

A FRAMEWORK FOR ELASTIC PRESENTATION SPACE

by

Marianne Sheelagh Therese Carpendale

B.Sc. Simon Fraser University 1992

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in the School
of
Computing Science

© Marianne Sheelagh Therese Carpendale 1999
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
March 1999

All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without the permission of the author.

APPROVAL

Name: Marianne Sheelagh Therese Carpendale
Degree: Doctor of Philosophy
Title of thesis: A Framework for Elastic Presentation Space

Examining Committee: Dr. Hassan Aït-Kaci
Chair

Dr. F. David Fracchia, Co-Senior Supervisor

Dr. Thomas Shermer, Co-Senior Supervisor

Dr. Art Liestman, Supervisor

Dr. John Dill, SFU Examiner

Dr. Thomas Strothotte, External Examiner,
Professor of Computer Science,
University of Magdeberg, Germany

Date Approved: _____

Abstract

Since the advent of video display terminals as the primary interface to the computer, how to make the best use of the available screen space has been a fundamental issue in user interface design. The necessity for effective solutions to this problem is intensifying as the ability to produce visual data in greater volumes continues to outstrip the rate at which display technology is developing. Most research in this area has concentrated on specific applications, exploiting their underlying information structure to obtain reasonable displays. In this work we take a different approach, examining the display problem independent of the application.

In particular, we divide the display problem into two components: representation and presentation. Representation is the act of creating a basic image that corresponds to the information such as creating a drawing of a graph. Presentation is the act of displaying this image, emphasizing and organizing areas of interest. For example, a map of Vancouver may be presented with one's route to work magnified to reveal street names. Since representation is inherently dependent on the information, this part of the problem is not considered. Instead we concentrate on presentation and assume the existence of a two-dimensional representation.

Our research into the presentation problem has led to the development of a framework that describes a presentation space in which the adjustments and reorganizations are elastic in the sense that reverting to previous presentations is facilitated. Within this framework the approach is to map the representation onto a surface in three dimensions and use perspective projection to create the final display. Varying the surface provides control for magnification and organization of representation details. Use of the third dimension provides the possibility of making these presentation adjustments comprehensible. Our framework encompasses previous techniques and indicates a broad range of new ones.

Existing presentation methods create displays that vary considerably visually and algorithmically. Our framework provides a way of relating seemingly distinct methods, facilitating the inclusion of more than one presentation method in a single interface. Furthermore, it supports extrapolation between the presentation methods it describes. Of particular interest are the presentation possibilities that exist in the ranges between distortion presentations and magnified insets, distortion presentations and a full-zooming environment, and distortion presentations and those that support the repositioning of separate views.

Our elastic presentation space framework describes existing presentation methods, identifies new presentation variations, and provides methods for combining them. This removes some of the current difficulty around making a presentation choice, and allows a designer of new information visualizations to include a combination of presentation methods that best suit the needs of their application's information and tasks.

To Ian and Ailidh

“We could view the trees as cracks in the sky, like cracks in glasses. We could adopt that change of perspective. The space that exists around you could be solid - and you could be only a hollow in the middle of that solid space”

— *Chögyam Trungpa Rinpoche, DHARMA ART, 1996*

Acknowledgments

I imagine that every Ph.D. is a process of intellectual development that involves a whole community of people. It is difficult to know how the significance of ongoing intellectual exchange can be adequately acknowledged. This intellectual community that I have been privileged to take part in has many facets.

First there is my committee. I would like to thank Dave Fracchia, Tom Shermer and Art Liestman who at the onset of this degree were all my senior supervisors. I would like to thank Art Liestman for his appreciation of individuality and his dependability. I would like to thank Tom Shermer for his insight and his rigor. I especially would like to thank Dave Fracchia for his enthusiasm and perseverance. I would like to thank my internal examiner, John Dill, for keeping sufficient light on the practical. I would also like to thank my external examiner, Thomas Strothotte, for his interest in my research which made even the actual defense enjoyable.

Beyond my committee but within the School of Computing Science there are several members of the faculty, Joe Peters, Stella Atkins, Veronica Dahl, Fred Popowich and Lou Hafer who have been particularly supportive in unraveling various obstacles at different points in this process. Though she is no longer with us, it was Maggie Benston who started me along this path with an introduction to academic research while I was still an undergraduate. I cannot say enough about my fellow graduate students Dave Cowperthwaite, Ann Grbavec, Maria Lantin, Johanna van der Heyden, Daryl Hepting, Andrew Walenstien, Andrew Fall, Peggy Storey, Lyn Bartram, Graham Finlayson, Eric Guevremont, Dave Peters and Dave Bremner. It is this community that I will probably miss the most.

As this work has drawn from many fields, I have been lucky to discover interested people within the other disciplines who have freely given their time in discussion and given many helpful and insightful suggestions. These people include Jeremy Carpendale (Developmental Psychology), Suzanne de Castell (Education), Katherine Alexander (Education), Brian Fisher (Cognitive Science), Ginny Evans (English), Ellen Balka (Communications), Chris Groeneboer (Tele-learning),

Tom Poiker (Geography), Ken Lertzman (Resource Management) and Lee Gass (Biology).

While I take responsibility for the development of the ideas in this framework for elastic presentation space (EPS), it has been an ongoing process with significant research spin-offs and considerable involvement from others. In this regard the most important acknowledgment I wish to make is to David Cowperthwaite. His involvement started with the implementation of the first prototype and quickly progressed to full collaboration. In particular, it was at his suggestion that we applied these ideas to 3D representations. The joint work presented in Section 7.5 is both proof of the extensibility of this framework and will be the basis of his thesis [37]. As listed in Appendix A several other students, namely Christian Pantel, Dan Kennett and Mark Tigges, have been involved with the implementation of various prototypes. Thus, similarly to Brown's acknowledgments in his thesis, I would like readers to be aware that the use of "*the pronoun 'we' throughout this thesis is more the proverbial 'royal we'*" [18].

I would like to thank Ann Grbavec for reading very rough drafts, Pepe Kubon for providing the \LaTeX formatting, Tom Shermer for helping to clarify the verbal presentation of this thesis, Dave Fracchia for a very thorough reading and John Light for a final editing pass.

This research has been supported in part by postgraduate scholarships and grants from Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, equipment donations from Intel, and a research grant from Forest Renewal B.C. through B.C. Science Council. I also appreciate the resources provided by the Graphics and Multimedia Research Lab and the Algorithms Lab at Simon Fraser University. All support is gratefully acknowledged.

Contents

Approval	iii
Abstract	v
Dedication	vii
Quotation	viii
Acknowledgments	ix
List of Tables	xvii
List of Figures	xviii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 The Motivation for Developing a Framework	3
1.2 Positioning Presentation Space in the Information Visualization Pipeline	4
1.3 Issues in Presentation Space	7
1.4 Terminology	12
1.5 The Concept of Elastic Presentation Space	13
1.6 Contributions	15
1.7 Thesis Organization	16
2 The Screen Real Estate Problem	19
2.1 Initial Presentation Approaches	20
2.1.1 Windowing Paradigm	20
2.1.2 Bifocal Display	21

2.1.3	Generalized Fisheyes	22
2.2	Methods of Maintaining Context	23
2.2.1	Compressed Contexts	25
2.2.2	Filtered Contexts	30
2.2.3	Filtered and Distorted Contexts	32
2.2.4	Distorted Contexts	35
2.2.5	Partitioned Contexts	39
2.2.6	Zoomed Contexts	41
2.2.7	Summary	43
2.3	Comparing Visual Capabilities of Detail-in-Context Methods	43
2.3.1	Freedom of Focal Shape	43
2.3.2	Multiple foci	44
2.3.3	Focal Interaction	48
2.4	Beyond 2D	49
2.5	Analysis Literature	51
2.5.1	Examining Previous Taxonomies	52
2.5.2	Our Taxonomic Dimensions for Presentation Space	54
2.6	Discussion	60
3	Establishing our Framework	61
3.1	EPS: The Basic Concepts	63
3.1.1	Developing EPS as a General Framework	63
3.1.2	Developing Comprehensible Presentations	65
3.2	Developing a Detail-in-Context Approach with EPS	68
3.3	Providing a Single Focal Point	70
3.4	Freedom of Focal Shape	75
3.5	Magnification Control	78
3.5.1	Scaled-Only Focal Regions	83
3.6	Freedom of Focal Location	86
3.7	Multiple Foci	91
3.8	Discussion	94
3.9	Verifying the Usefulness of EPS	95

4	EPS: Extending Capabilities	97
4.1	Distortion Control	98
4.1.1	Controlling the Size of the Lens	98
4.1.2	Relating Compression to Curvature	101
4.1.3	Using an Auxiliary Function	103
4.2	Changing the Concept of Distance	104
4.3	Folding: Re-positioning Established Foci	107
4.4	Discussion	111
5	Lens Library	115
5.1	Zooming, Panning and Scrolling	117
5.2	Step Drop-off Functions	120
5.2.1	Manhattan Lenses	121
5.3	Non-Occluding Step Functions	125
5.4	Linear Drop-off Functions	128
5.5	Non-Linear Drop-off Functions	133
5.6	Comparing EPS Lenses with Other Methods	138
5.6.1	Using EPS to Obtain 2D Results	139
5.6.2	Comparing Results	141
5.7	Drop-off Functions in Combination	145
5.8	Discussion	147
6	Making Distortions Comprehensible	151
6.1	The New Comprehension Issues	153
6.1.1	Recognition	153
6.1.2	Interpretation	153
6.2	Previous Advice in Regards to the Recognition Problem	154
6.3	On the Interpretation of Distortions	155
6.3.1	Representations Styles that Reveal Distortions	156
6.3.2	Representation Types that Obscure Distortions	157
6.3.3	When Spatial Properties Encode Meaning	161
6.4	Towards an Interpretation Solution	161
6.5	Comprehensible Distortion Structure	162
6.5.1	Minimize Reorganization	163

6.5.2	Smooth integration	165
6.5.3	Distortion control	166
6.5.4	Mental Map	167
6.6	Comprehensible Transitions	170
6.6.1	Continuous Transitions	171
6.6.2	Reversible Transitions	171
6.7	Visual Cues	172
6.7.1	Constructions	173
6.7.2	Visual Formalisms	174
6.7.3	Acquired Skills	177
6.7.4	Pre-Attentive Ability	178
6.8	The On-going Comprehension Problem	182
6.8.1	Issue: The Grid and Topographic Images	182
6.8.2	Issue: Light Position for Shading	183
6.8.3	Issue: Shading and Colour	184
6.9	Summary	184
7	Beyond 2D	185
7.1	One-Dimensional Visual Representations	186
7.2	One-Plus Dimensional Visual Representations	188
7.3	Two-Dimensional Visual Representations	190
7.4	Two-Plus Dimensional Visual Representations	199
7.5	Three-Dimensional Visual Representations	203
7.5.1	Applying Distortion to 3D VReps	206
7.5.2	Observations	212
7.5.3	Using Distortion to Provide Visual Access	212
7.5.4	Application to Arbitrary Graphs	217
7.5.5	Providing Multiple Foci	217
7.5.6	Using Distortion for Visual Search	220
7.5.7	Discussion	224
8	Conclusion	225
8.1	Contributions	226
8.1.1	Defining Presentation Space	226

8.1.2	Providing a Detail-in-Context Method	226
8.1.3	Describing Elastic Presentation Space	227
8.1.4	Extending to Three-Dimensional Representations	228
8.1.5	Looking at Comprehension Issues with Elastic Presentation	228
8.2	Future Directions	229
8.2.1	Application	229
8.2.2	Comprehension Issues	231
8.2.3	Interaction Issues	232
8.2.4	Theoretical Exploration	232
8.3	Concluding Thoughts	235
A	Prototypes	237
A.1	Minimum Broadcast Graphs (MBG)	237
A.2	Voronoi Diagrams: An animation of Fortune’s plane sweep algorithm	240
A.3	3DPS: Three-Dimensional Pliable Surfaces	240
A.4	3D-Warp: Three-Dimensional Visual Access	242
A.5	Varying Dimensionality in 3DPS	243
A.6	3D-Pliable for image data	243
A.7	3DPS for 2D+ Representations	243
A.8	Temporal Access	243
A.9	Detail-in-context for H-curves	243
A.10	MR Image presentation	244
A.11	SEED	244
B	Perspective Projection	246
B.1	Basic Projections from 3D to 2D	247
B.2	Perspective Foreshortening	247
B.3	Perspective Viewing	248
B.4	Perspective Projection Geometry	249
B.5	One, Two and Three Vanishing Points	250
B.6	Occlusion in Perspective Projection	252
C	Image Credits	253
C.1	Land Cover Map of Champaign, Illinois	253

C.2	Map of British Columbia	255
C.3	Orion Nebula	256
C.4	Surface of Mars	257
C.5	Forest Species: Rocky Mountain Trench	258
C.6	Coastline Map of Vancouver British Columbia	260
C.7	CATGraph Image	260
C.8	Non-linear Views Image	261

Bibliography		263
---------------------	--	------------

List of Tables

2.1	These are the meanings of the abbreviations used in Table 2.2	44
2.2	This table compares the choice of focal shape and indicates whether or not multiple foci are supported. The meanings of the abbreviations are listed in Table 2.1	45
2.3	These are the meanings of the abbreviations used in Table 2.4	46
2.4	This table compares the modes of selection and interaction with foci. The meanings of the abbreviations are listed in Table 2.3	47
2.5	Some examples of the use of presentation dimensions. The amount of use is approximately indicated from very little or none (o——) to extensive use (——o) . . .	59
5.1	Comparing drop-off functions	137
5.2	Profiles of possible drop-off variations at visually critical points	148
5.3	Choosing the type of visual integration at the focal connection and at the context connection affects the lens' pattern of compression	149
7.1	This table illustrates the application of 2D distortion techniques to 3D VReps . . .	210

List of Figures

1.1	The information visualization pipeline, varying only in terminology from that published by Chi and Riedl [30]	5
1.2	The expanded information visualization pipeline, including presentation space	6
1.3	Two different presentations of a land usage map of Champaign, Illinois	8
1.4	A presentation containing two distinct views, showing the map of Champaign, Illinois in one and a selected region magnified in the other	9
1.5	A three foci detail-in-context view of Champaign, Illinois. Shading is used to reveal the distortion (see Chapter 6)	10
2.1	The relationships between the different ideas concerning maintaining context. The cross-hatch over the connection between windowing and detail-in-context indicates that detail-in-context ideas developed to provide a feature not available with windowing.	23
2.2	A diagram of the free-form overlapping allowed by most windowing approaches	23
2.3	Types of visual connections	24
2.4	A diagram of the characteristic compression pattern for compressed contexts	26
2.5	Characteristic visual presentation patterns of using compressed contexts. The darker regions are areas of magnification. The selected foci expand uniformly. Selected foci of differing sizes cause non-uniform magnification in the ghost foci.	27
2.6	The dynamics of an orthogonal stretch	27
2.7	Variations of compressed contexts	29
2.8	A diagram of a filtered context	30
2.9	An example of a filtered context	31
2.10	A diagram of a slightly filtered context that has also been distorted	33
2.11	An example of a filtered and distorted context	33

2.12	A diagram of a full distorted context. Note how the distortion continues right across the focus and note the extreme compression at the edges.	36
2.13	Distorted contexts	37
2.14	A diagram of a partitioned context	39
2.15	Partitioned contexts	40
2.16	A diagram of a zooming approach	42
2.17	This figure is derived from Leung and Apperley's Fig 1 in [94]. It shows their taxonomy of presentation techniques for large graphical data spaces. The arrow indicates that non-graphical representations are sometimes re-interpreted as graphic representations	54
3.1	The reference view point	67
3.2	A regular grid has been placed on the surface which is in normal position: on the left, projected view from RVP; centre and right, side views	70
3.3	A cross-section diagram of half the view volume from RVP to the base plane and from the central axis to the extreme ray with the surface in normal position	71
3.4	Magnifying the grid with simple zoom: left, 3D side view; centre, cross-section view; right, resulting magnified view showing the centre of the magnified grid	71
3.5	A cross-section diagram showing the raised central focal point, the profile of the drop-off function and the edge of the surface in normal position	72
3.6	The Gaussian drop-off function	73
3.7	A single point focus with a Gaussian drop-off function	73
3.8	The process of creating a single central focus.	74
3.9	Single focus at the centre of the field of view: left, 3D side view; centre, cross-section view showing projection vectors; right, resulting detail-in-context view	75
3.10	Focal types	76
3.11	Focal types	77
3.12	The parts of a lens	78
3.13	Single foci: effects of varying height only	78
3.14	The magnification function with RVP to base plane distance d_b of 10. Note the rapid increase after the distance $(d_b - h_f)$ is less than one.	79
3.15	The process of manipulating the surface	80

3.16	Similar triangles show the relationships between z-translation and magnification. The lateral distance between the projections of x_i and x_h on the view plane is the perceived magnification.	81
3.17	Magnification of a uniform grid by 3 times and 6 times respectively.	83
3.18	Creating a region of uniform scale by expanding the focal region	84
3.19	Creating a scaled-only focal region by expanding the focal radius	84
3.20	Creating a region of uniform scale by limiting the lens height	85
3.21	Creating a scaled-only focal region by limiting the lens height	85
3.22	Three different single foci with flattened tops. The top row shows the profile view of the truncated curve and the bottom row shows the matching projected view. The grid clearly shows the regions of uniform scale. Note also the change in scale corresponding to curve height	86
3.23	Single off-centre focal point: left, side view of the off-centre perpendicular focus; centre, the cross section view showing perpendicular vectors and the view volume; right, the projected view showing that the focal region cannot be seen	87
3.24	Single roving focus solution: left, side view of perpendicular focus; right, the side view of perpendicular focus with the translated viewpoint	87
3.25	No magnification series: left, flat untouched grid; centre left, 3D side view of actual shape of adjusted grid; centre right, side cross-section view showing the vectors to the reference viewpoint; right, projected view of the adjusted grid showing no evident change	88
3.26	Viewer Aligned Focus: left; 3D side view showing the focus directed to the viewpoint and inside the view volume, centre; side profile view showing parallel vectors with the central vector directed to the viewpoint, right; shows the top view of the projected image	89
3.27	On the left, traditionally normalized vectors and on the right, z-normalized vectors	90
3.28	Scaled-only viewer-aligned focus	90
3.29	Buckling: left, the cross section vector view, clearly showing the surface buckle; right, the top or projected view showing the surface buckle	91
3.30	The blending process	92
3.31	A blended inter-focal region	93
4.1	Single foci: effects of varying height only	99

4.2	Changing the width of the focal radius (left) versus changing the width of the lens (right)	99
4.3	Single foci with a Gaussian drop-off function: effects of varying the standard deviation with fixed height	100
4.4	The effects of varying deviation once a ring of compression has formed	100
4.5	As the focal magnification increases the region between points <i>A</i> and <i>B</i> becomes increasingly compressed	101
4.6	Relationship between compression and angle of surface to viewer. Maximum compression occurs when the surface normal is orthogonal to the view vector	102
4.7	When a point's view vector passes through the surface it will either be occluded or result in information reversal in the projected view	102
4.8	Using an auxiliary curve removes the ring of maximum compression.	103
4.9	L-one metric (for image credit for the map of British Columbia see Appendix C.2)	105
4.10	L-two metric	105
4.11	L-three metric	106
4.12	L-four metric	106
4.13	L- ∞ metric	107
4.14	Single off-center focus; left, pulled towards viewpoint; right, folded across the image	108
4.15	A pair of foci, repositioned to be adjacent	109
4.16	A central lens with the viewer-aligned vector sheared to the left (left) and to the right (right) folds the focus accordingly	109
4.17	Four views of a single focus, folded to position it over each of the four corners of the surface.	110
4.18	An iterated K12: top left, normal view; top right, two foci magnified to reveal sub-graphs of K12; bottom left, iterated K12 folded; bottom right; a side view of the folded iterated K12	112
4.19	Taking advantage of folding with a single focus	113
5.1	The components of a lens	116
5.2	Diagrams of zooming and panning	117
5.3	Zooming in to fat pixels	118
5.4	Using the central alignment vector to position the zoom	119
5.5	Viewer aligned zooming keeps the focal point in the same relative position	120

5.6	A diagram of an inset lens indicating the occluded region	121
5.7	Insets provide magnification to scale but cause local occlusion (for image credit see Appendix C.5)	122
5.8	Cross-section diagram of a Manhattan lens. The surface connects the base plane to the magnified focal region	123
5.9	Using Manhattan lenses to magnify the coast line around Ocean Falls and Vancouver	123
5.10	A folded view of the Manhattan lenses in Figure 5.7	124
5.11	The profile view of a non-occluding disjoint step function	125
5.12	Different approaches to the focus to context fit problem	126
5.13	Orthogonal variations developed in response to the particular needs of presenting MRI images [166]	126
5.14	The profile view of a non-occluding disjoint step function	127
5.15	The profile view of a connected non-occluding step function	128
5.16	The profile view of a global linear drop-off function	129
5.17	Perspective Wall and Document Lens use orthogonal global linear drop-off functions	129
5.18	The profile view of a constrained linear drop-off function	130
5.19	The constrained linear drop-off function	131
5.20	Linear slope sides views	131
5.21	Linear slope top views with varying lens radius	132
5.22	Constrained linear drop-off functions with the same lens radii and varying magnification	132
5.23	Constrained linear drop-off functions with scaled-only focal regions	133
5.24	The hemisphere drop-off function	134
5.25	The cosine drop-off function	135
5.26	The hyperbolic drop-off function	135
5.27	The Gaussian drop-off function	135
5.28	The profile views of hemispherical functions	136
5.29	Graphs of the drop-off functions	137
5.30	For comparison, top views of the different lenses	137
5.31	The transformed grid	139
5.32	The applying the surface to the 2D transformed grid	140

5.33	Example of a multi-scale view. The three-dimensional surface manipulation that organizes the presentation has been projected back into the base plane with equation 5.3. The foci zoom in on downtown Vancouver and the academic quadrangle of the SFU campus.	141
5.34	The Gaussian drop-off function and the related Gaussian 2D-to-2D functions . . .	142
5.35	The graph of the transformation functions: (1) $T_{KR:nonlinear}$, (2) $T_{SB:fisheye}$ and $T_{EPS:linear}$, and (3) $T_{EPS:gaus}$	143
5.36	The graph of the magnification functions; (1) $M_{EPS:gaus}$, (2) $M_{SB:fisheye}$ and $M_{EPS:linear}$, (3) $M_{EPS:cosine}$, and (4) $T_{KR:nonlinear}$	144
5.37	Step pyramid	145
5.38	A variety of lenses resulting from a Gaussian basis function modified by a half sine function	146
5.39	Lenses in combination	147
5.40	Lenses in combination	148
6.1	A text file with two focal points	156
6.2	Sparse text, B.C. map, with one focal point (for map credit see Appendix C.2) . . .	157
6.3	Regular layout of a grid graph with two focal points	157
6.4	Four presentations of a map of the Vancouver coastline. It is hard to tell which of these is the normal presentation (for map credit see Appendix C.6)	158
6.5	These photographs show a section of the surface of Mars (for image credit see Appendix C.4)	159
6.6	One of these two presentations of British Columbia contains a focal region. For explanation see text 6.3.3 (for map credit see Appendix C.2)	160
6.7	The normal presentations of a grid and a map of British Columbia	162
6.8	Global distortions	163
6.9	Constrained distortions showing large regions of image in normal presentation . . .	164
6.10	These presentations have a large focal region of magnification to scale	165
6.11	Smooth visual integration of the focus, the compression and the context	166
6.12	A constrained distortion with a region of scaled magnification in the focus creates a detectable division between the focal region, the compressed region and the remaining context	167
6.13	Orthogonal and radial displacement	168

6.14	The basic configuration of the graph layout in 6.14(a) is better preserved in 6.14(c)	168
6.15	3D distortions	169
6.16	Question of orthogonality in 3D distortions	170
6.17	Two presentations showing manipulated surfaces	173
6.18	Coastline of Vancouver in normal presentation	175
6.19	Use of the cartographic grid (for map credit see Appendix C.6)	175
6.20	In these two presentations the outlines of the scaled-only regions of the focus are displayed (for map credit see Appendix C.2)	176
6.21	The grid lines in this case support a 3D perspective reading	177
6.22	Shading gives an intuitive impression of the location shape of the focal regions (for map credit see Appendix C.6)	179
6.23	The grid and shading can be used alone or together (for map credit see Appendix C.6)	180
6.24	The grid and shading can be used alone or together (for image credit see Appendix C.4)	181
6.25	The shading effect in the photograph is combined with the shading effect of the visual cue and changes how the information is interpreted (for image credit see Appendix C.4)	182
6.26	Both of these images show the same presentation of the Orion nebula with different visual cues (for image credit see Appendix C.3)	183
7.1	1D VRep: A nine node graph with a linear layout along the x axis in normal presentation	187
7.2	1D VRep with 1D distortions	187
7.3	1D VRep: 2D distortion in x and y	187
7.4	1D VRep: 2D distortion in x and z	188
7.5	1D VRep with 1D distortions and no magnification, aligned with the visual representation's single dimension	188
7.6	1D+ VRep	189
7.7	1D+ VReps: the presentation patterns for Bifocal Display [147] and Perspective Wall [99]	189
7.8	2D VRep: a nine by nine grid graph in normal presentation	190
7.9	2D VRep with one dimensional distortions. All the affected nodes are slightly darker	191
7.10	2D VRep with two dimensional distortions	191
7.11	2D VR: normal presentations	192

7.12	2D VR: This lens with a small scaled-only focal region (center four squares in the grid) this used as the basis for the next series of images (Figures 7.12 to 7.19	193
7.13	2D VRep: y and z distortion	194
7.14	2D VRep: x and z distortion	195
7.15	2D VRep: moving the focal centre in order to bring the lower end of the scroll into view	196
7.16	2D VRep: Folding the scroll towards the right shows a clear view of the left hand context	196
7.17	2D VRep: a z only distortion	197
7.18	2D VRep: a partial x , y and z distortion	198
7.19	2D VRep: an x , partial y and z distortion	199
7.20	2D+ VRep: The surface of Mars can be interpreted as 3D. The detail-in-context presentation does not interfere with this interpretation	200
7.21	2D+ VRep examples from the SEED project showing data from simulated landscape dynamics [27]	200
7.22	2D+ VRep: Placing a height field on a pliable surface	201
7.23	2D+ VRep: looking at the differences between perpendicular and surface normal aligned height fields from the side	201
7.24	2D+ VRep: perpendicular height fields allow comparisons of aligned height fields .	202
7.25	2D+ VRep: surface normal aligned height fields open like pages in a book	203
7.26	3D VRep: the grid graph	206
7.27	Space-filling orthogonal distortion applied to a 2D grid graph and a 3D grid graph	207
7.28	Nonlinear distortion applied to a 2D grid graph and a 3D grid graph	207
7.29	Gaussian radial distortion applied to a 2D grid graph and a 3D grid graph	208
7.30	Step orthogonal distortion applied to a 2D grid graph and a 3D grid graph	209
7.31	For a 1D VRep; top to bottom, normal presentation, magnification without displacement, displacement without magnification, magnification and displacement combined	209
7.32	Visual access distortion	214
7.33	This series shows Gaussian visual access distortion applied progressively to the 3D grid	215
7.34	Applying visual access distortion to the 3D grid graph with different magnification patterns	216
7.35	Undistorted random polar graph layout	217

7.36	Increased magnification brings crossing edges into conflict	218
7.37	Visual access distortion also applied to edges	218
7.38	The visual access function may be applied simultaneously to more than one focus .	219
7.39	Even when the two foci are in line with the viewpoint both foci remain visible because the distortion function from the furthest focus effects all occluding objects including other foci	219
7.40	Land coverage image and legend	221
7.41	The temporal block of landscape coverage information	222
7.42	Peering through the temporal axis	222
7.43	Browsing through temporal space to a spatial layer	223
7.44	Continued browsing reveals fire start	223
8.1	Left, a tree with a clumped group of nodes; middle and right, progressive application of visual access distortion, effectively separating this grouping	233
8.2	Left, graph with considerable edge confusion in central left; right, application of radial Gaussian distortion centered on a single node in that region	234
8.3	Graph in Figure 8.2 with visual access distortion applied progressively to clarify which edges are attached to this node	234
A.1	The interface to the minimum broadcast graph library. Each node represents a graph. They are organized by the number of nodes (horizontal axis) and the number of edges (vertical axis) and linked by colour to the papers that describe them.	238
A.2	The left image shows a thirty node graph from the library. The right image shows the same graph after three steps of broadcasting.	238
A.3	The right image is part of the storyboard explanation of developing minimum broadcast graphs. The pink shows the edges used for a broadcast scheme for one node. The blue shows the edges needed to be able to use this scheme from all nodes. The red shows those edges which will not be needed. The left images shows the step before last when gossiping with sixteen nodes. The checkerboard pattern in the nodes show positionally which nodes a given node has gossiped with.	239
A.4	These two images show two layouts for a five dimensional hypercube.	239
A.5	Animating Fortune's plane sweep with controls for reversing and viewing sub-steps	240

A.6	The interface to the initial prototype, 3DPS. The panel on the left allows selection of what is to be displayed. The control on the right sets the height, the maximum, the width and the amount that the auxiliary curve is used. The two small windows control, on the left, folding and on the right location of the active focus.	241
A.7	The 3D-Warp prototype	242
A.8	This version includes several drop-off variations and some L-metric variations . . .	244
A.9	This version includes Gaussian, linear and Manhattan lenses	245
A.10	This is the Tardis visualization environment. It includes visual exploration methods for both 2D visual representations and 3D visual representations	245
B.1	Planar geometric projections: left, perspective; right, parallel	246
B.2	Perspective foreshortening; lines AB and CD are the same length, CD's greater distance from the centre of projection creates a smaller projection	248
B.3	The 3D viewing volume	249
B.4	Similar triangles used to calculate single point perspective	250
B.5	Two views of single point perspective	251
B.6	Two point perspective	251
B.7	Three point perspective	252
C.1	Land Cover Map of Champaign, Illinois	254
C.2	Map of British Columbia	255
C.3	Image of the Orion Nebula	256
C.4	An image of the surface of Mars	257
C.5	Forest Species: Rocky Mountain Trench	259
C.6	Coastline Map of Vancouver British Columbia	260
C.7	Arctan Fisheye from CATGraph	261
C.8	Non-Linear Views [84]	261