

**Tactile, Spatial Interfaces for Computer-Aided Design
Superimposing Physical Media and Computation**

by
Dorothy J. Shamonsky

Bachelor of Fine Arts, Rhode Island School of Design, 1977
Master of Science in Visual Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1984

Submitted to the Department of Architecture
in the Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy in Architecture:
Design and Computation**

at the
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
September 2003

©2003 Dorothy J. Shamonsky. All rights reserved.
The author hereby grants MIT permission to reproduce and publicly distribute paper and
electronic copies of this thesis document in whole or in part.

Signature of Author

Dorothy J. Shamonsky
Department of Architecture
August 8, 2003

Certified by

William J. Mitchell
Dean, School of Architecture and Planning
Academic Head, Program in Media Arts and Sciences
Thesis Supervisor

Accepted by

Stanford Anderson
Chairman, Committee on Graduate Students
Head, Department of Architecture

**Tactile, Spatial Interfaces for Computer-Aided Design
Superimposing Physical Media and Computation**

by
Dorothy J. Shamonsky

Dissertation Committee Members:

William J. Mitchell

Dean, School of Architecture and Planning
Academic Head, Program in Media Arts and Sciences
Thesis Supervisor

Glorianna Davenport

Principal Research Associate, Interactive Cinema
Media Laboratory
Thesis Reader

Joseph Paradiso

Associate Professor of Media Arts and Sciences
Co-Director, Things That Think
Media Laboratory
Thesis Reader

Tactile, Spatial Interfaces for Computer-Aided Design Superimposing Physical Media and Computation

by
Dorothy J. Shamonsky

Submitted to the Department of Architecture
on August 8, 2003
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy in Architecture:
Design and Computation**

ABSTRACT

Computer-aided design (CAD) systems have become invaluable in three-dimensional creative design fields such as architecture and landscape architecture. However, these digital tools have not replaced the use of physical tools and materials as envisioned by the early developers of CAD. Instead, most designers have added digital media to their suite of physical media, gaining the benefits of both realms and using each where it is most advantageous.

Given current CAD systems and how they are being used, two significant problems are apparent. First, the side-by-side physical/digital work environment has resulted in the need to frequently digitize and print in order to switch between physical and digital representations. This process is often time-consuming, costly, and frustrating. Second and more fundamental, the standard graphical user interface (GUI), although appropriate to some tasks, is restrictive as the only interface to CAD, because it lacks tactile and spatial qualities. Interacting with physical media such as paper, cardboard, and clay is a multisensory, spatial experience. Interacting in a GUI may be visual, but our other senses and spatial abilities remain underutilized. Recent interface design research includes embedding or augmenting physical artifacts with computation as one remedy to the limitations of the GUI.

This dissertation investigates whether superimposing physical and digital media to create new interfaces for CAD has merit. Findings are presented from experiments performed with Illuminating Clay, a prototype interface that superimposes modeling clay and topographic analysis. The objective was to discover whether these new kinds of interfaces could successfully combine the cognitive, motor, and emotional advantages of physical media with the capabilities of computation. Findings indicate that Illuminating Clay can indeed supplement a designer's eyeball analysis with more-accurate feedback while retaining the tactile and spatial advantages of working with a physical material. Salient issues pertaining to the design of tangible, and augmented-reality user interfaces were raised by these experiments: what the appropriate scale limitations should be, what the appropriate type of feedback is from computation, and whether real-time feedback is necessary.

Thesis Supervisor: **William J. Mitchell**
Dean, School of Architecture and Planning
Academic Head, Program in Media Arts and Sciences

**Tactile, Spatial Interfaces for Computer-Aided Design
Superimposing Physical Media and Computation**

by
Dorothy J. Shamonsky

Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA
September 2003

To my parents, Matthew and Anne Shamonsky

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation was made possible because of the wisdom and patience of my advisor, William J. Mitchell. It has been a privilege and a pleasure to work with him, and I give him my sincerest admiration and appreciation. I also want to thank my readers, Glorianna Davenport and Joseph Paradiso, for their time, energy, and insightful comments.

I am especially grateful to Hiroshi Ishii for his helpful comments about my research, and for allowing me to work with him and the development team of Illuminating Clay: Carlo Ratti, Ben Piper, and Yao Wang. Eran Ben-Joseph in the Planning Department generously opened his class, Illuminating Sites, to my research, and agreed to be interviewed along with Kirt Rieder and Hope Hasbrouck of the Harvard Graduate School of Design.

For assistance with my research, I want to thank all who volunteered to be test subjects. I also want to acknowledge the diligent work of UROPS, John Jhee, Liz Evans, and Alycia Hillman.

In the years leading up to this dissertation, the teaching of Janet H. Murray and Rosiland Picard inspired and shaped many of my ideas. The pieces to this process came together only with the kind help of the staff in the Dean's office of the School of Architecture and Planning, especially Cynthia Wilkes, and also Peggy McNally, Diane McLaughlin, and Dineen Doucette. Renee Caso, in the School of Architecture office was always helpful and kept me on track.

My family has been extremely supportive while I have pursued this degree. I want to thank them all—Mom, Dad, Ellen, Margie, Andy, Isabel, Lillian, Iris, Jim, and Larry—for their unending encouragement and faith. Andy Bennett, Ellen Sebring, and Ellen Bingham generously offered editing assistance. Carol Kaufman and Kate Purdie kindly offered advice and support. And Pam Gallup, Maureen Haviland, Cathy Mara, Julia Miner, and Mary Pappas always responded to my pleas for babysitting help.

PREFACE

As I worked toward this doctoral degree, I periodically received e-mail messages that began “That degree you always wanted may be closer than you think!” After a momentary glimmer of hope that a higher power was delivering me from a lot of hard work, I realized that this was spam from a place that sells college degrees. Receiving these messages was a blunt reminder that although cheap fixes can be had instantly, significant achievements of creativity, skill, and learning are the result of a long process of applied, focused effort. Fortunately, a good tool can increase efficiency to a great degree. For example, word processing enabled me to write this dissertation faster than my predecessors on typewriters, because I didn’t have to retype the manuscript every time I wanted to make changes.

Ironically, with their promise of “smarter-faster-better,” computers have brought confusion to ideas of efficiency, skill, achievement, and quick fixes. A couple years ago, veteran interface designer Bill Verplanck taught a week-long seminar at the MIT Media Lab on sketching for interface designers. Although I felt comfortable with my sketching skills—I spent many hours in drawing classes as an art school undergraduate—I took the class to glean some of Verplanck’s wisdom. Students in the class energetically participated in the exercises, but as I chatted with some of them during breaks, I was surprised to discover how many of these students were hoping to learn a few easy techniques that would leapfrog them into becoming competent drawers or, better yet, hoping to find out what software could instantly improve the look of their drawings.

The opposite reality became evident to me as I was conducting the research for this dissertation: *Good designers design well no matter what tools or materials they have access to. Also, skilled, experienced designers use tools and materials more efficiently and effectively than novices do.* I acknowledge that this may change in the future when and if computation achieves significantly more intelligence than it has now.

I have to admit that in the past I, too, have indulged in fantasies of quick fixes, which is how I eventually came to write this dissertation. As an undergraduate sculpture major, I can recall sitting in my studio overwhelmed by the cost of materials, and exhausted by tools that weren’t working properly as end-of-semester deadlines loomed. I wondered, “Wouldn’t it be great if I could simply visualize a sculpture and have it materialize instantly?” I’m sure that others, tired and working late, have shared this fantasy. I wished

that I could work directly with my visualizations, as if they were shimmering life-size, three-dimensional holograms floating in space. I imagined that I could control my creation with gestures, like a conductor directing an orchestra. My baton would be a handy pointer or magical pencil. If the piece was not quite right, I would wave my wand like a wizard to rearrange the parts. Once satisfied, *poof!* The hologram would be changed into a material form.

When I first started working with computer graphics, it felt a bit like my fantasy. But my shimmering hologram of a virtual sculpture was, instead, a crude line drawing on a small screen. I could control it only by typing complicated, time-consuming commands on a keyboard. No gestures. No instant solutions. Yet I could see the potential of computer technology as well as the next person could, and became involved with digital media whole-heartedly.

What I did not see coming was how my work environment would change over the next couple of decades as computers became common design tools. I experienced what I think of as the “office-ication” of my studio. As an undergraduate, my sculpture studio was filled with natural light, texturally rich materials, and musty, invigorating smells. My tools required a variety of muscle/motor control skills and reverberated with a range of sounds, from the ping of a small hammer to the screaming of a skill saw. A decade later, working as an interface designer, my studio was considerably more sterile, with the shades pulled low and the dominant sounds being the whir of the CPU and the clicking of keys. I often would sit for hours, barely moving except for sliding the mouse around and typing. My studio had transformed from sensory-rich and playful to efficient and rote. My body—senses and muscle/motor control skills—were considerably less engaged by my new tools and materials. Although I wanted the capabilities of computation, the reality was not satisfactory.

My motivation for this dissertation is simple and comes from my experience as a designer. I want the fluid, fast, ephemeral qualities of the digital medium—something much like our thoughts—but with interfaces that are more embodied, like my old-fashioned textured tools and materials. I believe that these kinds of interfaces can better serve the needs and desires of designers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| ABSTRACT | 5 |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | 9 |
| PREFACE | 10 |
| Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION | 17 |
| 1.1 Overview | |
| 1.2 Designers Are Visual <i>and</i> Tactile | |
| 1.3 Current CAD Interfaces | |
| 1.4 The Digital Medium | |
| 1.5 Using the Appropriate Medium for a Task | |
| 1.6 Comparing Physical Media and Digital Media | |
| 1.7 Physical Media and Knowing-in-Action | |
| 1.8 Limitations of the GUI | |
| 1.9 An Uneasy Marriage of Physical and Digital Realms | |
| 1.10 Problems with Current CAD Interfaces and Possible Solutions | |
| 1.11 Superimposing | |
| 1.12 Background to Superimposing | |
| 1.13 A Prototype: Illuminating Clay | |
| 1.14 The Experiments | |
| 1.15 Summary | |
| 1.16 How This Thesis Is Organized | |
| Chapter 2: THE PRACTICE: VISION VS. REALITY | 31 |
| 2.1 The Vision: An All-Virtual Work Environment | |
| 2.2 The Reality: Side-by-Side | |
| 2.2.1 <i>When</i> Designers Use Specific Tools and Materials | |
| 2.2.2 <i>Why</i> Designers Choose Specific Tools and Materials | |
| 2.2.3 Best Practice | |
| 2.3 Summary | |
| Chapter 3: A MEDIUM OF EXPRESSION | 41 |
| 3.1 Defining a Medium | |
| 3.1.1 Properties | |
| 3.1.2 Usability | |
| 3.1.3 Appeal | |
| 3.2 Choosing a Medium | |
| 3.3 Becoming Skilled with a Medium | |
| 3.3.1 Manual Skill | |
| 3.4 Summary | |
| Chapter 4: QUALITIES OF PHYSICAL MEDIA COMPARED WITH DIGITAL MEDIA | 51 |
| 4.1 Qualities | |
| 4.1.1 Physical Media | |
| 4.1.2 Digital Media | |
| 4.1.3 Comparisons | |
| 4.2 The Qualities Discussed | |

| | |
|---|----|
| 4.2.1 Tactile | |
| 4.2.2 Visual | |
| 4.2.3 Aural | |
| 4.2.4 Olfactory | |
| 4.2.5 Spatial and Representative of Space | |
| 4.2.6 Ambiguous and Explicit | |
| 4.2.7 Precise | |
| 4.2.8 Persistent and Ephemeral | |
| 4.2.9 Physically and Logically Transformable | |
| 4.2.10 Fast and Real-time | |
| 4.2.11 Intelligent | |
| 4.2.12 Reworkable | |
| 4.2.13 Copyable | |
| 4.2.14 Portable | |
| 4.3 Summary | |
| Chapter 5: THE EXPERIENCE OF A PHYSICAL MEDIUM | 71 |
| 5.1 The Senses | |
| 5.1.1 Constructionist Learning | |
| 5.2 Interacting with Physical Media | |
| 5.2.1 Discrete Physical Media | |
| 5.2.2 More-Complex State-Spaces | |
| 5.3 Summary | |
| Chapter 6: SUPERIMPOSING | 77 |
| 6.1 My Hypothesis | |
| 6.1.1 The Problem Restated | |
| 6.1.2 Possible Solutions | |
| 6.1.3 Superimposing Physical Media and Computation | |
| 6.1.4 Superimposing Explained | |
| 6.1.5 Foundations of Superimposing | |
| 6.1.6 Instances of Bootstrapping Physical and Digital Media | |
| 6.2 A Vision of the Future Design Studio | |
| 6.2.1 Hybrid Operations | |
| 6.2.2 Linking and Unlinking | |
| 6.3 Summary | |
| Chapter 7: RELATED PROTOTYPES | 89 |
| 7.1 Construction Kits | |
| 7.2 Smart Sculptural Materials | |
| 7.3 Tangible User Interfaces | |
| 7.4 Displays on Physical Materials | |
| 7.5 New Musical Instruments | |
| 7.6 Computer-generated Tactile Feedback | |
| Chapter 8: EXPERIMENTS WITH A NEW PROTOTYPE: ILLUMINATING CLAY | 97 |
| 8.1 Description of Illuminating Clay | |
| 8.2 The Experiments | |
| 8.2.1 Goal of the Experiments | |
| 8.2.2 Method | |

| | | |
|--------------|--|-----|
| 8.2.3 | Establishing the task | |
| 8.2.4 | Structure of the Experiments | |
| 8.2.5 | Recruiting Subjects | |
| 8.2.6 | Physical Setting | |
| 8.2.7 | Consent | |
| 8.2.8 | Demonstrations and Directions | |
| 8.2.9 | Known Shortcomings of the Experiments | |
| Chapter 9: | PROTOCOL ANALYSIS: THE FINDINGS | 107 |
| 9.1 | Format of the Analysis Presentation | |
| 9.2 | Analysis of Individual (Short-Term Task) | |
| 9.2.1 | Overview, Individual | |
| 9.2.2 | Individual, Part 1: Paper Tool Set | |
| 9.2.3 | Individual, Part 2: Illuminating Clay Tool Set | |
| 9.3 | Analysis of Pair (Short-Term Task) | |
| 9.3.1 | Overview, Pair | |
| 9.3.2 | Pair, Part 1: Illuminating Clay Tool Set | |
| 9.3.3 | Pair, Part 2: Clay Tool Set | |
| 9.4 | Student Subjects (Short-Term Task) | |
| 9.4.1 | Overview, Group 1 | |
| 9.4.2 | Group 1: Illuminating Clay Tool Set | |
| 9.4.3 | Overview, Group 2 | |
| 9.4.4 | Group 2: Clay Tool Set | |
| 9.4.5 | Overview, Group 3 | |
| 9.4.6 | Group 3: Paper Tool Set | |
| 9.5 | The Class (Long-Term Project) | |
| 9.5.1 | Overview, the Class | |
| 9.5.2 | Class Log | |
| 9.6 | Summary of Findings | |
| 9.6.1 | General | |
| 9.6.2 | Short-Term Tasks | |
| 9.6.3 | Long-Term Project | |
| Chapter 10: | CONCLUSIONS | 141 |
| 10.1 | Experiments with Illuminating Clay | |
| 10.1.1 | Findings | |
| 10.1.2 | Limitations of the Research | |
| 10.2 | Lessons Learned About Tangible and Augmented-Reality User Interfaces | |
| 10.2.1 | Appropriate Scale | |
| 10.2.2 | Type and Amount of Feedback | |
| 10.2.3 | Real-Time or Not | |
| 10.3 | Next Steps | |
| 10.3.1 | Discrete Tests Specific to Illuminating Clay | |
| 10.3.2 | Discrete Tests General to Tangible and Augmented-Reality User Interfaces | |
| 10.4 | Summary | |
| NOTES | | 153 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | | 157 |

