

SPARC

Shared Perspective with Avatar Distortion for Remote Collaboration in VR

João Simões · Anderson Maciel · Catarina Moreira · Joaquim Jorge

June 6 2024

Abstract Telepresence VR systems allow for face-to-face communication, promoting the feeling of presence and understanding of nonverbal cues. However, when discussing virtual 3D objects, limitations to presence and communication cause deictic gestures to lose meaning due to disparities in orientation. Current approaches use shared perspective and avatar overlap to restore these references, which cause occlusions and discomfort that worsen when multiple users participate.

We introduce a new approach to shared perspective in multi-user collaboration where the avatars are not co-located. Each person sees the others' avatars at their positions around the workspace while having a first-person view of the workspace. Whenever a user manipulates an object, others will see his/her arms stretching to reach that object in their perspective. SPARC combines a shared orientation and support to nonverbal communication, minimizing occlusions. We conducted a user study (n=18) to understand how the novel approach impacts task performance and workspace awareness. We found evidence that SPARC is more efficient and less mentally demanding than life-like settings.

Keywords Collaborative UI · Virtual Reality · Shared Perspective · Avatar Manipulation

J. Simões
Instituto Superior Técnico da Universidade de Lisboa
(IST/UL)

A. Maciel anderson.maciел@tecnico.ulisboa.pt
INESC-ID/IST/UL

C. Moreira Catarina.PintoMoreira@uts.edu.au
University Technology Sydney

J. Jorge jaj@inesc-id.pt
INESC-ID/IST/UL

1 Introduction

Remote work strongly impacts corporations and workers since it saves time and resources, along with many other changes still to be understood. Remote work has increased fast with the recent pandemic and is mostly done through the many teleconferencing solutions available. However, videoconferencing systems limit users' interactions with counterproductive communication layers. Even the most widely used teleconferencing solutions cannot avoid cumbersome steps to what would be easily performed in a face-to-face meeting [38], e.g., various people pointing to a diagram in a presentation. These communication barriers are caused by the disregard for the various ways users communicate in a face-to-face setting, including gestures, body posture, awareness of where others are looking, and side conversations.

Past works have shown that using Virtual Reality (VR) is a better approach to cooperation between multiple users since it affords new but natural ways of visualizing and interacting with objects, the environment, and people [14, 43, 38]. This is especially useful when there is a need to manipulate and discuss objects such as 3D models, which is a very common setting in many fields, such as engineering, architecture, geophysical exploration, and even medicine. Effective remote collaboration requires users to understand each other and know where others are in the environment and what they are doing unambiguously.

Current VR technology can simulate face-to-face settings faithfully. However, when collaborating over shared content, people have different points of view on the environment and the task at hand. Despite being very natural, this disparity can induce some ambiguities with opposing orientations, i.e., left and right [11], which is especially true when many collaborators are working

around a table. While this also occurs in physical environments, VR can simulate environments one "step outside of the normal bounds of reality" [44], enhancing it.

That said, a virtual environment (VE) can be designed to purposefully manipulate individual perspectives into a shared perspective between users [12, 46]. For each user, it is as if they were seated on the same chair, seeing the work area from the same point of view (POV), with the difference that four hands are visible, and each user controls their pair. Shared perspective has induced a more effective collaboration between two users [10, 8]. However, it is limited as it removes the non-verbal communication offered by a face-to-face setting. Not addressing the unsolved issues can hurt collaborative efforts, hinder the awareness of others in collaborative tasks, and interfere with the perceived workload and the social presence felt by the collaborators. Moreover, when there is a need for multiple experts in different fields to be able to give their insights about the working task, more than two users must be supported. Using the current approaches with multiple users would cause the visual space to become cluttered, a reason why shared perspectives with multiple users have not been explored.

This paper introduces a solution to cluttering and lack of face-to-face non-verbal communication. With our approach, multiple users work around a table in a VE. They can see each other in their respective seats at the same time that they all see the working objects from the same perspective (Fig. 1). It works as if there were multiple synchronized copies of the scenario, one before each user. Nevertheless, this is not enough because when you point to an object in front of you, your co-workers will not see where your hand is pointing in their copy of the scene. Therefore, we present a solution based on manipulating the user representations (avatars) that provides a faithful localization of references in the workspace. This approach stretches the users' arms representation in the others' environments while maintaining the local user in their virtual body. In the remainder of the paper, we detail the technique and present an experimental study we conducted on the impact of the technique on metrics such as task performance, the feeling of co-presence, and workspace awareness (WA) compared to a conventional VR setting without a shared perspective.

2 Background and Related Work

This section analyzes various important concepts in collaborative work and multiple approaches already developed.




Fig. 1: Over-the-shoulder collaboration (top) is replaced by shared perspective with stretched avatars (bottom). While the perspective is shared, the avatar visualization is face-to-face, allowing for non-verbal cues.

2.1 Awareness

Awareness of groupware is a common topic in the CSCW community. Greenberg et al. [17] summarized Workspace Awareness (WA) as "the collection of up-to-the-minute knowledge a person uses to capture another's interaction with the workspace," which comprises the knowledge of where other people are and what they are doing in the workspace as well as changes to the shared environment [20]. Although maintaining awareness in a collaborative face-to-face setting comes naturally, it must be explicitly implemented in a VR collaboration. It has proven to be a rather difficult task to achieve a real-life-like sense of awareness [17]. The consequent lack of awareness is why the usual feeling of inefficiency and awkwardness felt in many groupware systems compared to face-to-face work [20]. Therefore, we understand that developing mechanisms to maintain WA is a pivotal factor in making remote collaboration systems feel closer to the fluidity of face-to-face collaboration [13].

When working alone, a person's activities and WA only cover the workspace and the domain task. This changes in a collaborative setting where an additional *collaboration task* is added. Hence, a person's WA will involve the workspace, the domain task, and the collaboration task, which encompasses both communication and discussion of the domain task.




Fig. 2: Domain and collaboration tasks (from Gutwin and Greenberg [21])

Gutwin and Greenberg [21] suggest that in a groupware system, awareness information should be presented in a natural way, as people have grown accustomed to co-located environments, by making use of the following WA gathering mechanisms: *consequential communication*, *feedthrough* and *intentional communication*. Consequential communication revolves around nonverbal communication, consequent to a person’s activity within an environment. This includes body posture, movement, the position of arms and hands, and knowing where the other person is looking. Yet, it does not include intentional bodily communication (e.g., pointing). Artifacts around the workspace can also give off awareness information. Feedthrough is the perception of an artifact’s state during or after manipulation. This information can be gathered through senses like sight or hearing, such as the sound of crumpling a paper, which will allow a person to infer the state of that object. When the person manipulating the artifact and the artifact can be seen, feedthrough is coupled with consequential communication. Intentional communication encompasses verbal communication and gestures. Deictic gestures and other visual actions, such as nodding, are also a part of this mechanism.

Although these mechanisms happen naturally in a co-located environment, maintaining WA is challenging in a remote collaboration system with current technological limitations.

2.2 Awareness in shared workspace

Bill Buxton [6] identified the three types of spaces that need to be considered at the micro-level of communication: **person space** – the space from which nonverbal cues such as gaze, posture, and body language are picked up. It is also the space where the attention is directed to when another person talks; **task space** – the shared space where the work is presented, such as diagrams, presentations, or 3D models. This space can be altered, and all participants should notice differences; **reference space** – “the space within which the remote party

can use body language to reference the work.” This is the space where deictic gestures such as pointing or gesturing happen. Buxton further argued that “effective telepresence depends on quality sharing of both person and task space” [7]. Integrating body language and non-verbal cues within the task space was proven very important to the effectiveness of collaborative work. These allow for maintaining consequential communication and feedthrough, which, as discussed, were decisive for WA, especially in virtual collaboration.

Intending to integrate person and task space seamlessly, Ishii et al. [24] discussed three metaphors: the whiteboard, over-the-table, and glass window. Regarding the whiteboard metaphor, participants share a common task space. Reference space and orientation are shared, and intentional communication like pointing is facilitated. However, there is a clear distinction between person and task space, so collaborators must shift focus from the task space to read others’ body language and nonverbal cues, which can be straining and hinder communication efforts. Collaboard [27] uses this approach and displays the back-view of the user on top of the whiteboard, allowing for deictic gestures but hindering consequential communication since users are not presented face-to-face. With some common features, Zillner et al. [50] proposed the 3D-Board, which renders a front-facing 3D embodiment of the remote user behind the whiteboard and suggests a gain in efficiency and user awareness when collaborating in a face-to-face setting compared to a solution like Collaboard. Alternatively, Higuchi et al. [22] developed ImmerseBoard, where different configurations were studied: one where the remote user’s full body is shown at the side of the shared task space and deictic references are consistent through the elongation of the remote user’s arm; and another configuration where the shared task space is tilted. Both of these approaches bear some constraints, such as occlusions from the arm and hindrances to non-verbal communication. In the over-the-table metaphor, collaborators sit across the table from each other and the collaborative task at the table. Consequential communication is ensured since a user can see the other face-to-face, but the task space orientation is not common, as referred by Ishii et al. [24].

IllumiShare ([26]) can project on and share any surface as the task space. Participants are connected through a video call to support personal space and acquire consequential communication cues. This implementation separates person and task spaces but closely couples task and reference spaces. It was found that removing the projected surface was more disruptive than removing the video call. Sodhi et al. [45] developed BeThere, an AR solution that renders the remote

user’s hand in the local user’s workspace. This approach supports intentional communication and feedthrough, although non-verbal communication cues are absent due to only the person’s hands being shown.

Benko et al. [5] designed *MirageTable*, a curved projection-based AR system that can display real and virtual worlds on a tabletop with one user having an inverted perspective. Leithinger et al. [29] tackled physical telepresence with an approach where users can interact with and manipulate objects remotely in face-to-face and corner-to-corner settings. Iwai et al. [25] approach projects the arm of the remote user onto the local tabletop, applying transformations to seamlessly extend the remote user’s image in the monitor where a video chat is happening. In the three previous approaches, users are constrained, e.g., to the range of the depth camera or the table, and cannot roam around the room. Maintaining effective intentional communication can also be challenging due to objects occluding part of a person’s gestures.

Finally, the glass window metaphor is a naturally coordinated shared space since both users can write on their side of the glass while still seeing the other person’s work. There is support for consequential communication because users can see each other’s faces and bodies. The reference space is also respected and ensured with intentional communication, including deictic gestures. Gutwin et al. [21] identified the inversion of orientation as a downside, which can be solved by mirror-reversing one of the participants. This is called a *WYSIWIS* [47] approach, although in this case, it was mirrored. That was one feature of the design characteristics in *ClearBoard* [24], a shared drawing medium for pairwise collaboration. It was found that gaze awareness played a vital role in this solution. Despite this, it constrained users to a specific location. Similarly, Li et al. [30,31] designed *FacingBoard-2*, enabling remote collaboration between two users. It suggested that in a telepresence system, the reversal of graphical content improved awareness in a face-to-face setting. The study dove into techniques to facilitate intentional and consequential communication and studied how these can lessen awareness loss.

2.3 Awareness in multi-user meetings

Gross et al. [19] introduced *blue-c*, a system where the user is surrounded by three “see-through” projection screens that allow the user to be captured by cameras positioned behind these. A full-body 3D model of the user is then created from the different cameras’ output and rendered in the shared virtual environment. This

approach provides a good sense of presence and a realistic model of the person in the virtual world. However, it takes up much room and shows the same limitation as previous techniques [16,3] by lacking interaction with both real and virtual objects, which plays an important role in these settings [4].

Analogous to the *blue-c* system, Kurillo et al. [28] presented a system that renders full-scale 3D reconstructions of users in real-time in a VE, which allows interacting with virtual objects in a CAVE environment system. Besides requiring a sizable amount of hardware, it is not portable and very hard to implement in a remotely located meeting between groups. Maimome et al. [32] presented a telepresence system that allowed one tracked user to “look through a window” into a room. It conveyed a good sense of presence by displaying the remote room in 3D on two large screens at the correct viewpoint by the local user. This approach only allows for one user’s viewpoint to be tracked, so it would not work in a group-to-group setting, which poses a problem for multi-user-dependent collaborative tasks. More recently, in 2016, Orts-Escolano et al. [37] presented a system that supports both AR and VR telepresence, which allows for both the real-time 3D reconstruction of an entire space and for users to interact with real and virtual objects. The downsides of this approach are that it has very demanding hardware requirements and does not account for the problem of object occlusion. Scott et al. [18] presented *CocoVerse*, an immersive multi-user collaboration tool that allows creating and manipulating virtual 3D objects to improve learning experiences. This approach supports user interactions with other users and the environment, although it suffers from occlusions when participants stand in front of each other. Ardal et al. [1] uses a VR filmmaking tool, including editing, scene visualization, and discussion. They suggest that VR technologies are useful in collaborative settings, giving users a sense of awareness and co-presence while working on a shared task, including [35].

Other approaches to 3D teleconferencing and 3D virtual collaboration [39,49,48,40] were also studied but are limited to two simultaneous people.

2.4 Perception Manipulation

Human beings use their body to communicate, either inadvertently or purposely. The latter fits into intentional communication, where actions such as nodding or gestures like pointing fit in. The effectiveness of this communication is decisive when remote collaborators work on collaborative tasks.

Piumsombon et al. [41] found that always keeping communication cues in sight of the collaborators

improved collaborative task completion times and reduced mental effort. Azmandian et al. [2] used warping of the virtual world and the virtual body to align virtual objects with real-world objects. Results showed that a higher sense of presence was achieved when combining the two transformations, i.e., virtual world and body, was used. Fussel et al. [15] argued that collaborative tasks and communication performance were enhanced when participants had a more complete perception of the gestures the other collaborators were executing. Their results showed that when collaborators could pair verbal references with visual ones, performance in collaboration increased significantly, with pointing gestures being the most frequent. Sousa et al. [46] studied how different manipulations of participants and environment representations affected WA in face-to-face communication. It was argued that sharing the same perspective decreased mental effort. They also pointed out that opposing viewpoints were not ideal for complex analysis scenarios, with the first option being preferable. A related approach [33], discussed remote selection techniques. Hoppe et al. [23] introduced ShiSha, which allows multi-user collaboration by having users share the same perspective of an object or task space while maintaining the users' avatars spatially positioned without overlapping. Results from this work were similar to the previous one in that having intentional communication and sharing a common perspective enhanced task efficiency. However, the spatial inconsistency between where the user is looking from and where the user's avatar is might induce some confusion and break the feeling of presence in the virtual world.

Chénéchal et al. [8] developed Vishnu, a mixed-reality collaborative tool where a local user connected with an AR HMD can see the hands and arms of a remote user connected through VR. It was argued that although task completion times were not lower than with a desktop application with a pen tool to sketch, mapping references was easier since there was the availability of deictic references in 3D space and a shared perspective between users. Fidalgo et al. [12] also employed a shared perspective over the task space with manipulations to users' avatars to preserve deictic references without them being noticeable by the second user. It was argued that there was an improvement in WA and in the feeling of co-presence. Piumsomboon et al. [42] also showed that manipulating avatars can improve awareness, positively contribute to collaborative tasks, or even create additional interactions.

2.5 Discussion

This section reviewed various approaches representing the state of the art, focusing on multi-user collaboration technologies since our approach aims to improve this type of setting. The different approaches are used against different features of our work, such as support for multiple users and supported communication mechanisms. WA requires the three types of communication to be successfully maintained. Approaches in references [50, 1, 12, 24, 30, 28, 37] do this. Despite that, manipulation of 3D virtual objects is essential to many collaboration tasks, and only references [18, 1, 5, 7, 46, 12, 28, 37] support this. In terms of support for multiple users, there is a limited number of approaches: references [18, 1, 34, 23, 36].

Approaches that combine all of the different types of communication, through which it is possible to maintain WA better and support multi-party interactions, are scarce. To our knowledge, ShiSha [23] is the closest approach to doing it since avatar and perspective manipulations are also employed to provide a shared perspective in a multi-user setting. However, the authors do this through the disembodiment of the avatar, which hinders consequential communication since users may not be aware of others' body language cues.

3 SPARC Approach

In the context of the past work presented in Sec. 2, we introduce SPARC, a multi-user VR collaborative technique that enables users to work together from the same perspective while maintaining face-to-face communication, distorting the Avatar Representation as needed to reconcile face-to-face communication with a shared perspective (Fig. 3). We developed a Proof of Concept (POC) using Unity, incorporating Photon Engine's PUN multiplayer networking engine. It supports various VR platforms, including the Oculus Quest 2 used in our prototype, a.k.a. Meta Quest 2.

3.1 Improving Workspace Awareness

Following the three collaboration metaphors discussed, our solution uses an over-the-table setting, where users sit around a table with a collaborative task between them. In this approach, the task space, i.e., where the work is presented, is the table placed between the users, which will also correspond to the reference space where users can use gesturing and pointing to reference the work. Additionally, users can see each other from across the table, simplifying the capture of nonverbal cues in




Fig. 3: Avatar manipulation: [A] - User on the left points at a piece in his local workspace; [B] - User on the right sees this reference mapped to local own workspace

a person's space. This approach ensures consequential and intentional communication since users can see each other face-to-face, thus understanding where the other is looking, their position, and their actions.

SPARC also enables users to collaborate through a shared perspective over one or more objects in the workspace, allowing for differences in their actions to be noticeable to all participants as such feedthrough is ensured.

However, as identified by Ishii et al. [24], the over-the-table metaphor has a downside in that the perspective will be inverted for one of the users in a pairwise collaboration. To deal with this problem, we will provide a shared perspective for all users. This not only allows for a common understanding of the workspace but also removes the problem of the occlusion of gestures by the objects in the workspace. To preserve the meaning of gestures, transformations are applied to map the user's intended referencing position to the others' workspace, i.e., if the user points to a piece on the right of their workspace, the other users will see the avatar's arm stretched and pointing to the right of their local workspace. This is an imperative part of any collaborative task involving referencing specific workspace parts through gestures.

3.2 Perspective-sharing: Environment Modifications

To obtain a common perspective over the workspace, manipulations are done to the local environment of each user. These are based on the seat that the user takes around the table. The workspace is divided into eight increments of 45 degrees, starting from the Assembler position, i.e., the right of the table in a top view. In Fig. 4, there is an example. In [A], we see user A's POV, which has the workspace rotated by 90 degrees counter clockwise. In [C], representing user B's POV, their workspace does not require rotation since they are at position 0, i.e., right of the table. User C will need a rotation of 270 degrees since they are at position 7 in




Fig. 4: Transformation applied to the avatar's arm and hand position: [A] - User A points at a point in his workspace, [B] - User B receives the information of where user A pointed and maps it to his own workspace, [C] - User A's opposing arm is rendered as a spline and his hand points at the mapped point in User B's workspace.

the table, while B is in position 1 (0 degrees) and A is in position 3 (90 degrees). In a setting with eight users, the space between User A and User B would have another user with an increment of 45 degrees and a user between User C and A with an increment of 315 degrees.

3.3 Perspective-sharing: Avatar Modifications

In our POC, there are two modes of interacting and referencing the workspace: by direct interaction, using their virtual hands, or indirect interaction, using their virtual rays or pointers (see Fig.5).

Due to the locally applied rotation to the user's workspace, the meaning of the deictic gestures and any referencing of the workspace is lost. To counter this, our approach maps the references made by each user in their workspace to the local user's workspace. This is done in three main steps that are shown in Fig. 4: [A] - User A points at a point in their local workspace with their right hand; [B] - User B receives the point where user A's right hand is and maps it to their workspace (by rotating it by the difference in rotation between the two users, i.e., 90°) [C] - User B renders user A's left hand to the mapped point with a line connecting to it.

In our implementation, the manipulation of the avatars does not always happen. It will only occur if the user references something in the workspace using either of the interaction modes. The trigger will happen if the hand enters the workspace or the ray points at an object inside the workspace. This trigger happens for each hand individually.

Each user is assigned an angle, and this is used to calculate others' deictic references. The information regarding each user's hand position is propagated and then rotated around the center point, i.e., the center of the table, by the difference in degrees between the




Fig. 5: Different conditions in the same POV: [A] and [B] represent the Veridical condition. [C] and [D] represent SPARC

local user (LU) and the remote user (RU). To connect the RU’s avatar to these new calculated references, we used Splines that are rendered in real-time in the LU’s environment coming from the RU’s arm to his hand positioned at the calculated reference, as can be seen in Fig.3, where the angle difference will be 180° . Notice that there was a mirroring of the RU. This is done to avoid the arms crossing over one another when both hands are being used to reference something.

4 Evaluation

We designed and conducted a user study to assess the effects of the SPARC on task performance, workspace awareness, and sense of co-presence in the VE. Our POC demonstrated technical support for up to eight users at a time. Nevertheless, for the sake of simplicity, we chose to test with trios only. Thus, any effect involving a different number of co-workers is out of the scope of this assessment. With trios, we address a scenario challenging the previous works with a shared perspective.

We tested two conditions:

- **Condition V:** Veridical collaboration. Participants stood around a virtual table and collaborated with different individual perspectives of the task, as it would be in real-life interactions.

- **Condition S:** Collaboration under SPARC. Participants stood around a virtual table with a shared perspective and avatar manipulations active.

4.1 Task

We chose a 3D assembly task represented by the Bedlam Cube [9]. It is a 3D puzzle with thirteen distinct pieces designed to fit together in a $4 \times 4 \times 4$ frame. With over 19,000 combinations, the assembler can’t guess which piece fits each position. In our setting, each participant in a trio is assigned one of three roles: Assembler, Instructor 1, or Instructor 2. The assembler is the one who can manipulate objects. The two instructors have access to the instructions, i.e., the solution for the next piece, but cannot manipulate the pieces. The instructors see the outline of a piece correctly placed inside the cube and must indicate to the assembler which piece and where it should go. In such a scenario, the two instructors have to communicate with each other and with the assembler to share their knowledge, which must be understood by the assembler, who manipulates the pieces, one at a time, until the task is completed with the assembly of the full cube.

An example of the puzzle in the POV of an instructor is depicted in Fig. 5D, where the yellow outline inside the empty cube represents the piece and its orientation.

A grid-snapping system is employed to aid in the positioning of the pieces, and when a piece is dropped or rotated, its pose will be corrected to this grid - this removes issues regarding overly precise positioning.

Users are constrained to life-like perspectives in the veridical condition (V). The puzzle is directed towards the assembler, and the instructors have a side view of the puzzle. The instructor on the left-hand side of the assembler will see the puzzle from the left of the puzzle. A comparison between the two conditions can be seen in Fig. 5, where the POV of Instructor 1 is seen under the two conditions.

4.2 Procedure

All experiments followed the same procedure. Participants began by completing a user profile and a consent form. Next, they were provided with an explanation of how to use the HMD and interact in the POC. The task was also explained at this point, and participants decided who would be assigned to each role, with the task and roles further elaborated on as needed. After adjusting their HMD, participants familiarized themselves with their respective roles and the different interactions available in the VE. In particular, the assembler was instructed on moving and rotating the pieces using direct and indirect interaction modes.

The design is within subjects. The 18 participants are grouped into 6 trios, and each trio performs the task once in condition V and once in condition S. The order between conditions is counterbalanced: the first three groups started in condition S, followed by condition V, and the remaining three groups did the inverse.

The participants began in one of the conditions and were tasked with completing one puzzle until all the pieces were correctly placed. Following this, there was a short break during which participants completed a questionnaire regarding the collaborative task. The pieces were then jumbled, and the task was repeated under the other condition, and another questionnaire was completed afterwards.

4.3 Measurements

The measurements we obtained were divided by type into two groups: task performance and user preference. Regarding performance, we collected the following:

1. **Total completion time:** End time minus initial time, in seconds.
2. **Errors per piece:** Counted when a piece is released at a wrong position within the cube (it returns to its place on the table).

3. **Number of attempts:** Counted when a piece is grabbed and released outside the cube.
4. **Eye-contact time:** Time spent looking at the other players. Computed when a raycast from the center point of the avatar's head intercepts another avatar's head.

These other metrics are derived from the measures above:

1. **Total errors:** The sum of the errors per piece.
2. **Total moves:** The sum of errors and attempts. Note that the successful moves are not accounted for as they are forcefully the same for every completed puzzle, i.e., 13.

To evaluate user preference and satisfaction, we applied a questionnaire that compiled questions evaluating various aspects of a collaborative task in a VE: the perceived workload of the task, the sense of co-presence felt, and user awareness. The questionnaire was mostly composed of statements evaluated on a 6-point Likert scale. At the end of the questionnaire, the users could also give their thoughts on the task and report any bugs they experienced.

4.4 Participants

The subject group comprised 18 participants, with 8 females and 10 males. Their ages ranged from 20 to 39, with an average age of approximately 24 years ($M = 24$, $SD = 4.14$). All participants had attained a university education.

Regarding remote collaboration technology usage, eight individuals reported using videoconference platforms, such as Skype, Zoom, or Microsoft Teams, at least once a day. Six participants used these platforms at least once a week, while four reported rare usage. Concerning VR environments, the data indicated that the majority of participants (15 out of 18) had never used VR environments, and the remaining three participants reported infrequent usage of these environments.

5 Results

Fig. 6 shows the raw data collected from the experiment. In a preliminary analysis, we looked for tendencies and eventual outliers. Remember that groups 1-3 performed condition V first, and groups 4-5 started with condition S. Two facts are strikingly noticeable: (1) green bars (condition V) tend to be higher than orange ones (condition S) for groups 1 to 3, and the trend inverts for the remaining groups; (2) group 6 is the only one with an

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

	(Mean \pm SD)		
	Total Time	Total Errors	Total Moves
SPARC	681 \pm 192	4.2 \pm 2.3	64 \pm 26
Veridical	1015 \pm 455	7.8 \pm 5.6	96 \pm 34
Total	848 \pm 373	6 \pm 4.5	80 \pm 33

inverted trend in the three measures. These facts suggest an order effect. On the one hand, V-first presents higher times, errors, and moves for V than S. On the other hand, S-first has more mixed results, with fairly lower S bars than groups 1-3, which did not improve much in condition V. Our interpretation is that V is harder for everyone but becomes easier after some experience with S. The opposite is not true. Groups performing S first perform well and keep performing well in V, with only slight improvement. Concerning group 6, it presented a pattern diverse enough to be excluded from the study due to its profile.

A third factor is also noticeable. Group 1 presented much higher times and moves than the average of the other groups. Nevertheless, we identified that this group spent all that additional time and moves by playing with a single piece. However, we did not remove that piece from the analysis because we did not record individual times per piece.

For further analysis, we kept the data from 15 participants, i.e., five groups and ten trials. Overall statistics are in Table 1.

We detail the results below, grouped into four different categories. It is worth noticing that with five groups, the statistical power of our sample is not strong. Yet, as the results will show, there are statistically significant findings, and non-significant data also has interesting trends.

5.1 User preferences

The applied questionnaires and associated results are summarized in Fig. 7. We employed the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test to check for the significance of the differences. Most of them showed no statistical significance. This hints that the tested conditions weakly affect co-presence, attentional allocation, and perceived message understanding.

In terms of Task Load, the test reported a significant increase in mental demand in the Veridical condition ("How mentally demanding was the task?"), where $Z = -2.486$, $p = .013$.

5.2 Task performance: completion time

After running the Shapiro-Wilk test, we could assume a normal distribution for the time data. We then used a paired T-test and observed that there was no statistically significant difference in the total times with results $t(6) = -1.83$, $p = .14$ between SPARC ($M = 681$, $SD = 192$) and the Veridical approach ($M = 1015$, $SD = 455$). Nevertheless, the average of times suggests an advantage for SPARC in terms of time efficiency. Fig. 8a illustrates the magnitude of this potential advantage.

5.3 Task performance: total errors

After a Shapiro-Wilk test, the error distribution could also be assumed normal. The mean results are our approach ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 2.38$) and veridical ($M = 7.80$, $SD = 5.67$). Again, we performed a Paired T-Test ($t(6) = -1.28$, $p = .26$), which also resulted in no statistical significance for the difference of the means. See also Fig. 8b.

5.4 Task performance: movement economy

We define movement economy as the number of times pieces were picked up until the puzzle's completion. Similar to the previous two variables, we discovered through the Shapiro-Wilk test that our data was normally distributed. The results for the total errors between our approach ($M = 64.4$, $SD = 26.5$) and veridical ($M = 96.2$, $SD = 34.3$) are depicted in Fig. 8c. We performed the Paired T-Test and, this time, obtained statistical significance with $t(6) = -3.17$, $p = .033$.

5.5 Additional observations

We observed that in the Veridical condition, users with the role of instructor tended to move around the table and reposition themselves beside the assembler, possibly to have a better view of the pieces or the puzzle. About the observed communication at the moments of discovering which piece was going on the cube, users mostly verbalized references to their pointers or hand (e.g. "this piece"). We also observed that explaining rotations was harder under SPARC for some users. In general, some interactions were also limited because the other user's arms were in the way of the user's workspace.

6 Discussion

The main research questions we approached with this work are:




Fig. 6: Raw data collected from the experiment depicting the three measures variation by trios for the two conditions. The lower, the better. Arrows indicate the direction of the difference for each group: red when veridical is higher and blue when SPARC is higher.

- Q1. Task Performance:** Does using a common perspective with manipulations to the avatars affect task performance in a collaborative task?
- Q2. Workspace Awareness and Co-presence:** Does using a common perspective with manipulations to the avatars affect workspace awareness and the sense of co-presence?

To evaluate **Q1**, we analyzed three main characteristics regarding task performance: the total time spent, the number of errors made, and the number of movements required to achieve the goal. Despite the novelty and non-naturalness of our approach, the means point to SPARC as more efficient than veridic in time and error performance. However, the results show the mean differences are non-significant. This is probably due to the small sample size.

The third performance measure variable was movement economy. SPARC performed significantly better than veridic in the moves count. This means that sharing the perspective causes users to understand better how a piece is rotated or which piece needs to be picked up, thus resulting in fewer trial-and-error movements. There is enough evidence that a shared perspective with stretched references outperforms a veridic condition for collaborating with more than two users in VR. The low statistical significance for some metrics is explained by our small sample size to detect significant differences. Yet, some are significant, and all of them indicate a trend in favor of SPARC.

Our User Preference results reported a significant increase in how mentally demanding the task was in V compared to S . Such may happen because when employing a shared perspective, users have a common orientation of the workspace, where commands such as left, up, or back are the same for all users, facilitating the giving and receiving of instructions, which causes less mental effort.

This can also be connected to an effect reported in the observations, where we recognized a tendency for instructors in V to work from the shoulder of the assembler to get a better view of the workspace or the piece's rotation. From previous works, we know that this shift in position, effectively putting the participants in a whiteboard metaphor setting, results in users shifting focus between person and task spaces that are now distinctively separated. This could explain the reported result since collaborators must move to both understand and be understood, especially when using intentional communication mechanisms such as gestures. Consequential communication is also obstructed when working with this displacement, considering that seeing the other user's body or arms position is more demanding when standing over their shoulder.

We can now connect these results to **Q2**. Our results showed no statistical significance regarding the sense of co-presence, workspace awareness (WA), and the user's perception of others. However, one could argue that S potentially increased the WA when compared to V since it allowed users to remain in a face-to-face setting while maintaining the use of intentional communication (e.g., deictic gestures), consequential awareness (e.g., body language) and feedthrough (e.g., piece's rotation after being moved by the assembler). This would be supported by the mental load result since users are not required to shift focus between person and task spaces, and previous studies show that these communication forms are the three basic mechanisms through which WA is maintained [17].

Although more research is needed to refine the technique and answer all questions with stronger significance, our findings contribute to understanding the effects of perspective and avatar manipulations on collaboration in a VE, emphasizing the importance of shared perspectives for improved communication and less mental demand.

Statements	Condition	Median (IQR)
1. Co-Presence		
1.1 I felt present in the virtual environment	V	6 (1)
	A	5 (1)
1.2 I felt that my partners were present in the virtual environment	V	5.5 (1)
	A	5 (0.75)
1.3 I felt that my presence was evident to my partners	V	5 (1.75)
	A	5 (1)
2. Attentional Allocation		
2.1 I remained focused on my partners throughout our interaction	V	5 (1)
	A	5 (1.75)
2.2 I remained focused on the workspace throughout our interaction	V	5.5 (1)
	A	5.5 (1)
2.3 I felt that my partners could remain focused on me throughout our interaction	V	5 (0.75)
	A	5 (1.75)
2.4 I felt that I remained more focused on one person over the other	V	4.5 (3)
	A	3 (4)
3. Perceived Message Understanding		
3.1 I could understand what each partner was doing	V	5 (1)
	A	5 (1)
3.2 I could understand the changes happening in the workspace	V	6 (1.75)
	A	6 (0.75)
3.3 I understood what my partners could see	V	5 (2)
	A	5 (2.75)
3.4 I understood what my partners could do	V	5.5 (1)
	A	6 (1)
3.5 I understood where my partners could make changes	V	6 (1)
	A	6 (1)
3.6 I could understand what my partners needed me to do next	V	5.5 (1)
	A	6 (1)
3.7 I understood what pieces were being used at each moment	V	5.5 (1)
	A	6 (1)
4. Task load		
4.1 How mentally demanding was the task? *	V	4 (1.75)
	A	3 (1)
4.2 How hurried or rushed was the pace of the task?	V	4 (1)
	A	3 (1.75)
4.3 How hard did you have to work to accomplish your level of performance?	V	4 (1)
	A	4 (2)
4.4 How insecure, discouraged, irritated, stressed, and annoyed were you?	V	2 (2)
	A	2 (1)

■ Strongly disagree/Very low
■
■
■
■
■ Strongly agree/Very high

Fig. 7: Results from the user preferences questionnaire for both our approach(A) and Veridical(V) conditions. * indicates statistical significance.

7 Conclusions and future work

Through Virtual Reality, we can do more than copy reality; we can enhance it. SPARC takes advantage of this by using environment and avatar manipulations to tackle workspace occlusions in shared perspective collaborative interactions. It features a common perspective while preserving the meaning of deictic references. Users can then maintain a common understanding of the task space and how others interact with it. Using a round-table setting, all users can see each other, which means they can understand and be understood by others relative to their intentions and nonverbal cues, and they do this without shifting their attention between task and person spaces.

The combination of these features and the accommodation of an unlimited number of users in a shared

perspective is unique in the literature. Reports from our user study concluded that collaborating under a shared perspective meant lower mental demand than in the Veridical condition. It could be argued that Workspace Awareness was improved under SPARC by creating a common task, reference, and personal space without requiring users to shift focus between them, which would be supported by the lower mental demand result. Moreover, a mix of significant and non-significant quantitative results indicate that SPARC helps improve an assembly task's performance.

Our work paves the way for future research that could build upon this. We aim to conduct a bigger user study, with more simultaneous users in the VE where we would explore the effects of different numbers of users. Scaling to more users would also create new challenges, such as the overload of arms stretching in the workspace




Fig. 8: Summary of the experimental data analysis comparing SPARC (S) and Veridical (V) conditions.

and the difficulty of understanding where each user is by where their voice originates. Alternative means to stretch the arms and other references are under study. Additionally, spatial audio and other natural features such as eye-gaze could be included to improve workspace awareness and experimental data collection.

Virtual Reality technologies enable us to achieve things beyond reality, potentially positioning this technology as a better alternative to real-life meetings than videoconference tools, allowing richer and more accurate communication.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) Grants UIDB/50021/2020 (DOI:10.54499/UIDB/50021/2020) and 2022.09212.PTDC This paper was written under the auspices of the UNESCO Chair on AI&XR.

References

1. Ardal, D., Alexandersson, S., Lempert, M., Abelho Pereira, A.T.: A collaborative previsualization tool for filmmaking in virtual reality. In: European Conference on Visual Media Production, CVMP '19. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2019). DOI 10.1145/3359998.3369404. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3359998.3369404>
2. Azmandian, M., Hancock, M., Benko, H., Ofek, E., Wilson, A.D.: Haptic retargeting: Dynamic repurposing of passive haptics for enhanced virtual reality experiences. In: Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '16, p. 1968–1979. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2016). DOI 10.1145/2858036.2858226. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858226>
3. Baker, H., Tanguay, D., Sobel, I., Gelb, D., Goss, M.E., Culbertson, W.B., Malzbender, T.: The coliseum immersive teleconferencing system. In: Proc. International Workshop on Immersive Telepresence, vol. 6. Citeseer (2002)
4. Baker, H.H., Bhatti, N., Tanguay, D., Sobel, I., Gelb, D., Goss, M.E., Culbertson, W.B., Malzbender, T.: Understanding performance in coliseum, an immersive videoconferencing system. *ACM Trans. Multimedia Comput. Commun. Appl.* **1**(2), 190–210 (2005). DOI 10.1145/1062253.1062258. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1062253.1062258>
5. Benko, H., Jota, R., Wilson, A.: Miragetable: Freehand interaction on a projected augmented reality tabletop. In: Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '12, p. 199–208. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2012). DOI 10.1145/2207676.2207704. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2207676.2207704>
6. Buxton, B.: *Mediaspace – MeaningSpace – Meetingspace*, pp. 217–231. Springer London, London (2009)
7. Buxton, W.: Telepresence: Integrating shared task and person spaces. In: Proceedings of graphics interface, vol. 92, pp. 123–129. Citeseer (1992)
8. Chenechal, M.L., Duval, T., Gouranton, V., Royan, J., Arnaldi, B.: Vishnu: virtual immersive support for helping users an interaction paradigm for collaborative remote guiding in mixed reality. In: 2016 IEEE Third VR International Workshop on Collaborative Virtual Environments (3DCVE), pp. 9–12 (2016)
9. Chlond, M.J.: Box-packing puzzles. *INFORMS Transactions on Education* **5**(3), 70–72 (2005)
10. Feick, M., Mok, T., Tang, A., Oehlberg, L., Sharlin, E.: Perspective on and Re-Orientation of Physical Proxies in Object-Focused Remote Collaboration, p. 1–13. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2018)
11. Feuchtner, T., Müller, J.: Ownership: Facilitating overhead interaction in virtual reality with an ownership-preserving hand space shift. In: Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology, UIST '18, p. 31–43. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2018). DOI 10.1145/3242587.3242594. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3242587.3242594>

12. Fidalgo, C.G., Sousa, M., Mendes, D., Anjos, R.D., Medeiros, D., Singh, K., Jorge, J.: Magic: Manipulating avatars and gestures to improve remote collaboration. In: 2023 IEEE Conference Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces (VR), pp. 438–448. IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA (2023). DOI 10.1109/VR55154.2023.00059
13. Fidalgo, C.G., Yan, Y., Cho, H., Sousa, M., Lindlbauer, D., Jorge, J.: A survey on remote assistance and training in mixed reality environments. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* **29**(5), 2291–2303 (2023). DOI 10.1109/TVCG.2023.3247081
14. Frécon, E., Nöu, A.A.: Building distributed virtual environments to support collaborative work. In: Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology, VRST '98, p. 105–113. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (1998)
15. Fussell, S.R., Setlock, L.D., Yang, J., Ou, J., Mauer, E., Kramer, A.D.: Gestures over video streams to support remote collaboration on physical tasks. *Human-Computer Interaction* **19**(3), 273–309 (2004)
16. Gibbs, S.J., Arapis, C., Breiteneder, C.J.: Teleport-towards immersive copresence. *Multimedia Systems* **7**(3), 214–221 (1999)
17. Greenberg, S., Gutwin, C., Cockburn, A.: Awareness through fisheye views in relaxed-wysiwiw groupware. In: Graphics interface, vol. 96, pp. 28–38. Citeseer (1996)
18. Greenwald, S.W., Corning, W., Maes, P.: Multi-user framework for collaboration and co-creation in virtual reality. 12th International Conference on Computer Supported Collaborative Learning (2017)
19. Gross, M., Würmlin, S., Naef, M., Lamboray, E., Spagno, C., Kunz, A., Koller-Meier, E., Svoboda, T., Van Gool, L., Lang, S., Strehlke, K., Moere, A.V., Staadt, O.: Blue-c: A spatially immersive display and 3d video portal for telepresence. *ACM Trans. Graph.* **22**(3), 819–827 (2003). DOI 10.1145/882262.882350. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/882262.882350>
20. Gutwin, C., Greenberg, S.: Workspace awareness for groupware. In: Conference Companion on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '96, p. 208–209. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (1996). DOI 10.1145/257089.257284. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/257089.257284>
21. Gutwin, C., Greenberg, S.: A descriptive framework of workspace awareness for real-time groupware. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)* **11**(3), 411–446 (2002)
22. Higuchi, K., Chen, Y., Chou, P.A., Zhang, Z., Liu, Z.: Immerseboard: Immersive telepresence experience using a digital whiteboard. In: Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '15, p. 2383–2392. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2015). DOI 10.1145/2702123.2702160. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702160>
23. Hoppe, A.H., van de Camp, F., Stiefelhagen, R.: Shisha: Enabling shared perspective with face-to-face collaboration using redirected avatars in virtual reality. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* **4**(CSCW3) (2021). DOI 10.1145/3432950. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3432950>
24. Ishii, H., Kobayashi, M.: Clearboard: A seamless medium for shared drawing and conversation with eye contact. In: Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '92, p. 525–532. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (1992). DOI 10.1145/142750.142977. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/142750.142977>
25. Iwai, D., Matsukage, R., Aoyama, S., Kikukawa, T., Sato, K.: Geometrically consistent projection-based tabletop sharing for remote collaboration. *IEEE Access* **6**, 6293–6302 (2018). DOI 10.1109/ACCESS.2017.2781699
26. Junuzovic, S., Inkpen, K., Blank, T., Gupta, A.: Illumishare: Sharing any surface. In: Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '12, p. 1919–1928. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2012). DOI 10.1145/2207676.2208333. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2207676.2208333>
27. Kunz, A., Nescher, T., Kuchler, M.: Collaboard: A novel interactive electronic whiteboard for remote collaboration with people on content. In: 2010 International Conference on Cyberworlds, pp. 430–437 (2010). DOI 10.1109/CW.2010.17
28. Kurillo, G., Bajcsy, R., Nahrsted, K., Kreylos, O.: Immersive 3d environment for remote collaboration and training of physical activities. In: 2008 IEEE Virtual Reality Conference, pp. 269–270 (2008). DOI 10.1109/VR.2008.4480795
29. Leithinger, D., Follmer, S., Olwal, A., Ishii, H.: Physical telepresence: Shape capture and display for embodied, computer-mediated remote collaboration. In: Proceedings of the 27th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology, UIST '14, p. 461–470. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2014). DOI 10.1145/2642918.2647377. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2642918.2647377>
30. Li, J., Greenberg, S., Sharlin, E.: A two-sided collaborative transparent display supporting workspace awareness. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* **101**, 23–44 (2017). DOI <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2017.01.003>
31. Li, J., Greenberg, S., Sharlin, E., Jorge, J.: Interactive two-sided transparent displays: Designing for collaboration. In: Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Designing Interactive Systems, DIS '14, p. 395–404. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2014). DOI 10.1145/2598510.2598518. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2598510.2598518>
32. Maimone, A., Fuchs, H.: A first look at a telepresence system with room-sized real-time 3d capture and life-sized tracked display wall. *Proceedings of ICAT 2011*, to appear pp. 4–9 (2011)
33. Mendes, D., Medeiros, D., Cordeiro, E., Sousa, M., Ferreira, A., Jorge, J.: Precious! out-of-reach selection using iterative refinement in vr. In: 2017 IEEE Symposium on 3D User Interfaces (3DUI), pp. 237–238 (2017). DOI 10.1109/3DUI.2017.7893359
34. Nguyen, V.A., Zhao, S., Vu, T.D., Jones, D.L., Do, M.N.: Spatialized audio multiparty teleconferencing with commodity miniature microphone array. In: Proceedings of the 21st ACM International Conference on Multimedia, MM '13, p. 553–556. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2013). DOI 10.1145/2502081.2502146. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2502081.2502146>
35. Noronha, H., Campos, P., Jorge, J., Araújo, B., Soares, L., Raposo, A.: Designing a mobile collaborative system for navigating and reviewing oil industry cad models. In: Proceedings of NordiCHI, vol. 2012 (2012)
36. Okada, K.I., Maeda, F., Ichikawaa, Y., Matsushita, Y.: Multiparty videoconferencing at virtual social distance: Majic design. In: Proceedings of the 1994 ACM Conference

- on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, CSCW '94, p. 385–393. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (1994). DOI 10.1145/192844.193054. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/192844.193054>
37. Orts-Escolano, S., Rhemann, C., Fanello, S., Chang, W., Kowdle, A., Degtyarev, Y., Kim, D., Davidson, P.L., Khamis, S., Dou, M., Tankovich, V., Loop, C., Cai, Q., Chou, P.A., Mennicken, S., Valentin, J., Pradeep, V., Wang, S., Kang, S.B., Kohli, P., Lutchyn, Y., Keskin, C., Izadi, S.: Holoportation: Virtual 3d teleportation in real-time. In: Proceedings of the 29th Annual Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology, UIST '16, p. 741–754. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2016). DOI 10.1145/2984511.2984517. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2984511.2984517>
 38. Otto, O., Roberts, D., Wolff, R.: A review on effective closely-coupled collaboration using immersive cve's. In: Proceedings of the 2006 ACM International Conference on Virtual Reality Continuum and Its Applications, VRCIA '06, p. 145–154. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2006)
 39. Pejsa, T., Kantor, J., Benko, H., Ofek, E., Wilson, A.: Room2room: Enabling life-size telepresence in a projected augmented reality environment. In: Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing, CSCW '16, p. 1716–1725. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2016). DOI 10.1145/2818048.2819965. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2818048.2819965>
 40. Piumsomboon, T., Lee, G.A., Billinghamurst, M.: Snow dome: A multi-scale interaction in mixed reality remote collaboration. In: Extended Abstracts of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI EA '18, p. 1–4. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2018). DOI 10.1145/3170427.3186495. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3170427.3186495>
 41. Piumsomboon, T., Lee, G.A., Hart, J.D., Ens, B., Lindeman, R.W., Thomas, B.H., Billinghamurst, M.: Mini-Me: An Adaptive Avatar for Mixed Reality Remote Collaboration, p. 1–13. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2018). URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173620>
 42. Piumsomboon, T., Lee, Y., Lee, G., Billinghamurst, M.: Covar: A collaborative virtual and augmented reality system for remote collaboration. In: SIGGRAPH Asia 2017 Emerging Technologies, SA '17. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2017). DOI 10.1145/3132818.3132822. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3132818.3132822>
 43. Roberts, D., Wolff, R., Otto, O., Steed, A.: Constructing a gazebo: Supporting teamwork in a tightly coupled, distributed task in virtual reality. *Presence* **12**(6), 644–657 (2003)
 44. Slater, M., Sanchez-Vives, M.V.: Enhancing our lives with immersive virtual reality. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI* **3**, 74 (2016). DOI 10.3389/frobt.2016.00074
 45. Sodhi, R.S., Jones, B.R., Forsyth, D., Bailey, B.P., Maciocci, G.: Bethere: 3d mobile collaboration with spatial input. In: Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '13, p. 179–188. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2013). DOI 10.1145/2470654.2470679. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2470654.2470679>
 46. Sousa, M., Mendes, D., Anjos, R.K.d., Lopes, D.S.o., Jorge, J.: Negative space: Workspace awareness in 3d face-to-face remote collaboration. In: The 17th International Conference on Virtual-Reality Continuum and Its Applications in Industry, VRCIAI '19. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2019). DOI 10.1145/3359997.3365744. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3359997.3365744>
 47. Stefik, M., Bobrow, D.G., Foster, G., Lanning, S., Tatar, D.: Wysiwis revised: Early experiences with multiuser interfaces. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* **5**(2), 147–167 (1987). DOI 10.1145/27636.28056. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/27636.28056>
 48. Teo, T., F. Hayati, A., A. Lee, G., Billinghamurst, M., Adcock, M.: A technique for mixed reality remote collaboration using 360 panoramas in 3d reconstructed scenes. In: 25th ACM Symposium on Virtual Reality Software and Technology, VRST '19. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2019). DOI 10.1145/3359996.3364238. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3359996.3364238>
 49. Towles, H., chao Chen, W., Yang, R., uok Kum, S., Kelshikar, H.F.N., Mulligan, J., Daniilidis, K., Fuchs, H., Hill, C.C., Mulligan, N.K.J., Holden, L., Zeleznik, B., Sadagic, A., Lanier, J.: 3d tele-collaboration over internet2. In: International Workshop on Immersive Telepresence, Juan Les Pins (2002)
 50. Zillner, J., Rhemann, C., Izadi, S., Haller, M.: 3d-board: A whole-body remote collaborative whiteboard. In: Proceedings of the 27th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology, UIST '14, p. 471–479. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2014). DOI 10.1145/2642918.2647393. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2642918.2647393>