptic feedback optically without resorting to special mechanical force feedback devices, commonly applied to produce haptic percepts in computer interfaces. The operation of the force feedback device is substituted by tiny displacements on the cursor position relative to the intended force. This method exploits the domination of the visual over the haptic modality. Results show that people can recognize optically simulated bump and hole structures, and that active cursor displacements influence the haptic perception of bumps and holes. Depending on the simulated strength of the force, optically simulated haptic feedback can take precedence over mechanically simulated haptic feedback and also the other way around. When optically simulated and mechanically simulated haptic feedback counteract each other, however, the weight attributed to each source of haptic information differs from user to user. It is concluded that active cursor displacements can be used to simulate the operation of mechanical force feedback devices.

Categories and Subject Descriptors: Information Systems, User Interfaces, Haptic I/O, Input devices and strategies, Interaction styles

General Terms: Design, Experimentation, Human Factors

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Optically simulated haptic feedback, simulation, force feedback, experimentation, multisensory perception.

---

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Before the prevalent use of computers, almost all human tasks involved the use of exquisite sensory-motor skills. By and large computer interfaces have not taken advantage of these deep-seated human capabilities. The touch feedback that did exist in older analogue technologies through mechanical mechanisms such as knobs, switches and dials has for the most part been replaced by digital electronics and visual displays. Since the invention of the mouse [English, Engelbart, Berman, 1967] and direct manipulation interfaces [Shneiderman, 1983], desktop metaphor computer interfaces based on windows, icons, menus and pointing, so called WIMP interfaces, have become the dominant paradigm in human-computer interaction. From a perceptual point of view, these interaction paradigms are extremely limited in their abilities to make use of human sensory-motor and cognitively-driven interactions. They engage only a fraction of the human sensory bandwidth. Although the lack of significant physical forces of the digital environment has some major advantages, few may doubt the intrinsic value of touch perception in everyday interactions. Research in human-computer interfaces has addressed this issue with the development and evaluation of several force feedback

---

\* **Corresponding author:** Eindhoven University of Technology, Industrial Design Department. P.O. Box 513 5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands. Tel. +31 624271385; fax: +31 40 2475608. Website: [www.powercursor.com](http://www.powercursor.com); E-mail address: [k.m.v.mensvoort@tue.nl](mailto:k.m.v.mensvoort@tue.nl)

1 devices [Akamatsu & Sato 1994; Akamatsu et al., 1994; Brooks et al., Burdea 1996;  
2 Engel et al., 1994; Kerstner et al., 1994; Rosenberg, 1996]. These devices are used to  
3 simulate a wide range of object properties such as their elasticity, hardness, stiffness and  
4 textures, which can be used to communicate with the user through the haptic channel.  
5 Although many force feedback devices are commercially available in specialist- and  
6 gaming environments, and commonly applied to support visually impaired people, they  
7 are not part of the standard desktop computer setup. Not much software has been  
8 developed that uses direct haptic feedback as a primary communication channel. Here a  
9 vicious circle becomes visible: On the one hand force feedback devices are not part of  
10 the standard computing setup, because there are hardly any interaction styles developed  
11 that use haptic feedback as a primary communication channel. On the other hand, there  
12 are hardly any interaction styles developed that use haptic feedback as a primary  
13 communication channel, because force feedback devices are not part of the standard  
14 setup.  
15

16 In an earlier paper [Mensvoort, 2002] we presented optically simulated force  
17 feedback, a method aimed at evoking a percept of touch in a standard GUI desktop  
18 setting, without resorting to special and haptic input/output devices. This simulation of  
19 touch is realized by tiny displacements of the cursor position. The displacements speed up  
20 the cursor movements for force feedback in the direction of the movement, and slow it  
21 down or become negative for forces in the opposite direction. For forces in other  
22 directions similar mechanically plausible rules apply. The disparity between the visual  
23 information, i.e., slowing down the speed of the cursor, and the increasing reaction force  
24 applied to the input device to compensate for this, appears to induce an illusion of haptic  
25 feedback. Optically simulated force feedback has much in common with existing force  
26 feedback systems, except that in force feedback systems the location of the cursor is  
27 manipulated as a result of the mechanical manipulation of the haptic input/output device,  
28 whereas in our system the cursor location is manipulated directly.  
29

30 Like force feedback devices, the active cursor displacements can guide the user  
31 towards preferred positions or communicate properties of the interface to the user. Among  
32 the virtual haptic objects we have created are 'holes' and 'bumps'. If the cursor moves over  
33 a hole, it is dragged towards the centre. When rolling over a bump, the cursor is pushed  
34 away from the centre. Due to these cursor displacements a hole becomes an easily  
35 accessible part of the screen, whereas a bump area is hard to access. We suggested that  
36 this technique can be applied to simulate the functioning of mechanical force feedback  
37 devices and established the usability benefits of the active cursor technique in a pointing  
38 task [Mensvoort et al. 2008]. An interactive demonstration, requiring a Flash plug-in, as  
39 well as a toolkit which allows interaction designers to apply optically simulated force  
40 feedback to their own interfaces, is online at [www.powercursor.com](http://www.powercursor.com) [Mensvoort, 2007].  
41

42 In the current study we assess the perception of bumps and holes, generated with  
43 active cursor displacements in comparison with the perception of bumps and holes  
44 generated by a mechanical force feedback mouse device. The experimental setup was  
45 inspired by the work of Robles-De-La-Torre and Hayward [2001], who assessed the  
46 perception of bumps and holes and, by using an ingenious robotic device, were able to  
47 uncouple force feedback from geometric information. Through this uncoupling they were  
48 able to generate stimuli with the geometric properties of a hole, but with the force  
49 feedback properties of a bump, and visa versa. Think for instance of a contradictory  
50 structure that, when explored geometrically by moving your finger, makes your finger go  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 down just as it would when the finger passes into a hole, but at the same time pushing it  
2 away from its centre with force feedback, just as it would when a bump structure would  
3 be passed. They found that force cues — not geometric cues — determine perceived  
4 shape. Likewise, we in our study uncouple the visual force information, i.e. cursor  
5 displacements seen on the screen, from the haptic force information generated by the  
6 mechanical haptic device. In a factorial design we compared the perceptual effect and  
7 interaction of both types of simulated haptic feedback, and determined how optical and  
8 mechanical haptic feedback independently and jointly contributed to this topographical  
9 experience.

10  
11 In this respect we formulated two hypotheses. Our first hypothesis is that optically  
12 simulated haptic feedback can be applied to create perceivable ‘bump’ and ‘hole’  
13 structures and that people are able to judge the heights of the bumps and the depths of the  
14 holes to an extent comparable to that obtained with mechanically simulated haptic  
15 feedback.

16 Our second hypothesis is that optically simulated haptic feedback can be used to  
17 enhance or decrease the perceived height of ‘bump’ and ‘hole’ structures generated with a  
18 mechanical force feedback device. In other words, our second hypothesis states that  
19 optically simulated haptic feedback can influence the perception of mechanically  
20 simulated haptic feedback.  
21

## 22 2 OPTICALLY SIMULATED HAPTIC FEEDBACK

### 23 2.1 Related Work

24  
25 The active cursor technique [Mensvoort, 2002] aims at evoking haptic effects, while  
26 using a normal mouse not capable of producing any force feedback except that involved  
27 in resistance as the mouse is moving over a surface. Comparable techniques of simulating  
28 touch through manipulation of the graphical element that represents the user have been  
29 intuitively applied earlier in videogames. For example, in the classic racing game Outrun  
30 [Suzuki, 1986] the players must, when the road bends, exert force on their input devices  
31 to keep the car in the middle of the road. This effect provides the players with the  
32 sensation of being “pushed” off the road. Apparently, the visual domain dominates the  
33 haptic domain in this situation, and this induces the illusion that the input device exerts a  
34 force in the direction of these additional cursor displacements. In this way haptic percepts  
35 like stickiness, touch, or inertia can be evoked.  
36

37 Numerous studies on human perception also indicate that stimuli in one modality  
38 can evoke percepts in another [Marks, 1978; Stein, 1993; Welch, 1986]. We know that  
39 humans exhibit distal attribution, which is the tendency to quickly integrate multi-modal  
40 sensations into single meaningful events in the external world. Gibson [1966] describes  
41 our senses as active interrelated systems providing information for our perception of the  
42 real world. It is well known that vision can influence haptic perception [Heller et al. 1999;  
43 Klatzky et al. 1987; Lederman et al. 1986; Rock and Victor 1964]. A classic and robust  
44 example of visual-to-haptic intersensory interaction is the size-weight illusion,  
45 documented by Charpentier [1894] and Flourney [1891] over 100 years ago [Murray,  
46 1999]. When lifting two objects of different volumes but equal weights, people judge the  
47 smaller object to be heavier. In this example, haptic feedback still plays a role, since the  
48 volume of the object is not only seen, but also felt by the hand. Runeson and Frykholm  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 [1981] showed that an external observer, watching another person handling a heavy box,  
2 is able to infer the weight of the lifted object. They concluded that visual information  
3 passed through the optic array and representing the kinetic pattern of the movement can  
4 also play a role in extracting higher-order properties within the haptic domain. Vision is  
5 thus assumed to contribute to what is generally taken to be the privileged domain of the  
6 haptic sense combining tactile and proprioceptive cues. Carr and Lederman [1995] have  
7 demonstrated the dominance of vision over haptics in various experiments. Research by  
8 Miner [1996] demonstrates that visual stimuli can influence haptic perception in virtual  
9 environments. More recently, Ernst and Banks [2002] showed that humans integrate  
10 visual and haptic information in a statistically optimal fashion.  
11

## 12 2.2 Application in WIMP interfaces

13  
14  
15 In WIMP based graphical user interfaces, an early application of what in  
16 retrospect can be considered as optically simulated haptic feedback is the use of *sticky*  
17 *icons* introduced by Keyson [1997] and Worden [1997]. With sticky icons the cursor's  
18 control/display ratio, which determines the mapping between the physical mouse  
19 movement and the cursor movement on the screen, is reduced as the cursor enters a  
20 target, and then returns to normal after passing the target. Inside the target, equal mouse  
21 movements result in smaller cursor movements due to the change in cursor gain. In this  
22 way, the cursor speed diminishes, when the user enters a target, though keeping the  
23 mouse speed constant. Like with the active cursor technique [Mensvoort, 2002] this  
24 reduction effectively results in an enlargement of the motor space underneath the target,  
25 while the visual space remains unchanged. The decoupling of motor space and visual  
26 space induces the 'sticky' feeling. Ahlström [2002] suggested that the cursor gain  
27 technique, manipulation of cursor gain, could also be used to simulate more complex  
28 slopes like holes and hills and that these could be applied to guide a user in a graphical  
29 user interface. Lécuyer et al. [2004] conducted a perceptual experiment confirming that  
30 subjects indeed could identify various types of bumps and holes by seeing the variation of  
31 the cursor gain. In a more recent study Lécuyer et al. [2008] showed that bump and hole  
32 structures can also be recognised by altering the size of the cursor according to the height  
33 of the slopes, as it moves over.  
34

35  
36 Various experiments have been conducted to assess the benefits of cursor  
37 manipulation techniques in WIMP interface. Keyson [1997] compared mechanical force  
38 feedback, consisting of a pulling force towards the centre of a target, with sticky targets,  
39 consisting of a reduction of the cursor gain within the target. The results of the  
40 experiment showed that target acquisition performance was generally higher in the  
41 tactile-feedback condition, followed by cursor-gain feedback, and then normal cursor  
42 control. In research by Worden [1997], the sticky icons had no effect on accuracy, but  
43 substantially improved the speed of performance over the traditional pointer. Older users  
44 especially benefited from the adaptive technique. Given the pervasiveness of pointing in  
45 graphical interfaces, every small improvement in the target-acquisition task, represents a  
46 substantial improvement in usability. Blanch et al. [2004] formalized the cursor gain  
47 technique and showed its performance in a pointing task is given by Fitts' index of  
48 difficulty in motor rather than visual space. Baudisch, et al. [2005] showed the benefits of  
49 the cursor gain technique in a snapping task. The benefits of the active cursor technique  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 have been established experimentally in targeting tasks [Park et al. 2006; Mensvoort et al.  
2 2008] and steering tasks [Ahlström 2005].

3 While pointing in the physical world is governed by Fitts' law and constrained by  
4 physical laws, pointing in the virtual world does not necessarily have to abide by the  
5 same constraint [Balakrishnan 2004]. Both the cursor gain and the active cursor technique  
6 are aimed at decoupling the visual space and motor space through cursor manipulation.  
7 The active cursor technique differs from the cursor gain technique in that the direction of  
8 adjustment is not necessarily parallel to the direction of the mouse movement. Although  
9 the cursor gain technique [Keyson 1997; Worden 1997; Ahlström 2002; Blanch et al.  
10 2004; Lécuyer et al. 2004; Baudish et al. 2005] is easy to implement, it only works when  
11 the mouse is being moved by the user and is limited to the direction of the users'  
12 movement. Just as for mechanical force feedback devices, the active cursor technique  
13 [Mensvoort 2002; Ahlström 2005; Park et al. 2006; Mensvoort et al. 2008] also works  
14 when the user is not moving the mouse. From a mathematical perspective, the  
15 manipulation of cursor gain is a more restricted way to simulate force feedback than  
16 actively displacing the cursor; the active cursor algorithm can, by constraining the cursor  
17 displacements within the vector of the user's mouse movement, be set to generate the  
18 same effects as the cursor gain technique but not the other way round. Ahlström [2006]  
19 compared the active cursor technique (force fields) with the cursor gain technique (sticky  
20 targets) in two realistic pointing situations which involve several closely placed targets  
21 and found that the force fields improve pointing performance and that the sticky target  
22 technique does not. However, this does not mean that the active cursor technique's more  
23 realistic way of simulating force feedback will in all cases lead to advantages for the user;  
24 having the cursor move without the user's action may also lead to drawbacks in some  
25 cases. Further research, which falls outside the scope of the current study, is required in  
26 this regard. Our current contribution focuses on a comparison between optically and  
27 mechanically simulated force fields.  
28  
29  
30

### 31 2.3 Terminology 32 33

34 Within haptic- and human computer interaction literature various terms are often  
35 used with different meanings that change over time. Haptics is often used as a catchall  
36 term to cover a variety of distinct sub-types, including proprioceptive (general sensory  
37 information about the bodily position and relative position of neighbouring bodyparts),  
38 vestibular (the perception of head motion), kinaesthetic (the feeling of motion in the  
39 body), cutaneous (sensory information from the skin like heat, cold and pain), and tactile  
40 (the sense of pressure experienced through the skin). In the context of computers, haptic  
41 feedback can refer to the simple feel of a keyboard or mouse, or to more sophisticated  
42 forms of force feedback employed by mechanical devices.  
43

44 When the first mechanical force feedback devices were invented the term 'force  
45 feedback' was still reserved for unmediated haptic feedback, resulting from direct contact  
46 between the human body and some object in the physical environment. At that time,  
47 device-generated haptic feedback was referred to as 'simulated force feedback' or 'virtual  
48 force feedback' [Bejczy et al., 1990; Burdea and Langrana, 1993], emphasizing that the  
49 device simulated a haptic effect; not the real thing, but a substitute. With the acceptance  
50 of such mechanical force feedback devices the adjectives 'simulated' and 'virtual' were  
51 dropped in the literature. Nowadays, when using the term 'force feedback', one usually  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 means the haptic feedback generated by a mechanical device. In the literature and popular  
2 language, these devices are usually described as ‘force feedback devices’, ‘haptic  
3 devices’, or sometimes redundantly as ‘haptic force feedback devices’.

4 Regarding techniques that produce haptic percepts by optical means, various terms  
5 have been suggested; sticky icons [Worden 1997] simulated force feedback [Mensvoort  
6 2002], pseudo haptic feedback [Lécuyer 2000], force fields [Ahlström 2005], gravity  
7 [Park et al. 2006]. Although terms like ‘sticky’, ‘force’ and ‘gravity’ are easy to  
8 understand, they overlook that the haptic perception is simulated. Terms like ‘simulated’  
9 and ‘pseudo’ are more precise in this regard, but still lack for not specifying the means of  
10 the simulation. Especially when techniques are compared across modalities the lack of  
11 precise terminology becomes problematic. Given that in the current study haptic percepts  
12 are simulated both mechanically and optically, we need to use a terminology descriptive  
13 enough to distinguish between the two techniques. In order to meet this requirement we  
14 speak of ‘mechanically simulated haptic feedback’ and ‘optically simulated haptic  
15 feedback’. We chose this terminology because it precisely and transparently describes  
16 both techniques; haptic percepts are simulated by mechanical/optical means.  
17  
18

### 19 3 METHODS

#### 20 3.1 Subjects

21  
22  
23  
24 Thirty volunteer subjects participated. There were 19 male and 11 female subjects,  
25 ranging in age from 20 to 36 years. Of the 30 participants 23 were right-handed and seven  
26 were left-handed. All subjects were regular users of mice in their daily work. The subjects  
27 were not informed about the goal of the experiments in advance. During the experiment,  
28 subjects were presented with various bump/hole structures which they could explore with  
29 the mouse in order to determine their heights/depths. The slopes of some bump/hole  
30 structures were generated through optically simulated haptic feedback, those of others  
31 through mechanically simulated haptic feedback, and some through, matching or  
32 conflicting, combinations of both techniques. The subjects were not informed about the  
33 different techniques used to generate the haptic structures. We divided the subjects  
34 randomly into three groups of ten people; each group being assigned a different  
35 combination of ranges of the mechanical and optical nominal force setting.  
36  
37

#### 38 3.2 Apparatus


39  
40  
41 The experiment was conducted using the Logitech Wingman force feedback  
42 mouse, a mouse attached to a mouse pad replacing the mouse mat and with two motors  
43 supplying force feedback to the user [Rosenberg, 1997]. This mouse was used in all  
44 experimental conditions. The host computer was a Pentium III class PC with a screen  
45 resolution of 1024x768 pixels on a 17-inch monitor. The default Windows XP cursor was  
46 used. The experiment was implemented in C++. The data were collected with 1-pixel and  
47 1-ms resolution and saved in output files for subsequent analysis. The subjects sat in a  
48 quiet, isolated room. During the session the experimenter waited at the other side of the  
49 room. For the mechanically simulated haptic feedback condition, the motors in the  
50 Logitech Wingman force feedback mouse were used to create hole-shaped and bump-  
51 shaped force-fields, pushing the pointing device and consequentially the cursor towards  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 the centre of the target or away from the centre. In the optically simulated force feedback  
 2 condition the same force field was simulated directly with cursor displacements. Since the  
 3 mechanical simulation outputs to the pointing device, while the optical simulation outputs  
 4 to the cursor position, both feedback conditions could be easily intervened. Both  
 5 techniques derive their own force vector from the steepness of their own slope definition  
 6 underneath the current cursor position – note that this cursor position can be altered by the  
 7 user as well as by the forces exercised by one or more of the techniques.  
 8

9 For the experiment we needed a formula that could render fluent bumps and holes  
 10 and without artefacts that could function as unintended cues for the subjects to recognise  
 11 the shapes. We tried different mathematical means of rendering the bumps and holes:  
 12 linear, polynomial, Gaussian, and sinusoid. The polynomial shapes were not chosen  
 13 because they have discontinuous derivatives at their boundaries at the zero plane that  
 14 could become an unintended cue for the subjects. The linear shape has discontinuities  
 15 both at the zero plane and at the top. The Gaussian shape is completely continuous, but is  
 16 zero nowhere. For the current experiment we chose to use a squared cosine shape since  
 17 this shape results in a bump or hole with a clear but not too abrupt boundary and a smooth  
 18 top (figure 1).  
 19

$$20 \quad f(x) = \cos^2(x) \quad 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}\pi$$

$$21 \quad f(x, y) = \cos^2(\sqrt{x^2 + y^2})$$



22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 Figure 1. Sinusoid calculation of the structures in 2D and 3D.

29 The circular area where the force field was applied had a diameter of 240 pixels, the same  
 30 as the diameter of the area occupied by the visually displayed target. The range of the  
 31 mechanical forces applied to the mouse and the range of the force gains of the optically  
 32 simulated haptic feedback was set by a committee of four people that were involved in  
 33 similar projects and had knowledge of the techniques used. They preset the optically and  
 34 mechanically simulated strength so that they were, in their perception, individually equal.  
 35 This was done by conducting a series of mini-experiments in which these four people  
 36 compared different mechanical strengths to different optical strengths up to the point  
 37 where they believed the most extreme slopes (deep hole and high bump) to be equal  
 38 across the two conditions. The values resulting from this cross-modal matching are called  
 39 the nominal values. During the experiment this setting was varied between the three  
 40 different groups.  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60




Figure 2. Screenshot of the experiment.

### 3.3 Procedure

In the experiment the subjects were presented with a series of ‘bump’ and ‘hole’ shaped force feedback fields centred in an area indicated by a circle 240 pixels in diameter (figure 2). The force fields were generated as a combination of mechanically and optically simulated force feedback in independently varying strengths. Subjects were instructed to move the cursor over the circle on the screen and asked to indicate how deep or high the structure was they perceived within the outlined circle. They were asked to do this at their own pace. They were not informed in advance about the different feedback conditions.

After the experiment the subjects were asked if they experienced different ways of representing the bumps and holes and if so, which ones. In addition, they were asked what strategy they used to determine the height or depth of a field and, finally, if they had had previous experiences with force feedback before the experiment.

### 3.4 Design

The experiment was a 7x7 within-subjects design. The two factors, optically simulated haptic feedback (OSHF) and mechanically simulated haptic feedback (MSHF), were varied over seven levels:

OPTICALLY SIMULATED HAPTIC FEEDBACK	-3,-2,-1,0,+1,+2,+3
MECHANICALLY SIMULATED HAPTIC FEEDBACK	-3,-2,-1,0,+1,+2,+3

The mechanically and optically simulated components both have seven different height settings: deep hole (-3), medium hole (-2), shallow hole (-1), flat (0), low bump (1), medium bump (2), high bump (3). Combining these settings into a factorial design, results in 49 combinations of optical and mechanical force field stimuli. In the first half of the experiment, all 49 combinations were presented to the subjects in random order. In the second half the same series of combinations was shown but in reversed order, resulting in a total of 98 trails. For each of these trails the user had to estimate the height of the force feedback texture underneath the disk on an integer scale from -3 to +3, where -3 represents a strong hole and +3 a strong bump. Note that in a part of these combinations the various types of feedback reinforce each other, whereas in other combinations they counteract. For instance, a medium bump in mechanical force feedback (+2) combined with a deep hole (-3) with optically simulated force feedback will result in a contradictory hole/bump situation (+2,-3) in which the subject has to integrate between the different modalities.

We introduced a test phase at the beginning of the experiment, to let the users know what kind of heights they would encounter during the experiment. During this phase the nine most extreme values (+3,+3),(+3,0),(+3,-3), (0,+3),(0,0),(0,-3), (-3,+3),(-3,0),(-3,-3) from the main experiment were presented to the subjects in a setting that is identical to that of the main experiment. Likewise these values were displayed in a randomized order.

In order to gain insight into a possible turning point between the dominance of the different modalities, we divided the subjects into three groups of ten people; each group

1 conducted the experiment with different ranges of the mechanical and optical nominal  
2 force settings.

- 3 • Group 1 : 100% nominal optical strength, 80% nominal mechanical strength
- 4 • Group 2: 100% nominal optical strength, 100% nominal mechanical strength
- 5 • Group 3: 80% nominal optical strength, 100% nominal mechanical strength

6  
7  
8 We thus conduct three experiments – one for each group – which only differ in the  
9 strength settings of the various forces. As mentioned, these nominal settings were  
10 determined on the basis of four informed judges who tried to balance the perceived  
11 relative strengths of the two feedback conditions in such a way that, on average, they  
12 would play an equal role.

13 Another more fundamental reason to carry out the experiment for three different  
14 ranges of the optical and the mechanical strength is to control for the possible strategy  
15 participants may adopt to adapt their estimations to these ranges. So, their strategy might  
16 be, after the practice trials, to rate the depth of a hole with -3 when both the optical and  
17 the mechanical strength are minimum, and to rate the depth of a hole with +3 when both  
18 optical and mechanical strength are maximum, more or less independent of the actual  
19 settings of these ranges. If the participants would follow this strategy the results for the  
20 three experiments will be the same. If not, the estimations by the participants will vary in  
21 accordance with the different ranges of the optical and the mechanical strengths of the  
22 simulation.

#### 23 24 4 RESULTS

25  
26 It appeared that participants easily recognized the condition in which both optical and  
27 mechanical feedback were 0; in all cases they indicated the height of the object as 0. This  
28 means that the variance for this data point is zero, and so it was excluded from the  
29 following analyses of variance.

30 The data were subjected to a 3-way analysis of variance with the estimations  
31 (ESTIM) of the height of the virtual object as dependent variable, and the factor EXP,  
32 experiment, representing the three nominal settings of the ranges of the two kinds of  
33 feedback, the factor OSHF, the strength of the optically simulated haptic feedback, and  
34 the factor MSHF, that of the mechanically simulated haptic feedback MSHF. The results  
35 are presented in Table I. There are significant effects of MSHF ( $F(6, 2736) = 143.152$ ;  
36  $p < 0.001$ ) and OSHF ( $F(6, 2736) = 958.367$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), but not of EXP ( $F(2, 2736) = 0.$   
37  $272$ ;  $p = 0.762$ ). On the other hand, there is no significant first-order interaction between  
38 MSHF\*OSHF ( $F(35, 2736) = 0.619$ ;  $p = 0.961$ ); but there are significant first-order  
39 interactions between MSHF\*EXP ( $F(12, 2736) = 8.622$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) and OSHF\*EXP ( $F$   
40 ( $12, 2736) = 5.205$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). This shows that the effect of both mechanically and  
41 optically simulated haptic feedback depends on the factor EXP, experiment. So, the  
42 different ranges used for the three experimental set-ups lead to significantly different  
43 estimations of the height of the virtual objects. The data of the three experimental  
44 conditions will, therefore, be analysed separately. Finally, there was no significant three-  
45 way interaction between MSHF, OSHF, and EXP. We will discuss the results of  
46 Experiment I, representing the 10 subjects of group 1, in detail and then only deal with  
47 the differences found for the other experiments II and III, which represent the subjects of  
48 group 2 and 3.

49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Tests of Between-Subjects Effects(b)

Dependent Variable: ESTIM

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	6292,388(a)	143	44,003	47,858	,000
Intercept	28,631	1	28,631	31,139	,000
EXP	,500	2	,250	,272	,762
MSHF	789,719	6	131,620	143,152	,000
OSHF	5286,993	6	881,165	958,367	,000
EXP * MSHF	95,126	12	7,927	8,622	,000
EXP * OSHF	57,433	12	4,786	5,205	,000
MSHF * OSHF	19,934	35	,570	,619	,961
EXP * MSHF * OSHF	42,738	70	,611	,664	,986
Error	2515,600	2736	,919		
Total	8838,000	2880			
Corrected Total	8807,988	2879			

a R Squared = ,714 (Adjusted R Squared = ,699)

b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by MSHF  $\sim$  0 | OSHF  $\sim$  0 (FILTER)

Table 1: ANOVA table for the 3-way analysis of variance with the factor EXP for Experiment, the factor MSHF for the strength of the mechanically simulated haptic feedback, and OSHF for the strength of the optically simulated feedback.

#### 4.1 Experiment I

The results of Experiment I, belonging to group 1, in which the participants received 100% nominal optically simulated haptic feedback and 80% nominal mechanically simulated haptic feedback, are presented in figure. 3. The vertical lines indicate for each combination of mechanically- and optically simulated haptic feedback the standard deviations of 20 estimations, 2 estimations for all 10 participants.

The estimations by the participants of Experiment I were subjected to a two-way analysis of variance with MSHF and OSHF as fixed factors. There were significant main effects of both MSHF ( $F(6, 912) = 27.672$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) and OSHF ( $F(6, 912) = 427.526$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). There was no significant interaction ( $F(35, 912) = 0.503$ ;  $p = 0.993$ ). Hence, we can collapse the data over MSHF and over OSHF, resulting in two marginal means. The results are shown in Fig. 4. It can be seen that, for mechanically simulated haptic feedback, with the data collapsed over optically simulated haptic feedback, the range of the estimations is much smaller than for optically simulated haptic feedback, while the standard deviations of the result are much larger. This shows that in this experimental configuration the participants attributed more weight to the values of the optically simulated haptic feedback than to those of the mechanically simulated haptic feedback. This is substantiated by the linear regression analysis on the data which shows that the regression coefficient was 0.739 for OSHF and 0.188 for MSHF; the intercept was 0.101. The correlation coefficient between OSHF and the estimations of the participants was 0.831, whereas it was 0.211 for MSHF, which is highly significant according to the difference test for correlations coefficients based on Fisher's z-transform ( $z = 21.37$ ,  $N = 960$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ).




Figure 3: Average estimations of the height of the virtual bumps and holes for the feedback conditions of Experiment I, in which the mechanically simulated haptic feedback (MSHF) varied over 80% of its maximum range and optically simulated haptic feedback (OSHF) over 100%.




Figure 4: Marginal means of the estimations shown in Figure 3. In the results for mechanically simulated haptic feedback are presented; hence, the data are collapsed over optically simulated haptic feedback. In b the results are collapsed over mechanically simulated haptic feedback, showing the results for optically simulated haptic feedback. The vertical lines represent one standard deviation up and one down.




Figure 5: Average estimations for the monosensory stimulation conditions, which means that either optically simulated haptic feedback was zero (a) or mechanically simulated haptic feedback was zero (b). Note that these graphs are the same as the vertical cross sections of figure 9 along the two horizontal axes.




Figure 6: Average estimations of the data shown in Figure 3 for which the optically simulated haptic feedback was equal to the mechanically simulated haptic feedback, the coherent condition, compared with the incoherent condition for which the optically simulated haptic feedback was opposite to the mechanically simulated haptic feedback. Note that these represent the diagonals shown in Figure 3. In (a) the results for the coherent feedback are presented; in (b) the results for the incoherent feedback.

The finding that in this experimental configuration the participants attributed more weight to the values of the optically simulated haptic feedback than to those of the mechanically simulated haptic feedback can also be seen by comparing the conditions in which there is only mechanically simulated feedback with those in which there is only optically simulated feedback. The average results for these mono-sensory conditions are

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 shown in Fig.5, in 5a for the purely mechanical simulations and in 5b for the purely  
2 optical simulations. Notice that in the purely mechanical simulation shown in Fig.5a, the  
3 standard deviations are much smaller than in the collapsed data shown in Fig. 4a, which  
4 demonstrates that the large variance represented by the high standard deviations of figure  
5 4a is induced by the variance introduced by the levels of the optical simulations. This in  
6 contrast with the conditions of purely optical simulations shown in Figs 4b and 5b.

7  
8 Another interesting aspect becomes apparent when one looks at the diagonals of  
9 Figure 3. The diagonal from the front corner, the point (-3, -3), to the back corner left to  
10 right, the point (3, 3), shows the estimations by the participants for those feedback  
11 conditions in which the numerical category of the mechanically simulated haptic  
12 feedback was equal to that of the optically simulated haptic feedback; so, mechanical and  
13 optical feedback reinforce each other. This will be called *coherent feedback*. The other  
14 diagonal, running from the left to the right corner, on the other hand, shows the  
15 conditions in which mechanical and optical simulations oppose each other. This will be  
16 called *incoherent feedback*. Notice that the standard deviations for the values on the latter  
17 diagonal look larger than for those on the former. This is substantiated by the amount of  
18 explained variance in both conditions as determined by the correlation coefficients  
19 between feedback and the estimations by the participants. In the coherent feedback  
20 condition it is 70%, whereas in the incoherent condition it is only 4%. This is highly  
21 significant ( $z = 5.70$ ,  $N = 120$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ).

22  
23 It is concluded that in the incoherent condition the variability of the responses is  
24 much larger than in the coherent condition. In addition, a three-way ANOVA with MSHF  
25 and OSHF as fixed factors, and participant (PP) as random factor resulted in no main  
26 effect of PP, but there was a significant interaction between both MSHF and PP ( $F(54,$   
27  $315)=5.285$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), and OSHF and PP ( $F(54, 315)=9.026$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). This shows that  
28 different participants reacted differently to the different combinations of feedback. The  
29 much smaller amount of explained variance in the incoherent stimulus condition shows  
30 that this is to a large extent due to the different responses in the incoherent stimulus  
31 conditions, whereas participants are more consistent with each other in the coherent  
32 condition.

#### 33 34 35 4.2 Experiments II and III

36  
37 The main difference between the results of the three experiments corresponded  
38 with the larger range covered by the strength of the mechanical simulation relative to that  
39 of the optical simulation. In Experiment II the nominal range of the mechanical  
40 simulation was increased from 80% to 100%, while in Experiment III the range of the  
41 optical simulation was reduced from 100% to 80%. This expressed itself in a higher  
42 weight the participants attributed to the mechanical component of the stimulus in  
43 Experiment II and III. Hence, the results were similar to those of Experiment I except for  
44 shifts according to the different balance between the mechanical and optical contribution  
45 to the simulations. This will be discussed in detail now.

46  
47 Indeed, in Experiment II there were significant main effects of both MSHF ( $F(6,$   
48  $912) = 32.847$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) and OSHF ( $F(6, 912) = 346.737$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), while there was no  
49 significant interaction ( $F(35, 912) = 0.672$ ;  $p = 0.928$ ). In Experiment III, with similar  
50 results, the statistics were  $F(6, 912) = 91.905$ ;  $p < 0.001$ , for MSHF,  $F(6, 912) = 217.535$ ;  
51  $p < 0.001$ , for OSHF, and  $F(35, 912) = 0.749$ ;  $p = 0.855$  for the interaction. Hence, we can  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

collapse the data over MSHF and over OSHF, resulting in two marginal means. The results are shown in Fig. 13 for Experiment II and in Fig. 14 for Experiment III. It can be seen that, again, for optically simulated haptic feedback, with the data collapsed over mechanically simulated haptic feedback, the range of the estimations is smaller, and the size of the standard deviations of the estimations is much larger, than for mechanically simulated haptic feedback, with the data collapsed over OSHF. This shows that, although the nominal contribution of the mechanically simulated haptic feedback was larger now, also in this experimental configuration the participants attributed more weight to the values of the optical simulation than to those of the mechanical simulation.




Figure 7: Marginal means of the estimations of Experiment II. In (a) the results for mechanically simulated haptic feedback are presented; hence, the data are collapsed over optically simulated haptic feedback. In (b) the results are collapsed over mechanically simulated haptic feedback, showing the results for optically simulated haptic feedback. The vertical lines represent one standard deviation up and one down.




Figure 8: Marginal means of the estimations of Experiment III. For details see Fig. 7.

This is substantiated by a linear regression analysis on the data which for Experiment II yielded a regression coefficient of 0.678 for OSHF and 0.209 for MSHF; the intercept was 0.086. The correlation coefficient between OSHF and the estimations of the participants was 0.801, whereas it was 0.246 for MSHF, which difference is highly significant according to the difference test for correlations coefficients based on Fisher's  $z$ -transform ( $z = 18.60$ ,  $N = 960$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). Observe that the difference between the weights attributed to optically simulated haptic feedback and to mechanically simulated haptic feedback diminishes in correspondence with the larger range of the mechanically simulated haptic feedback which from Experiment I to II was increased from 80% to 100%. For Experiment III these regression coefficients were 0.581 for OSHF and 0.376 for MSHF, while the intercept was 0.119. The correlation coefficient between OSHF and the estimations of the participants was 0.675, whereas it was 0.437 for MSHF, which difference is again highly significant ( $z = 7.69$ ,  $N = 960$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). The smaller difference between the weights now corresponds with the smaller range of the optically simulated haptic feedback which from Experiment II to III was decreased from 100% to 80%.




Figure 9: Average estimations of experiment II for the monosensory stimulation conditions, which means that either optically simulated haptic feedback was zero (a) or mechanically simulated haptic feedback was zero (b). Note that these graphs are the same as the vertical cross sections of figure 9 along the two horizontal axes.




Figure 10: Average estimations of experiment III for the monosensory stimulation conditions, which means that either optically simulated haptic feedback was zero (a) or mechanically simulated haptic feedback was zero (b). Note that these graphs are the same as the vertical cross sections of figure 9 along the two horizontal axes.

Showing the results for the monosensory simulations gives a similar picture as for experiment I. This is shown in Figs. 9 and 10. Again the variance of the monosensory conditions with purely mechanical simulations, shown in Fig. 9a and 10a, is much less than that of the average conditions shown in Fig. 7a and 8a, which contrasts with the conditions of purely optical simulations. But note that the difference is less for Experiment III (Fig. 10) than for Experiment II (Fig. 9), which in its turn is less than for Experiment I (Figure 5). This must be due to the range of the mechanical levels now being relatively wider in Experiment III than in Experiment II, where it is wider than in Experiment I, this in relation to the range of optical levels. In other aspects the results are similar. Furthermore, the standard deviations in Fig. 10b are now larger when compared with Fig. 9b, where it is larger than in 5b. This shows that the effect on the participants' estimations of the mechanical simulation is now stronger than in experiment II, where it is stronger than in Experiment I.

The results for the coherent and the incoherent stimulus conditions are presented in Fig. 11 for Experiment II and in Fig. 12 for Experiment III. A comparison between the coherent and the incoherent stimulus conditions in Experiment II gives a percentage of explained variance of 64% in the coherent feedback condition and of 6% in the incoherent feedback, which is highly significant ( $z = 6.87$ ,  $N = 120$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). For Experiment III the results are 46% for the coherent feedback condition and 19% for the incoherent feedback, which is highly significant ( $z = 12.30$ ,  $N = 120$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). So, it is concluded again that in the incoherent condition the variability of the responses is much larger than in the coherent condition. And as in Experiment I, another three-way ANOVA with MSHF and OSHF as fixed factors and PP as random factor resulted in no main effect of PP, but in significant interactions between MSHF and PP (Experiment II:  $F(54, 315) = 6.405$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ; Experiment III:  $F(54, 315) = 4.548$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), and OSHF and PP (Experiment II:  $F(54, 315) = 10.843$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ; Experiment III:  $F(54, 315) = 4.945$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). This shows that participants did not respond in the same way to the various

feedback conditions. The much smaller amount of explained variance in the incoherent stimulus condition shows that this is largely due to the different responses in the incoherent stimulus conditions. Observe that the difference in explained variance between the coherent and the incoherent condition is larger, again, than in Experiment II, where it was already larger than that in Experiment I.




Figure 11: Average estimations of experiment II for the monosensory stimulation conditions, which means that either optically simulated haptic feedback was zero (a) or mechanically simulated haptic feedback was zero (b). Note that these graphs are the same as the vertical cross sections of figure 3 along the two horizontal axes.




Figure 12: Average estimations of the data shown in Figure 11 for which the optically simulated haptic feedback was equal to the mechanically simulated haptic feedback, the coherent condition, compared with the incoherent condition for which the optical simulation was opposite to the mechanical simulation. Note that this represents the diagonals shown in Figure 11. In (a) the results for the coherent feedback are presented. In (b) the results for the incoherent feedback are presented.

### 4.3 Comparison of Experiment I, II, and III

The results show that the three different experimental conditions, in which the range of the mechanically simulated haptic and the optically simulated haptic feedback was varied over 80% mechanical feedback and 100% optical feedback, 100% mechanical feedback and 100% optical feedback, and 100% mechanical feedback and 80% optical feedback – whereby 100% represents the nominal value set by the committee of experts –, correspondingly changes the weight the participants attributed to the mechanically and the optically simulated haptic feedback. This follows from the decreasing correlation coefficients between the estimations and the optically simulated haptic feedback condition, and the increasing correlation coefficients between the estimations and the mechanically simulated haptic feedback condition. Although initially the choice of the values for the ranges of the optical and the mechanical feedback was based on judgments by the committee of four experts that, in the conditions of Experiment III, optical feedback would not dominate, the results show that even then the participants on the average attributed more weight to the optical simulation. We do not have a single explanation for the unexpected result that participants attributed more weight to the optical simulation than the committee of four, who set the standard and were familiar to

1 the different techniques. It could be that the experimenters, who had set the standard,  
2 subconsciously overweighed the optical simulation to make it more recognisable by the  
3 participants. Or it could be that uninformed participants who are not familiar with the two  
4 different techniques attribute more weight to the optical simulation than people who  
5 know the used techniques. Despite that we did not find a clear turning point where the  
6 optical outweighs the mechanical stimulation, the results clearly show that optically  
7 simulated haptic feedback is a powerful tool to complement or replace mechanical  
8 feedback, and that the relative role of each form of feedback can be adjusted.  
9

10 Furthermore, the comparisons of the coherent with the incoherent feedback  
11 conditions show that the correlation coefficients for the coherent stimulus conditions  
12 slightly increase from Experiment I to III, hence with decreasing optically and increasing  
13 mechanically simulated haptic feedback, from 0.925, via 0.941 to 0.956. The difference  
14 between the first and the last correlation coefficients is statistically significant ( $z = 2.10$ ;  
15  $N = 120$ ;  $p < 0.025$ ). This shows that in the coherent condition, mechanical and optical  
16 simulations of haptic feedback enhance each other. On the other hand, the correlation  
17 coefficients for the incoherent stimulus conditions decrease highly significantly from  
18 Experiment I to III from 0.705, through 0.690, to 0.281. The difference between the last  
19 correlation coefficient and the first is statistically significant ( $z = 4.50$ ;  $N = 120$ ;  
20  $p < 0.001$ ), as is the difference between the last and the second ( $z = 4.27$ ;  $N = 120$ ;  
21  $p < 0.001$ ). This shows that in the incoherent condition the 'disturbing' influence of the  
22 increasing contribution of the mechanical feedback on the participants' responses  
23 increases.  
24

25 The three experiments were carried out by three different groups. In this between-  
26 groups design it would have been possible that each group would adapt the range of  
27 estimations to the range of the optical and the mechanical feedback. Since this did not  
28 happen we can conclude that the estimations were based on a real percept of the depth of  
29 a hole or the height of a bump, and not on a perceptual normalization of the estimations  
30 over the stimulus ranges. Note that in a between-subject design in which the trials of the  
31 three experiments would have been randomly mixed, this strategy is not possible, and the  
32 differences found would only have been more significant.  
33

#### 34 4.4 Prior knowledge

35 After the experiment the participants were asked if they were experienced or had  
36 heard of force feedback. Twenty eight participants said that they knew about mechanical  
37 force feedback either through computer games or through professional use. Among the  
38 subjects there were eight who said that they knew about optically simulated force  
39 feedback before the experiment. We compared the answers of these participants with  
40 their experimental results. We found no correlation between prior knowledge of the  
41 applied techniques and the outcome of the experiment.  
42  
43  
44  
45

#### 46 4.5 Result summary

47 The results clearly show that, at least for the nominal values used in this study,  
48 mechanically and optically simulated haptic feedback complement each other in  
49 supplying information as to the depths of holes and heights of bumps in a GUI.  
50 Noticeably, in the ranges applied in the present study, optically simulated haptic feedback  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 gives a stronger haptic illusion of force feedback than anticipated by the researchers, even  
2 to a degree that it can replace mechanical force feedback. In all three experimental  
3 conditions the variation of the optical simulation contributes more to the variance of the  
4 participants' estimations than does mechanical simulation.

5 The statistical interaction between the nominal values of mechanically and  
6 optically simulated haptic feedback was not significant, indicating that *on average* the  
7 haptic effects of mechanical and optical simulations are simply additive. On the other  
8 hand, for incoherent stimuli when one simulation method gives the haptic illusion of a  
9 hole and the other of a bump, the variance of the estimations is much higher than for  
10 coherent stimuli. This is due to the fact that the relative weight each subject attributes to  
11 the information coming in through the visual and the haptic modality is different. Most  
12 subjects attributed more weight to the visual information, but a minority of subjects, one  
13 in Experiment I, two in experiment II and three in Experiment III, predominantly paid  
14 attention to the haptic information generated by the mechanical force feedback device.  
15 Together with the findings discussed in section 4.3, this increase, though statistically not  
16 significant, again corresponds with the relatively increasing contribution of the  
17 mechanically simulated feedback and its larger range in Experiment II and III. Hence, the  
18 subjects did not adapt their estimations of the heights of the bumps and the depths of the  
19 holes to the ranges of the mechanical and the optical strength, but really based their  
20 estimations on the percept of depth and height as induced by the optical and the  
21 mechanical stimulus components. In the case of conflicting information some  
22 participants attributed other weights to the two stimulus components than others.  
23  
24  
25

## 26 5 GENERAL DISCUSSION

27  
28 We compared the perception of virtual bump and hole structures in a GUI,  
29 simulated mechanically with a force feedback device and optically by applying cursor  
30 displacements as if there was force feedback. The present study points out that, since  
31 active cursor displacements can induce strong haptic illusions, they are well suited for  
32 simulating bump and hole structures. Hence, the results are in line with our first  
33 hypothesis that optically simulated haptic feedback can be applied to create perceivable  
34 bump and hole structures and that people are able to judge the relative heights of the  
35 bumps and the depths of the holes to an extent comparable to that of mechanically  
36 simulated force feedback.  
37

38 Our second hypothesis, that optically simulated haptic feedback can be used to  
39 enhance or decrease the perceived height of bump and hole structures generated with a  
40 mechanical force feedback device, is confirmed in the sense that, on average, the haptic  
41 illusions induced by mechanical and optical simulations are additive. On the other hand,  
42 for incoherent stimuli for which the illusions induced by mechanical and optical  
43 simulations oppose each other, a minority of subjects attributes more weight to haptic  
44 information than to visual information, as mentioned one for Experiment I, two for  
45 Experiment II and three for Experiment III.  
46

47 These findings demonstrate that, at least for the structures and nominal values of  
48 feedback used in this experiment, optically simulated haptic feedback can replace  
49 mechanically simulated haptic feedback. However, this does not mean that optically  
50 simulated haptic feedback can be applied in all situations in which mechanical force  
51 feedback has shown to be beneficial. Optically simulated haptic feedback can naturally be  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 applied only in situations in which the users of the GUI can direct their attention to the  
2 visual information presented on the screen, even more specifically to the position of the  
3 cursor on the screen where the haptic illusions are induced.

4 Furthermore, it is possible that optical simulations are especially beneficial for  
5 small targets, or for weak mechanical forces. In another study [Mensvoort et al., 2008]  
6 using a Fitts' type target-acquisition task, we have shown that optically simulated haptic  
7 feedback has a significantly higher usability than mechanically simulated haptic feedback,  
8 but the benefit of the optical simulation expressed itself mainly for smaller targets, less  
9 than 20 pixels in diameter. In the experiments presented here, the holes and bumps were  
10 240 pixels in diameter, which is in the range where this usability benefit of optically  
11 simulated force feedback is no longer significant. Hence, it may very well be that it is not  
12 so much size of targets but strengths of forces that matters. In other words, the enhancing  
13 effects of optically simulated haptic feedback may express themselves especially when  
14 mechanical feedback is relatively weak.  
15

### 16 17 18 5.1 Future work

19 The research presented here showed that users are able to interpret the simulated  
20 topographical structures correctly. So, the active cursor technique can be applied in  
21 today's graphical user interfaces. But more research into the potential and limitations of  
22 optically simulated force feedback is needed. Further perceptual experiments might deal  
23 with the recognition of various objects, from simple forms, like ramps, squares, gutters,  
24 and triangles, to dynamic complex scenes. Other future work may consist of evaluations  
25 of the applications of optically simulated force feedback, in particular in more complex  
26 GUIs. The current interfaces are not designed with tactility in mind. The most important  
27 research path, therefore, is the design of completely new interaction styles based upon  
28 optically simulated force feedback. The cursor channel is no longer an input channel  
29 only, but is transformed into an input/output channel.  
30

31 Before optically simulated force feedback can be fully applied in more complex  
32 interaction styles, an expressive language of satisfactory and tolerable active cursor  
33 behaviours needs to be developed. Interface designers and researchers need to experiment  
34 more with the technique in order to explore the affordances of the created objects and  
35 find out what works and what does not. Since the active cursor technique is not so easy to  
36 implement, we have developed a software toolset that enables designers to add optically  
37 simulated haptic feedback to their interfaces without difficult programming. The software  
38 toolset is implemented in Adobe Flash and can be downloaded at [www.powercursor.com](http://www.powercursor.com).  
39  
40

### 41 42 5.2 Conclusions

43 We conclude that, at least for the hole and bump structures and nominal values of  
44 feedback used in our experiment, optically simulated force feedback is a good alternative  
45 for mechanically simulated force feedback. Active cursor displacements, influencing the  
46 normal cursor movement linked to the user's mouse movements, can be applied to  
47 generate bump and hole structures. Participants in the experiments successfully identified  
48 the bump and hole slopes and estimated their sizes in a consistent way, in both the  
49 optically simulated haptic feedback condition, and in the condition using a mechanical  
50 force feedback device. Optically simulated haptic feedback can further be applied to alter  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 the perception of mechanically simulated haptic structures. In some respects, e.g., for  
2 more subtle forces, optically simulated haptic feedback is likely to be even more  
3 expressive than mechanical simulations of force feedback, at least for the ranges tested  
4 and nominal values used in the present study. Furthermore we have learned that optically  
5 and mechanically simulated haptic feedback must be applied in a coherent way. If not,  
6 different users will react differently and, hence, unpredictably.

7 Hence, optically simulated haptic feedback can be applied to generate perceivable  
8 haptic structures in a standard cursor controlled graphical user interfaces, without  
9 resorting to special mechanical input/output devices. This technique of simulating haptic  
10 feedback optically opens up an additional communication channel with the user. Optically  
11 simulated haptic feedback is not expected, however, to replace mechanically simulated  
12 haptic feedback in general. Rather we expect that, since optically simulated haptic  
13 feedback can be implemented in a standard desktop set-up without special hardware, it  
14 could catalyse the development of novel physical interaction styles and the acceptance of  
15 mechanical force feedback devices.  
16

## 17 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

18 We want to thank Jim Juola and Berry Eggen who provided helpful comments on  
19 previous versions of this document.  
20

21 This research was supported by the Eindhoven University of Technology.  
22 Corresponding Authors' addresses: Tel. +31 624271385; fax: +31 40 2475608. Website: [www.koert.com](http://www.koert.com); E-  
23 mail address: [k.m.v.mensvoort@tue.nl](mailto:k.m.v.mensvoort@tue.nl)

24 Permission to make digital/hard copy of part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee  
25 provided that the copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage, the copyright notice, the  
26 title of the publication, and its date of appear, and notice is given that copying is by permission of the ACM, Inc.  
27 To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers, or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission  
28 and/or a fee.  
29

30 © 2001 ACM 1073-0516/01/0300-0034 \$5.00  
31

## 32 REFERENCES

- 33  
34 AHLSTRÖM, D., HITZ, M. AND LEITNER, G. 2002. Improving Mouse Navigation - A  
35 Walk Through the .Hilly Screen Landscape. In Proc. DSV-IS 2002, Springer-  
36 Verlag, 185.195.  
37  
38 AHLSTRÖM, D. 2005. Modeling and improving selection in cascading pull-down menus  
39 using Fitts' law, the steering law and force fields, Proceedings of the SIGCHI  
40 conference on Human factors in computing systems, April 02-07, 2005, Portland,  
41 Oregon, USA.  
42  
43 AHLSTRÖM, D., HITZ, M., AND LEITNER, G. 2006. An evaluation of sticky and force  
44 enhanced targets in multi target situations. In *Proceedings of the 4th Nordic*  
45 *Conference on Human-Computer interaction: Changing Roles* (Oslo, Norway,  
46 October 14 - 18, 2006). A. Mørch, K. Morgan, T. Bratteteig, G. Ghosh, and D.  
47 Svanaes, Eds. NordiCHI '06, vol. 189. ACM, New York, NY, 58-67.  
48  
49 AKAMATSU, M., & SATO, S., 1994. A multi-modal mouse with tactile and force  
50 feedback. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 40, 443-453.  
51  
52 AKAMATSU, M., SATO, S. & MACKENZIE, I.S. 1994. Multimodal mouse: A mouse-  
53 type device with tactile and force display. *Presence* 3, 73-90.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1 BALAKRISHNAN, R. 2004. "Beating" Fitts' law: virtual enhancements for pointing  
2 facilitation. *Int. J. Hum.-Comput. Stud.* 61, 6, Dec. 2004, 857-874.
- 3 BAUDISCH, P., CUTRELL, E., HINCKLEY, K., AND EVERSOLE, A. 2005. Snap-  
4 and-go: helping users align objects without the modality of traditional snapping. In  
5 *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*  
6 (Portland, Oregon, USA, April 02 - 07, 2005). CHI '05. ACM, New York, NY,  
7 301-310.
- 8 BEJCZY ET AL., 1990 BEJCZY, A.K., KIM, W.S., VENEMA, S.C., 1990. The phantom  
9 robot: predictive displays for teleoperation with time delay. In: *Robotics and*  
10 *Automation, 1990. Proceedings, 1990 IEEE International Conference, vol. 1, 13–*  
11 *18 May 1990, pp. 546–551.*
- 12 BEVAN, M., 1995. Force feedback technology. *VR NEWS – Virtual Reality Worldwide*  
13 *4, 23-29.*
- 14 BLANCH, R., GUIARD, Y., AND BEAUDOUIN-LAFON, M. 2004. Semantic pointing:  
15 improving target acquisition with control-display ratio adaptation. In *Proceedings*  
16 *of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Vienna,  
17 Austria, April 24 - 29, 2004). CHI '04. ACM, New York, NY, 519-526.
- 18 BROOKS, JR., F.P., OUH-YOUNG, M., BATTER, J.J., & KILPATRICK, P.J., 1990.  
19 Project GROPE - Haptic Displays for Scientific Visualization. *Proceedings*  
20 *SIGGRAPH '90, August, 177-185, Dallas, TX, Computer Graphics 24, 177-185.*
- 21 BURDEA AND LANGRANA, 1993. G. BURDEA AND N. LANGRANA, Virtual force  
22 feedback: lessons, challenges, future applications, *Journal of Robotics and*  
23 *Mechatronics 5 (2) (1993) Japan.*
- 24 BURDEA, G. 1996. *Force and Touch Feedback for Virtual Reality*, John Wiley & Sons,  
25 New York.
- 26 CARR, K.T. & LEDERMAN, S.J., 1995. *Simulated and Virtual Realities: Elements of*  
27 *Perception*. Taylor and Francis Ltd, London, UK
- 28 CHARPENTIER, A., 1891. Analyse expérimentale de quelques éléments de la sensation  
29 de poids [Experimental study of some aspects of weight perception]. *Arch.*  
30 *Physiol. Normales Pathologiques 3, 122-135*
- 31 ENGEL, F.L., GOOSSENS, P. & HAAKMA, R., 1994. Improved efficiency through I-  
32 and E-feedback: A trackball with contextual force feedback. *International Journal*  
33 *of Human-Computer Studies 41, 949-974.*
- 34 ENGELBART, D. & ENGLISH, W. 1968. *Research Center for Augmenting Human*  
35 *Intellect*. Reprinted in *ACM SIGGRAPH Video Review 106 (1994)*, video made  
36 in 1968
- 37 ENGLISH, W.K., ENGELBART, D.C., & BERMAN, M.L. 1967. Display selection  
38 techniques for text manipulation. *IEEE Transactions on Human Factors in*  
39 *Electronics HFE-8 1 (1967), pp. 5-15.*
- 40 ERNST, M. O. AND BANKS, M. S. 2002. Humans integrate visual and haptic  
41 information in a statistically optimal fashion. *Nature (London) 415, 429–433.*
- 42 FLANAGAN, J.R., LEDERMAN, S.J., 2001. Neurobiology: feeling bumps and holes,  
43 *Nature, Vol. 412 pp.389-91.*
- 44 FLOURNEY, T., 1894. De l'influence de la perception visuelle des corps sur leur poids  
45 [The influence of visual perception on the apparent weight of objects]. *L'Année*  
46 *Psychologique 1, 1989-208*
- 47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1 FOGG, B.J. 1998. Persuasive computers: perspectives and research directions,  
2 Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems,  
3 p.225-232, April 18-23, 1998, Los Angeles, California, United States
- 4 GIBSON, J.J., 1966. The senses considered as perceptual systems. Boston, MA:  
5 Houghton Mifflin.
- 6 HELLER, M. A., CALCATERRA, J. A., GREEN, S. L., AND BROWN, L. 1999.  
7 Intersensory conflict between vision and touch: The response modality dominates  
8 when precise, attention-riveting judgments are required. *Perception Psychophys.*  
9 61, 1384--1398.
- 10 HORVITZ, ERIC, 1999. Principles of mixed-initiative user interfaces, Proceedings of the  
11 SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems: the CHI is the limit,  
12 May 15-20, 1999, Pittsburgh, PN, pp.159-166.
- 13 KERSTNER, W. PIGEL, G. AND TSCHELIGI, M. (1994). The FeelMouse: Making  
14 Computer Screens Feelable. In W. Zagler et al., editors, *Computers for*  
15 *handicapped Persons*. Proc. Of the ICCHP'94. Springer-Verlag, 1994
- 16 KEYSON, D.V. 1997. Dynamic control gain and tactile feedback in the capture of cursor  
17 movements, *Ergonomics* (12) (1991), pp. 1287--1298.
- 18 KLATZKY, R. L., LEDERMAN, S., AND REED, C. 1987. There's more to touch than  
19 meets the eye: The salience of object attributes for haptics with and without  
20 vision. *J. Exp. Psychol. General*, 116, 356--369.
- 21 LÉCUYER, A., COQUILLART, S., KHEDDAR, A., RICHARD, P., AND COIFFET, P.  
22 2000. Pseudo-haptic feedback: Can isometric input devices simulate force  
23 feedback? In Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Virtual Reality.  
24 239--246.
- 25 LÉCUYER, A., BURKHARDT, J.-M., & ETIENNE, L., 2004. Feeling bumps and holes  
26 without a haptic interface: The perception of pseudo-haptic textures. Proceedings  
27 of the CHI 2004 Conference, Vienna, Austria, April 24-29 2004, pp. 239-246.
- 28 LÉCUYER, A., BURKHARDT, J., AND TAN, C. 2008. A study of the modification of  
29 the speed and size of the cursor for simulating pseudo-haptic bumps and holes.  
30 *ACM Trans. Appl. Percept.* 5, 3 (Aug. 2008), 1-21.
- 31 LEDERMAN, S. J., THORNE, G., AND JONES, B. 1986. Perception of texture by  
32 vision and touch: Multidimensionality and intersensory integration. *J. Exp.*  
33 *Psychol. Hum. Perception Performance* 12, 169--180.
- 34 MENSVOORT VAN, K., 2002. What you see is what you feel. Exploiting the dominance  
35 of the visual over the haptic domain to simulate force feedback with cursor  
36 displacement. Proceedings of the Conference on Designing Interactive Systems:  
37 Processes, Practices, Methods, and Techniques, June 25-28, 2002, London,  
38 England. New York: ACM Press, pp. 345-348.
- 39 MENSVOORT VAN, K., 2007. Powercursor, Toolkit for designing interfaces with  
40 optically simulated haptic feedback. [www.powercursor.com](http://www.powercursor.com).
- 41 MENSVOORT VAN, K. HERMES D.J., MONFORT VAN, M., 2008. Usability of  
42 visually simulated force feedback, *International Journal of Human-Computer*  
43 *Studies* 66 (2008), pp. 438--451.
- 44 MARKS, L.E., 1978. The unity of the senses. New York, NY: Academic Press
- 45 MINER, N., GILLESPIE, B., & CAUDELL, T., 1996. Examining the influence of audio  
46 and visual stimuli on a haptic display. Proceedings of the 1996 IMAGE  
47 Conference, Phoenix, AZ, June 23-25, 1996.
- 48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1 MURRAY, D.J., ELLIS, R.R., BANDOMIR, C.A. & ROSS, H.E., 1999. Charpentier  
2 (1891) on the size-weight illusion. *Percept. Psychophys*, 61, 1681-1685.
- 3 PARK, J., HAN, S.H., YANG, H., 2006, Evaluation of cursor capturing functions in a  
4 target positioning task, *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* 36 (2006)  
5 pp721-730.
- 6 ROBLES-DE-LA-TORRE, G., HAYWARD, V. 2001 Force can overcome object  
7 geometry in the perception of shape through active touch. *Nature*, Volume 412,  
8 Issue 6845, pp. 445-448.
- 9 ROCK, I. AND VICTOR, J. 1964. Vision and touch: An experimentally created conflict  
10 between the senses. *Science* 143, 594--596.
- 11 ROSENBERG, L.B. 1997. FEELit mouse: Adding a realistic sense of FEEL to the  
12 computing experience. <http://www.force-feedback.com/feelit/>.
- 13 RUNESON S, & FRYKHOLM G. 1981. Visual perception of lifted weight. *Journal of*  
14 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 7, 733-740.
- 15 SHNEIDERMAN, B. 1981. Direct manipulation: A step beyond programming languages.  
16 In *Proceedings of the Joint Conference on Easier and More Productive Use of*  
17 *Computer Systems. (Part - II): Human interface and the User interface - Volume*  
18 *1981 (Ann Arbor, MI, May 20 - 22, 1981). L. Borman, Ed., New York, NY, ACM*  
19 *Press, p. 143*
- 20 STEIN, E., & MEREDITH, A., 1993. *The merging of the senses*, London: MIT Press.
- 21 SUZUKI, YU, 1986. *Outrun*, classic arcade racing game, Sega 1986.
- 22 WELCH, R. B., & WARREN, D. H., 1986. Intersensory Interactions. In *Handbook of*  
23 *Perception and Human Performance*, edited by K. R. Boff, L. Kaufman, and J. P.  
24 Thomas, chap. 25. New York: Wiley.
- 25 WORDEN, A., WALKER, N., BHARAT, K., & HUDSON, S., 1997. Making computers  
26 easier for older adults to use: Area cursors and sticky icons, *Proceedings of the*  
27 *SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*, March 22-27, 1997,  
28 Atlanta, Georgia, United States, p.266-271.
- 29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60