

Inertial proprioceptive devices: Self-motion-sensing toys and tools

by C. Verplaetse

One of the current goals of technology is to redirect computation and communication capabilities from within the traditional computer and into everyday objects and devices—to make smart devices. One important function of smart devices is motion sensing. A proprioceptive device has a sense of its own motion and position. This ability can allow pens to remember what they have written, cameras to record their positions along with images, and baseball bats to communicate to batters information about their swing. In this paper, inertial sensing is introduced as the logical choice for unobtrusive, fully general motion sensing. Example proprioceptive device applications are presented along with their sensing ranges and sensitivities. Finally, the technologies used in implementing inertial sensors are described, and a survey of commercially available accelerometers and gyroscopes is presented.

As technology redirects *intelligence* away from the desktop and into everyday objects, common devices such as appliances, clothing, and toys are given computational sensing and communication abilities. This technological movement is exemplified in such research initiatives as the MIT Media Laboratory's *Things That Think* projects and Xerox PARC's concept of *Ubiquitous Computing*. While much of the associated work centers around devices that sense and respond to the motion, presence, or state of people and objects in their surroundings (examples include three-dimensional mice, smart tables, and smart coffee cups), this paper focuses on devices that have a sense of *themselves*, particularly a sense of their own motions. Embedded with inertial sensors, these devices are capable of autonomously sensing their own motions and orientations and reacting accord-

ingly. As a result, they are called *inertial proprioceptive devices*.

Devices with this self-motion-sensing ability can monitor their motions and respond to them. Consider a hand-held personal digital assistant (PDA) containing inertial sensors. Such a device could allow its user to move through complex information spaces by physically moving or tilting the PDA in the corresponding direction. To go a step further, an inertial-sensing user-controlled device with a sense of its own functionality could assess its state and give its user appropriate feedback. For example, a baseball bat could give batting tips, or juggling balls could teach a novice to juggle.

Motion sensing is not a new idea. For years, security systems, weapon systems, and medical and entertainment systems have employed various forms of “externally referenced” motion-sensing technologies such as infrared, radar, and video. Internally referenced, autonomous motion sensing has also existed for quite some time. Robots, aircraft, automobiles, and other vehicles have sensed and measured their motions for decades, using varying electromechanical sensors as well as inertial sensors.

Most of the motion-sensing technologies referred to above are restricted in terms of where and how they

©Copyright 1996 by International Business Machines Corporation. Copying in printed form for private use is permitted without payment of royalty provided that (1) each reproduction is done without alteration and (2) the *Journal* reference and IBM copyright notice are included on the first page. The title and abstract, but no other portions, of this paper may be copied or distributed royalty free without further permission by computer-based and other information-service systems. Permission to *republish* any other portion of this paper must be obtained from the Editor.

Table 1 Cost, size, and performance of selected inertial sensors from the 1970s to 1990s

Sensor Type	Date	Bias Stability (deg/hr)	Size (in ³)	Price (\$U.S./axis)
Electrostatic Gyro (ESG), Rockwell†	1970s	0.02 (1 naut.m/hr)	50–100	17000
Expected near-term†† navigation and military gyros	1990s	0.02 (1 naut.m/hr)	10–20	5000–10000
Expected near-term†† general consumer gyros	1990s	10	0.01–1.0	1–10

† = ESG references include 1 and 2 in the cited references
 †† = With reference to Kumar et al.³

are useful. Infrared, radar, and video motion-sensing technologies are all “externally referenced,” physically removed from the moving object of interest. As a result these sensing modes are subject to occlusions and numerous interferences and noise sources. Although cars and aircraft measure their own motions, their motion sensors are both dimensionally and directionally limited. The motion sensor of a car wheel requires the friction of a road and only senses in one dimension; a pitot tube only works for an aircraft traveling forward in familiar atmospheric conditions.

A more tractable and generally effective type of motion sensor is the inertial sensor. Used in spacecraft, aircraft, and submarines for years, this type of sensor attaches directly to the moving body of interest and gives an output signal proportional to its own motion with respect to an inertial frame of reference. Two types of sensors comprise inertial sensing: accelerometers and gyroscopes. Accelerometers sense and respond to translational accelerations; gyroscopes sense and respond to rotational rates. Inertial sensors are desirable for general motion sensing because they operate regardless of external references, friction, winds, directions, and dimensions. However, inertial systems are not well-suited for absolute position tracking. In such systems, positions are found by integrating, over time, the signals of the sensors as well as any signal errors. As a result, position errors accumulate. Inertial systems are most effective in sensing applications involving relative motion.


Until recent years, inertial sensors have only found use in the few fields mentioned above, since their cost and size have traditionally been quite prohibitive (see Table 1). Since their inception, these sensors have largely been complex and expensive electromechanical devices. Accelerometers have been made of relatively large mechanical proof masses, hinges, and servos; gyroscopes have been built with multiple mechanical gimbals, pick-offs, torques, and bearings. Recent advances in microelectromechanical system (MEMS) technologies have enabled inertial sensors to become available on the small size and price scales associated with such commonplace devices as consumer appliances. These advances are largely a result of batch processing techniques developed by the time-keeping and microelectronics industries.³

In this paper, several types of new motion-sensing applications are described along with corresponding sensing ranges and sensitivities. Then a brief introduction to general inertial measurement systems is given. Finally, the technologies used to implement accelerometers and gyroscopes are described, and representative commercial inertial sensors are surveyed.

Example proprioceptive applications

Motion sensing of common objects such as shoes and pens has long existed in one form or another. Treadmills have measured people’s walking speeds and distances. PDAs sense the path of a pen tip as a user

Figure 1 Characteristic motions of common human-controlled devices



writes on them. And computer programs analyze the optical flow of digitized video to infer camera motion. Each of these forms of motion detection requires an externally displaced device to actually sense motion.

Inertial sensors do not require external references, and since they are becoming inexpensive and smaller in size, they offer a new means of autonomous motion detection for devices that have long been dependent on external references (i.e., shoes and treadmills). Both the automobile and computer industries have quickly found uses for inertial sensing. In the automotive market, car navigation and air-bag control are the main inertial applications; the consumer computer market is seeing new input devices that can be used in three-dimensional space such as inertial mice and head trackers for virtual reality. The inertial market for these two industries is estimated to be in the range

of four billion dollars a year over the next several years.¹

Current work at the MIT Media Lab is focused on giving ordinary devices autonomous motion-sensing capabilities, via inertial sensing, so that as pens write, shoes walk, and cameras move, these objects sense their own motions without need for external references. The following subsections describe several example applications of human-controlled motion-sensing devices and the characteristics of their related motions. Figure 1 summarizes the characteristic input motion levels for general user-controlled devices. For each application, estimated motion data ranges are given along with experimentally recorded ranges. The experimental motion data were gathered both from video analysis and from a three-axis accelerometer-based inertial measurement unit (IMU) with a range of

± 10 gs, where g is the acceleration constant due to gravity. This IMU used Analog Devices' accelerometer model ADXL05, a type of capacitive pendulous accelerometer to be described later.

Pen. Personal digital assistants and signature verification devices both employ forms of handwriting recognition—each analyzes the path of a pen tip on a writing surface. If a pen is given inertial sensors and on-board computation and memory resources, it can sense its motions while it writes and use those motion data to estimate its time-varying position. By employing a pattern recognition method such as a neural network or hidden Markov model⁴ on its time-varying pen tip position, the pen can *know* and remember what it has written. Such a “smart” pen could not only save notes and letters but also send electronic mail (e-mail), solve mathematical problems, check for spelling errors, and carry out other standard computer operations.

An estimated range for pen tip accelerations was found by videotaping the pens and papers of several people as they signed their names. Pen tip velocities and radii of curvature of a number of characters were used to calculate the corresponding centripetal accelerations, which ranged from 0.1 g to 1.0 g.

Pen tip accelerations in the two-dimensional writing plane were also recorded using the aforementioned IMU attached to a pen tip. Recorded handwriting accelerations ranged, with uniform distribution, from 0.04 to 0.66 g.

The frequency of motion for handwriting will be estimated as the approximate natural frequency of the wrist and hand, 8 to 12 hertz (Hz), and should not exceed 20 Hz.⁵ When the relative size and motion scales are considered, the handwriting characteristic frequency described here will act as the frequency limit for other applications such as foot-, leg-, and arm-controlled devices.

Camera. Many current video analysis schemes attempt to extract camera motion from optical flow.⁶ Optical flow is the apparent motion of image intensity on the image plane of the camera over time. A number of models exist that relate this two-dimensional optical flow motion with its corresponding three-dimensional camera motion. Such optically based motion estimation schemes are best suited for static scenes, where the only motion on the image plane is that caused by camera motion. In most cases, however,

video cameras are not used to record static scenes. If a video camera can sense its own motions inertially and record its motion data along with the video, subsequent camera motion analysis can be performed solely by using the inertial data, or a joint inertial-optical motion estimator⁷ can be implemented with a state-estimation scheme such as an extended Kalman filter.

The required sensing capabilities for a motion-sensing camera can be estimated by looking at the rates of movement of typical camera maneuvers. Camera movement rates were experimentally found by monitoring the pan and tilt motions of a hand-held video recorder throughout a series of shooting sequences. An average rotational rate of about 36 degrees per second (deg/sec) was observed. Pan rates varied from near zero deg/sec up to about 60 deg/sec. These rotational rates determine the input range for gyroscopes used in a motion-sensing camera.

Characteristic camera motion frequency can be estimated as that of human head motion. Head motion frequency averages about 3.5 Hz and rolls off around 8 Hz.⁸ Inertial sensors used for tracking a video camera should thus have optimal frequency response in the 3 to 8 Hz range.

Shoes. Just as most types of vehicles have speedometers and odometers, shoes should also be able to sense and track their motions. The medical and athletic fields have relied on various forms of externally referenced walking rate and distance sensors for some time. Shoes embedded with an inertial-sensing system would allow walking-sensing to be carried out unobtrusively and in any setting. An inertial shoe pedometer system would work much like the pen and camera described above; inertial sensors would record shoe motion components, and an on-board computer would estimate speed and distance traveled. Given sufficient computational, memory, and sensing resources, a proprioceptive shoe system could not only tell its wearer how far and fast he or she is walking, but could also diagnose gait abnormalities or alert the wearer that it is time to replace the shoe soles.

For a benchmark estimate of the shoe accelerations associated with walking, consider an average person's walking speed of 3.5 miles per hour (mph) (5.13 feet per second, or fps) or 2 steps per second.⁹ The centripetal acceleration of a shoe traveling 5.13 fps about an average adult's knee of radius 2.17 ft¹⁰ is 12.1 ft/sec² (about 0.4 g).

Experimental values of walking foot accelerations were obtained with the previously mentioned IMU fastened to a shoe near the ball of a foot while walking. Recorded accelerations ranged from 0.19 to 6.57 g, with nearly all the acceleration activity located near the mean of 1.59 g.

Given the estimated walking accelerations, inertial sensors used for shoe motion tracking should have an input range of about ± 10 gs.

Bats, rackets, and batons. The final example application area includes toys and tools that are swung or waved expressively by their users. A baseball bat or tennis racket that senses its motions can tell a player how fast he or she is swinging, and if used with other sensors and a microprocessor, could give feedback information about a player's performance.

An application with similar motion-sensing requirements is the "Digital Baton,"¹¹ which was developed at the MIT Media Lab. This device, using an orthogonal accelerometer triad for motion sensing and several pressure sensors for analog finger inputs, allows its user to "conduct" and control computer music orchestrations simply by being moved and gripped in different ways.

Using the test IMU, hand accelerations were recorded during athletic arm- or hand-swinging motions. An acceleration range of 0.49 to 9.02 g was found. Most of the acceleration activity was concentrated near the mean value of 2.2 g.

Baseball bat accelerations for the typical swing of a youth (bat speed of 40 mph, 58.7 fps)¹² are estimated as the centripetal acceleration. These accelerations will serve as an upper limit. If a swinging arm length of 2 feet and a distance of about 10 inches from the hands' position to the center of mass of the bat is assumed, the bat will experience a maximum acceleration of $(58.7 \text{ fps})^2 / 2.8 \text{ ft} = 1230 \text{ ft/sec}^2 = 38 \text{ gs}$! At the same time, the handle of the bat will undergo an acceleration of about $(29.3 \text{ fps})^2 / 2 \text{ ft} = 429 \text{ ft/sec}^2 = 13 \text{ gs}$.

Given the motion range estimates for these athletic and expressive hand and arm applications, any inertial sensors measuring the motion of a user's hand or arm needs to have an upper input limit of near 10 to 15 gs. If the motion of an object extending from the user's body (like a baseball bat) is to be sensed, a greater input range (about 50 g) is necessary.

General inertial measurement systems

Motor-cognizant devices like those mentioned in the preceding sections can independently track their motions using inertial sensors. As mentioned earlier, inertial sensing is accomplished with two types of sensors: accelerometers and gyroscopes. Typically, both of these sensors are sensitive to only one axis of motion. Inertial navigation systems (INSs) used in aircraft, spacecraft, and other vehicles are ordinarily based on an inertial measurement unit that consists of a set of three orthogonal accelerometers and three mutually orthogonal gyroscopes. Such a device is sensitive to the full six degrees of freedom of motion (three translational and three rotational). It should also be noted that rotation can be measured inertially without gyroscopes, using the differential linear accelerations measured by two (or more) accelerometers undergoing the same rotational motion but located at different distances from the center of rotation.

INSs determine position and orientation from the basic kinematic equations for translational and rotational motion. The orientation of an object, given a sensed rotational rate, ω , during each time step, t , is given by

$$\theta = \theta_0 + \omega t \quad (1)$$

where θ equals the orientation angle, and t equals the time step. The output of a gyroscope is the rotational rate ω . Similarly, position is found with the translational kinematic equation


$$x = x_0 + v_0 t + \frac{1}{2} a t^2 \quad (2)$$

where x equals position, v equals velocity, and a equals acceleration, the output of an accelerometer.

A schematized inertial measurement system for a general proprioceptive device is shown in Figure 2. This system consists of a set of sensors whose signals go through an analog-to-digital converter to a microcontroller. The sensors include accelerometers and gyroscopes as well as a temperature sensor (because the signals of most inertial sensors are temperature-dependent) and any other sensors called for by a given application. The microcontroller either stores the sensor data for later use, or it performs some type of real-time analysis and invokes the appropriate output.

Several types of computation and analysis may be performed with the data of the inertial sensors by the microcontroller of the system. The most basic micro-

Figure 2 Schematic of general proprioceptive system



controller computational function is to estimate motion and position with Equations 1 and 2. A more sophisticated method for estimating motion and position is to use a Kalman filter state-estimation algorithm. Once the time-dependent motions and positions of the system are estimated, a pattern recognition scheme such as a neural network, hidden

Markov model, or matched filter may be performed with that motion data. These pattern recognition schemes are useful for identifying certain segments of the motion of a system. Those motion segments might be caused by a baton moving through the upbeat of a conducting gesture, a pen signing its user's signature, or a pair of dancing shoes stepping through a samba.

After estimating the motion and position of the device and recognizing any appropriate patterns, the microcontroller of the system may accordingly store system state data, activate output media, or communicate with external devices.

It was mentioned earlier that IMUs cannot be used for absolute position tracking. Since an INS calculates position by multiplying the output of an accelerometer by t^2 , any errors in the output of the accelerometer are also multiplied by t^2 ; accelerometer errors propagate by Equation 2. This leads to huge position errors: in just 60 seconds, a one-dimensional IMU using an accelerometer with an output noise level of just 0.004 g yields a position uncertainty of about 70 meters. Gyroscope errors increase linearly with time, via Equation 1, and are therefore typically less “harmful” than accelerometer errors. Because of their inherent accumulation of absolute positional errors, inertial sensors are much better suited for relative motion sensing or tracking. The accelerometer with 0.004 g noise gives a positional uncertainty of about 0.2 millimeter (mm) per cycle in a system as slow as 10 Hz; the uncertainty falls to about 80 micrometers per cycle in a 50-Hz system.

Pure inertial measurement systems are best suited for relative motion-sensing applications or for short-duration position-tracking applications. The smart-pen application is an example of a system where absolute position tracking of the pen tip would be desirable, but relative position tracking still allows a highly useful system. Given absolute position tracking, the IMU of the pen could essentially store analog “carbon” copies of what the pen had written. Due to inertial errors, the pen system could never accurately track the position of the pen tip on the paper for a useful duration, but in tracking the relative motions of the pen tip and continuously checking for verifiable characters, the IMU of the pen can recognize written characters and store the corresponding ASCII characters in memory.

Inertial navigational systems suffer most from the inherent buildup of positional errors associated with inertial sensors because INSs need to operate indefinitely for the duration of their “missions.” For navigation and other applications where system accuracy is more important than system autonomy, hybrid inertial motion-sensing systems are common. An inertial-optical motion estimator was discussed previously in the context of a proprioceptive video camera. Other hybrid inertial systems include inertial stellar missile

navigation systems² and inertial GPS (global position system) airplane guidance systems.

Applications requiring absolute rotation (orientation) tracking and relative translation tracking can accomplish this with a pure inertial system. In such a system, orientation is computed from the gyroscope outputs as usual—with a slightly growing time-dependent error as usual. Provided that the system is at rest occasionally, the accelerometers can accurately sense the orientation of the 1 g gravity acceleration vector. Given these occasional gravity-orientation updates, the system can correct its gyroscope-induced orientation errors for an indefinite duration. This is an example of a “zero velocity update.” Note this scheme will only work if the accelerometers being used are DC responsive (sense both steady-state and changing signals), that is, if they sense constant accelerations.

Accelerometers. This subsection provides an overview of the accelerometer, the translational-motion inertial sensor. Accelerometers sense and respond to translational accelerations; their outputs need to be integrated once with respect to time to get velocity and integrated twice to get position. Numerous technologies are used to implement today’s accelerometer designs, including piezoelectric, piezoresistive, and capacitive technologies. Here these technologies are described, and representative commercial accelerometer models are surveyed (see Table 2).

Regardless of sensing mechanism, the vast majority of modern accelerometers are of the pendulous type. Pendulous accelerometers feature an inertial *proof mass*, a segment of the sensor with known mass, that is mechanically coupled to the rest of the sensor by a spring-like hinge or tether—a cantilever structure is an example of a pendulous system. In this type of accelerometer, when the sensor is accelerated from rest, its proof mass tends to stay at rest, and the spring is deformed. It is this deformation of the spring (or the corresponding displacement of the proof mass) that is transduced to become the output signal of the sensor.

Piezoelectricity is a primary transducer technology used for pendulous accelerometers. Piezoelectric materials develop distributed electric charges when pressed or subjected to forces—they transform mechanical work to electrical output and vice versa. Piezoelectric accelerometers, like those made by AMP Inc., employ a cantilever design (Figure 3) with a piezoelectric film attached to the beam of the cantilever. When accelerated, the proof mass causes the

Table 2 Summary of selected accelerometers

Make/Model	Type	Input Range (g)	3 dB Frequency Response (Hz)	Output Noise @ 12 Hz(g)	Price Range (\$U.S.)	Size (in)
AMP ACH-04-08	piezoelectric	± 2 to ± 30	7 to 3300	0.02	25–50	.4X.4X.06
Entran EGAX	piezoresistive	0 to ± 10	0 to 240	0.00013	500	.14X.14X.3
IC sensors 3021	piezoresistive	0 to ± 10	0 to 400	.33 mg	100	.6X.6X.2
Silicon microstructures 7130	capacitive	0 to ± 10	0 to 500	0.1	100	.8X1X.3
Silicon designs 1210	capacitive	0 to ± 10	0 to 800	0.002	100	.35X.35X.1
Analog Devices ADXL05	differential capacitive	0 to ± 5	0 to 20†	0.002	15–30	0.4D×0.2
Analog Devices ADXL50	differential capacitive	0 to ± 50	0 to 20†	0.13	15–30	0.4D×0.2

† = These sensors have customized bandwidth
†† = Includes linearity, hysteresis, and repeatability

beam to deflect, which in turn causes the piezoelectric film to stretch, resulting in an electric charge difference (the output of the sensor). Piezoelectric accelerometers are called *active devices* because they generate their own signals and theoretically do not need to be powered. Since these sensors require a time-varying input (physical work), they do not respond to steady-state inputs such as the acceleration of gravity, hence they are called AC responsive (sense only changing signals).


Another common transducer technology used for accelerometers is piezoresistivity. Piezoresistive materials have the property of changing their electrical resistance under physical pressure or mechanical work. If a piezoresistive material is strained or deflected, its internal resistance will change and will stay changed until the original position of the material is restored. Piezoresistive accelerometers can sense static signals and are thus called DC sensors; they also require external power, so they are *passive*. Common piezoresistive pendulous accelerometers are made from micromachined silicon and are situated in a “double cantilever” manner, with proof mass suspended on two sides by piezoresistive springs. It should be noted that piezoresistive materials are also temperature-sen-

sitive (they are used in thermistors). This is often corrected by arranging the piezoresistors of a sensor in a Wheatstone bridge circuit.

Perhaps the most common type of consumer accelerometer is the capacitive pendulous accelerometer. Accelerometers with capacitive sensing elements typically use the proof mass as one plate of a capacitor and the base as the other. When the sensor is accelerated, the proof mass tends to move, and the voltage across the capacitor changes; this change in voltage corresponds to the applied acceleration. These sensors may be operated open-loop or closed-loop. Capacitive accelerometers are primarily made of micromachined silicon (like the piezoresistive type) and generally have higher sensitivities than piezoresistive models. The two piezoresistive accelerometers listed in Table 2 have sensitivities of about 10 millivolts per gram (mV/g), and the capacitive accelerometers in the same table have sensitivities an order of magnitude higher.

In terms of the self-motion-sensing applications described in the previous section, it is evident that the accelerometer market is approaching the desired size, price, and performance. Table 2 surveys representative commercially available accelerometers.

Figure 3 A piezoelectric pendulous three-degrees-of-freedom inertial sensor



Gyroscopes. This subsection briefly discusses the gyroscope, or gyro, the rotational-motion inertial sensor. There are two main branches of gyroscope design: *mechanical* gyros that operate using the inertial properties of matter, and *optical* gyros that operate using the inertial properties of light. Mechanical gyros, at present, are more commonly available for the types of applications discussed in this paper. Optical gyros are typically more expensive than mechanical gyros and are currently developed primarily for navigational applications.

Original gyro designs, called *gimbaled systems*, were based on the preservation of rotational momentum and consisted of a spinning disk or *rotor* connected to the moving body of interest by low-friction gimbals. When the body underwent rotation, the spinning rotor maintained its original orientation (preserving its angular momentum). Today's mechanical gyroscope designs are more commonly of the *vibrating* type. Instead of using angular momentum to sense rotation, vibrating gyroscopes use Coriolis acceleration effects to sense when they rotate. This is accomplished by establishing an oscillatory motion orthogonal to the input axis in a sensing element within the gyro. When

the sensor is rotated about its input axis, the vibrating element experiences Coriolis forces in a direction tangential to the rotation (orthogonal to the vibratory and rotating axes).

The double tuning fork gyro (Figure 4) is a popular vibrating gyro design. This sensor has two pairs of tines, with each pair having the same orientation. The double tines are made to oscillate antiphase, which yields no net motion but provides a varying radius about the input axis. When a tuning fork gyro is made to rotate about its input axis, its tines undergo sinusoidally varying Coriolis forces in the direction normal to the driven motion of the tines. When the tines are subjected to these Coriolis forces, they oscillate in the same direction as the forces. These oscillations are detected by the sensing elements of the gyro. Tuning fork gyros may use piezoelectric, piezoresistive, magnetic, or other types of sensing elements.

A gyro design using principles similar to the tuning fork design is a vibrating gyro whose cross section is an equilateral triangle. Murata Electronics Corporation's vibrating gyroscope, the Gyrostar**, employs this design. Figure 5 shows cross-sectional views of

Figure 4 A tuning fork gyro





Figure 5 Murata's Gyrostar



the gyro while at rest and while rotating. This design uses three piezoelectric ceramic elements, one attached to each outer wall. One driving element, C, is made to oscillate and the two other, A and B, act as sensors. The output signal of this device is the difference between A's signal and B's signal.

$$output(t) = a(t) - b(t)$$

When the gyro is at rest, the signals at A and B are equal, and therefore there is zero output, but under rotation, C experiences Coriolis forces, and there is a sinusoidally varying difference between A and B whose amplitude is proportional to the rotation rate.

In addition to vibrational gyros, the main gyroscopes in development are optical gyros. Optical gyroscopes

Table 3 Summary of selected gyroscopes

Make/Model	Type	Input Range (deg/s)	3 dB Bandwidth (Hz)	Output Noise @ 12 Hz (deg/s)	Bias Stability	Price Range (\$U.S.)	Size (in)
Murata Gyrostar	vibrating piezoelectric	0 to ± 90	0 to 7	0.45	0.9 deg/10 min	80–300	.8×.3×.3
Systron Donner GyroChip II Watson Ind.	double tuning fork	0 to ± 100	0 to 50	0.17	0.05 deg/sec	1000	2.7×1×.75
ARS-C132-1A	tuning fork	0 to ± 100	0 to 50	0.05	<10 deg/sec	700–800	2×3×1
Hitachi HGA-V	IFOG	0 to ± 60	not available	not available	5.0 deg/ $\sqrt{\text{hr}}$	1500	3×3×1
Hitachi HGA-D	IFOG	0 to ± 60	not available	not available	1.3 deg/ $\sqrt{\text{hr}}$	1250	6.7×4.7×2

operate based on “The Sagnac Effect.” These sensors use two light waves, traveling in opposite directions around a fixed path. When the device is rotated, the light wave traveling against the direction of rotation will complete a revolution faster than the light wave traveling with the rotation. This effect is detected by means of the phase difference in the two light waves. The ring laser gyro (RLG), zero lock-ring laser gyro (ZLG), and the interferometric fiber optical gyro (IFOG) are the main types of optical gyros currently being developed.

Some examples of commercially available optical gyros are Hitachi’s IFOG models HGA-V and HGA-D. Compared with the vibrational gyros mentioned above, these IFOGs are fairly large and expensive, but they exhibit superior bias stabilities (see Table 3).

Conclusion

Recently, a primary focus of technology has been to make ordinary objects *smarter*, that is, to embed *intelligence* into toys, tools, and clothing. Computational power is being redirected from the common computer as we know it into commonplace devices. In this environment where ordinary devices are smart, such devices need to be able to sense, compute, and communicate. One important sensing attribute is motion sensing. By knowing their own motions, devices such as pens, cameras, and shoes would be able to perform on new levels. These motor-cognizant and position-aware devices are called *proprioceptive devices*.

Inertial sensing has existed for several decades, but this technology has long been almost exclusively developed for large-scale size and cost applications

(i.e., military projects). Only in the past several years, with the advancement of silicon and micromachining fabrication techniques, have accelerometers and gyroscopes become available for use in consumer markets. These inertial sensors, devoid of external references and decreasing in size and price scales, are the logical motion-sensing choice for consumer proprioceptive device applications.

Common devices such as a pen or a pair of shoes become motion-aware with a system consisting of inertial sensors, a microcontroller, minimal supporting electronics, and whatever output media are deemed necessary for a given application. Programmed with motion estimation and pattern recognition algorithms, the IMUs begin to allow their host tools (i.e., pens and shoes) to serve as ubiquitous interfaces for new computational and informational abilities. A proprioceptive pen could not only save all the notes of a particular user, but could also fax a copy of those notes to his or her office. Motion-sensing applications that require more accurate position tracking are made possible with hybrid inertial systems in which two (or more) motion-sensing modes are used in parallel, each protecting the other’s vulnerabilities.

The commercial inertial market shows a number of prevalent inertial sensor technologies including piezoelectric, piezoresistive, and capacitive accelerometers and vibrational gyroscopes. These sensors are shrinking in size and price and are becoming useful in the context of the proprioceptive applications presented in this paper. Accelerometers and gyros are available for tens of dollars apiece and on the size scale of a pen cap. One shortcoming of inertial sensing is its inherent accumulation of positional errors that limits its

absolute position-tracking capabilities. Therefore, inertial sensors are best suited for relative motion-sensing applications. However, using zero velocity updates or other error-resetting methods, inertial motion-sensing systems can indefinitely monitor orientation, and given adequately fast clock speed and short motion sequences, an inertial tracking system can track position (i.e., smart pen). In order to allow the new proprioceptive device market to grow fully, inertial sensor manufacturers need to continue their current trend of making smaller, cheaper, and more accurate sensors.

Acknowledgments

Many thanks to the Media Lab's Things That Think and the News in the Future consortia for funding this work. I would also like to thank the reviewers of this paper for their constructive comments.

**Trademark or registered trademark of Murata Electronics Corporation.

Cited references

1. J. A. Schwarz, "Micro-Navigator (MICRON)," *AGARD Conference Proceedings No. 176 on Medium Accuracy Low Cost Navigation*, AGARD (1976), pp. 6/1-14.
2. D. Mackenzie, *Inventing Accuracy: A Historical Sociology of Nuclear Missile Guidance*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA (1990).
3. K. Kumar, N. Barbour, and J. M. Elwell Jr., "Emerging Low(er) Cost Inertial Sensors," presented at *22nd Joint Service Data Exchange for GN&C*, Scottsdale, AZ (October 31-November 3, 1994).
4. T. Starner, J. Makhoul, R. Schwartz, and G. Chou, "On-line Cursive Handwriting Recognition Using Speech Recognition Methods," *IEEE Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, Adelaide, Australia (April 1994), Vol. V, pp. 125-128.
5. R. N. Stiles, "Frequency and Displacement Amplitude Relations for Normal Hand Tremor," *Journal of Applied Physiology* **40**, No. 1, 44-54 (1976).
6. M. Massey and W. Bender, "Salient Stills: Process and Practice," *IBM Systems Journal* **35**, Nos. 3&4, 557-573 (1996, this issue).
7. C. Verplaetse, *Inertial-Optical Motion-Sensing Video Camera for Electronic Cinematography*, master's degree thesis proposal, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA (December 1995).
8. E. Foxlin and N. Durlach, "An Inertial Head Orientation Tracker with Automatic Drift Compensation for Use with HMD's," *Proceedings from VRST'94, Virtual Reality Software and Technology*, Singapore (August 23-26, 1994).
9. T. Starner, "Human-Powered Wearable Computing," *IBM Systems Journal* **35**, Nos. 3&4, 618-629 (1996, this issue).
10. W. E. Woodson, *Human Factors Design Handbook*, McGraw-Hill, New York (1981).
11. T. Marrin, *Toward an Understanding of Musical Gesture: Mapping Expressive Intention with the Digital Baton*, master's degree thesis proposal, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA (1995).
12. R. G. Watts and T. A. Bahill, *Keep Your Eye on the Ball: The Science and Folklore of Baseball*, W. H. Freeman and Company, New York (1990).

General references

- ADXL50 Monolithic Accelerometer with Signal Conditioning*, Product Data Sheet, Analog Devices, Norwood, MA (1995).
- Analog Accelerometer, Model 1210*, Product Data Sheet, Silicon Designs, Inc., Issaquah, WA (1995).
- Capacitive Accelerometer, 7130 Series*, Product Data Sheet, Silicon Microstructures Inc., Fremont, CA (1995).
- EGAX Miniature Accelerometer*, Product Data Sheet, Entran Sensors and Electronics, Fairfield, NJ (1993).
- J. Elwell, The Charles Stark Draper Laboratory, Inc., *Progress on Micromechanical Inertial Instruments*, published by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (1991).
- R. S. Figliola and D. E. Beasley, *Theory and Design for Mechanical Measurements*, John Wiley & Sons, New York (1991).
- N. Gershenfeld, *The Physics of Information Technology*, preprint, Cambridge University Press, New York (1995).
- GyroChip II: Solid State Rate Sensor*, Product Data Sheet, Systron Donner Inertial Division, Concord, CA (1995).
- A. Lawrence, *Modern Inertial Technology: Navigation, Guidance, and Control*, Springer-Verlag, New York (1993).
- T. Nakamura, "Vibration Gyroscope Employs Piezoelectric Vibrator," *JEE: Journal of Electronic Engineering*, 99-104 (September 1990). *Piezoresistive Accelerometer, Model 3021*, Product Data Sheet, I. C. Sensors, Milpitas, CA (1995).

Accepted for publication May 10, 1996.

Christopher Verplaetse MIT Media Laboratory, 20 Ames Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139-4307 (electronic mail: verp@media.mit.edu). Mr. Verplaetse received his B.S. in aerospace engineering from Boston University in 1994. He worked for a year at TechnoFrolics, a high-technology art firm in Boston, designing and building prototypes of kinetic sculptures. He is currently a graduate student and research assistant at the MIT Media Lab in the Physics and Media Group. His current research interests involve the design of motion-cognitive and motion-responsive systems.

Reprint Order No. G321-5630.