

Olaf Schroth

From Information to Participation

Interactive Landscape Visualization as a Tool for Collaborative Planning

Publikationsreihe
des Instituts für Raum-
und Landschaftsentwicklung (IRL), ETHZ

Table of contents

Preface	3
Acknowledgements	5
Table of contents	7
Abstract	13
Zusammenfassung	15
1. Introduction and research questions: The role of interactivity in landscape visualization	17
1.1 The problem of communication biases in participation	17
1.2 Interactive landscape visualization as a tool for collaborative planning	17
1.2.1 Interactive visualization as “common currency”	17
1.2.2 Definition of basic terms	18
1.2.3 Positioning in the research context	18
1.3 Need for applied research on the impact of interactivity and user preferences	19
1.4 Research questions	19
1.5 Research objectives	20
1.6 Scope of the research question	20
1.6.1 The VisuLands project – opportunities and constraints	21
1.7 Thesis outline	21
2. Literature review: Participation and collaborative planning	23
2.1 Five questions on participation in practice	23
2.1.1 Why participation? Reasons for participation	23
2.1.2 Who? Diversity addressed through an inclusionary process	24
2.1.3 What? Relevance of the topic	24
2.1.4 How far? Levels of participation	24
2.1.4.1 Arnstein’s ladder of participation	24
2.1.4.2 Continuum of participation	25
2.1.4.3 Participation and group size	25
2.1.5 How? Focus on the participation process	25
2.2 Collaborative planning as an approach to participation in multi-stakeholder contexts	26
2.2.1 The “communicative turn”	26
2.2.2 Discussion on the limitations of collaborative planning	27
2.3 Participation programs, processes and tools	28
2.3.1 Participation programs in the international and Swiss planning framework	28
2.3.2 Participation processes	29
2.3.3 Participation tools	30

2.3.3.1	Tools: organisation techniques	31
2.3.3.2	Tools: facilitation techniques	31
2.3.3.3	Tools: visualization tools	32
2.3.4	Code of visualization ethics	33
2.3.4.1	Visualizations are not neutral	33
2.3.4.2	Interim code of ethics	33
2.4	Qualities of collaborative planning	34
2.4.1	Inclusiveness (process)	34
2.4.2	Enrichment of information (process)	34
2.4.3	Dialogue (process)	35
2.4.4	Credibility and transparency (process)	35
2.4.5	Consensus (outcome)	35
2.4.6	Learning (outcome)	35
3.	Literature review: Interactivity in landscape visualization	37
3.1	Landscape visualization	37
3.1.1	Definition of landscape visualization	37
3.1.2	Distinction of visualization objects by visual variables	40
3.2	Distinction of landscape visualizations by the level of virtuality	40
3.2.1	Information intensity or realism	41
3.2.1.1	Realism – abstraction	41
3.2.1.2	Apparent realism	42
3.2.1.3	Realism and interactivity	42
3.2.2	Immersion	43
3.2.3	Intelligent landscape objects	43
3.2.4	Interface	43
3.2.4.1	Definition of interfaces	44
3.2.4.2	Interactive interfaces in landscape planning	44
3.2.5	Interactivity	45
3.2.5.1	Mediated interactivity	46
3.2.5.2	Basic levels of dynamics and interactivity in landscape visualization	46
3.3	Technical foundations of interactive landscape visualization	47
3.3.1	Real-time interaction techniques	47
3.3.2	Real-time landscapes close to reality	49
3.4	The role of interactivity in cognition and communication	52
3.4.1	The interactive shift in cartographic communication	52
3.4.2	The map use cube	53
3.4.3	Cognitive benefits of interactivity	54
3.4.4	Communicative benefits of interactivity	56
3.5	Functional typology of interactions with landscape visualizations	59
3.5.1	Spatial navigation	59
3.5.1.1	Navigation metaphors	61
3.5.2	Temporal navigation	61
3.5.3	Thematic navigation	62
3.5.4	Scenario navigation	62
3.5.5	Contextualizing interactions	63
3.5.6	Spatial analysis in landscape visualization	64
3.5.7	Landscape editing	64

3.5.8	Documentation	64
3.5.9	Didactic functions	65
3.5.10	Customization of the representation	65
3.5.11	Customization of the interface	65
4.	Research hypotheses	67
4.1	First research question: Hypotheses on the benefits of different types of interaction for the quality of collaborative planning	67
4.2	Second research question: Hypotheses on the correlation between user characteristics and interaction preferences	68
5.	Study site description: Entlebuch UNESCO Biosphere Reserve	69
5.1	Bottom-up participation as the key to acceptance and sustainable change	70
5.1.1	Organisation of the Entlebuch UNESCO Biosphere Reserve	71
5.1.2	Forums	72
5.2	Selection as study site	72
6.	Visualization methods and research design	73
6.1	Scenario and visualization methods	73
6.1.1	Database and landscape base model	73
6.1.2	Scenario methods	74
6.1.3	Visualization methods	74
6.1.3.1	Low to middle level of interactivity: Visual Nature Studio with animation software	75
6.1.3.2	High level of interactivity: LandXplorer Studio and Lenné3D	75
6.1.3.3	VNS in comparison to LandXplorer	75
6.2	Workshop procedures	76
6.2.1	Workshop choreography	76
6.2.2	Role of the facilitator and the visualization navigator	76
6.2.3	Time constraints and limitations in the visualization topic	77
6.2.4	Ethical conduct	77
6.3	Research methods: Qualitative case study	77
6.3.1	Definition of the cases and case-units	78
6.3.2	Data collection	79
6.3.3	Qualitative content analysis	81
6.3.4	Cross-case analysis	83
6.4	Research methods: Quantitative survey on user preferences	84
6.4.1	Survey setup	84
6.4.2	Target population	84
6.4.3	Venue	85
6.4.4	Survey sequence	85
6.4.5	Visualization content	86
6.4.6	Questionnaire	88
6.4.7	Open-ended question format	88

7. Single case results: Tourism, agriculture, forest management plan	91
7.1 Case one: Tourism – Long-term prospects of winter versus summer tourism	91
7.1.1 Case study context and participants	91
7.1.2 Workshop preparations	91
7.1.3 Workshop setting and choreography	92
7.1.4 Summary of the workshop on tourism	93
7.1.4.1 Workshop sequence	93
7.1.4.2 Selection of key moments	94
7.1.5 Results from the tourism workshop	94
7.1.5.1 Input moment: Showing the infrastructure in its spatial context	94
7.1.5.2 Moment of change: Visualizing the snow line	97
7.1.5.3 Key moments without visualization support	99
7.1.6 Discussion of the tourism case results	99
7.1.6.1 The tourism case in brief: Snow line analysis facilitates the workshop	100
7.2 Case two: Agriculture – Discussing future management strategies	100
7.2.1 Case study context and participants	100
7.2.2 Workshop preparations	101
7.2.3 Workshop setting and choreography	102
7.2.4 Summary of the first workshop on agriculture	103
7.2.4.1 Selection of key moments	104
7.2.5 Results from the first workshop on agriculture	104
7.2.5.1 Impact assessment: Spontaneous reforestation	104
7.2.5.2 Key moments without visualization support	109
7.2.6 Summary of the second workshop on agriculture	109
7.2.6.1 Selection of key moments	110
7.2.7 Results from the second workshop on agriculture	110
7.2.7.1 Expert input: Presenting landscape processes rationally	110
7.2.7.2 Brainstorming: Large grazing scenario	113
7.2.7.3 Discussion: Scenario visualization	115
7.2.7.4 Key moments without visualization support	120
7.2.8 Discussion of the agriculture case results	120
7.2.8.1 The agriculture case in brief: Communication of landscape change	121
7.3 Case three: Forest management plan – Consensus-building in a public involvement process	122
7.3.1 Case study context and participants	122
7.3.2 Workshop preparations	123
7.3.3 Workshop setting and choreography	125
7.3.4 Summary of the public kick-off meeting on the forest management plan	126
7.3.4.1 Selection of key moments	126
7.3.5 Results from the public kick-off meeting on the forest management plan	126
7.3.5.1 First key moment: Public kick-off meeting – introduce the plan	126
7.3.5.2 Key moments without visualization support	129
7.3.6 Summary of the final public meeting on the forest management plan	129
7.3.6.1 Selection of key moments	130
7.3.7 Results from the final public meeting on the forest management plan	130
7.3.7.1 Consensus-building: visualization-supported consensus-building	130
7.3.7.2 Key moments in which visualizations had no impact	134
7.3.8 Discussion of the forest management plan case results	135
7.3.8.1 The forestry case in brief	136

8. Cross-case analysis and results: The three cases in comparison	139
8.1 Results of the context factors clustering	139
8.1.1 Research database query	139
8.1.2 Clustering of context factor codes	139
8.1.3 Discussion of context factors	141
8.2 Comparison of interactions with regard to different workshop phases	142
8.2.1 Frequencies of interactions	142
8.2.2 Qualities of interactions	144
8.2.3 Discussion of results on interactions with regard to the workshop phase	144
8.3 Replication of the case study results	145
8.3.1 Interaction effects on the process	145
8.3.2 Interaction effects on the outcomes	148
8.4 Discussion of the cross-case analysis results: Assessing the reliability of the case study results	150
9. Quantitative analysis and results: User preferences	151
9.1 Quantitative results from the overall ranking	151
9.1.1 Descriptive statistics	151
9.1.2 Chi-square test	154
9.2 Quantitative results on group differences	156
9.2.1 Gender	156
9.2.1.1 Spearman's correlation coefficient	156
9.2.1.2 Chi-square tests of split samples	156
9.2.2 Age (or pupils in comparison to market visitors)	156
9.2.2.1 Spearman's correlation coefficient	156
9.2.2.2 Chi-square tests of split samples	157
9.2.3 Stakeholders	157
9.2.4 Place of residence (local knowledge) and profession	157
9.2.5 Map-reading skills	157
9.2.5.1 Spearman's correlation coefficient	157
9.2.5.2 Chi-square tests of split samples	158
9.3 Qualitative results from the open-ended questions	159
9.3.1 General comments: Facilitating the imagination and perception of landscape change	160
9.3.2 Qualitative comments related to user group characteristics	160
9.4 Discussion of the survey results	161
9.4.1 Limitations of the survey method and setting	161
9.4.2 Discussion of the ranking results	162
9.4.3 Discussion of user group preferences	163
10. Conclusions and recommendations	165
10.1 Benefits of interactivity in collaborative planning	165
10.1.1 The benefits of interactions for the qualities of collaborative planning	165
10.1.2 User group characteristics and preferences for different types of interactions	168
10.2 Recommendations for workshop facilitators and visualization navigators	169
10.2.1 Workshop preparations	169

10.2.2	Workshop setting	169
10.2.3	Workshop choreography	169
10.2.4	Functions of different types and levels of interaction in the workshop	170
10.3	Recommendations for software developers	174
10.4	Recommendations for landscape visualization researchers	174
10.5	Evaluation of the research	176
10.5.1	Research objectives revisited for the first research question	176
10.5.2	Research objectives revisited for the second research question	176
10.5.3	Review of the qualitative case study method	176
10.5.4	Review of the quantitative survey method	177
10.5.5	Benefits of the transdisciplinary research approach	177
10.6	Implications of the results for planning	177
10.6.1	Focus on the processes of landscape change	177
10.6.2	Focus on the participation process	177
10.6.3	Outlook on the future of interactive landscape visualization	178
Literature		181
List of figures		193
List of tables		197
Appendices		201
Preface		201
Appendix 1: Case study database overview		201
Appendix 2: Workshop scripts		203
A2.1	Case one: Tourism	203
A2.2	Case two: Agriculture	203
A2.3	Case three: Forest management plan	206
Appendix 3: Observation and interview guidelines		209
A3.1	Observation and interview guidelines – Original version, applied in the tourism case	209
A3.2	Revised observation and interview guidelines – Applied in the cases on agriculture and forest management plan	212
Appendix 4: Coding and counting methods in the qualitative analysis		215
A4.1	Coding by computer-aided analysis	215
A4.2	Counting interactions on the basis of video documentation	216
Appendix 5: Quantitative questionnaire		217