

## **Augmented and Virtual Reality for Spatial Reasoning**

### Author

Della-Bosca, Daniel, Bardini, Paul

### Published

2020

### Conference Title

EveryWorld 2020 Conference Proceedings

### Version

Version of Record (VoR)

### Rights statement

© 2020 Apple University Consortium (AUC). The attached file is reproduced here in accordance with the copyright policy of the publisher. Please refer to the conference's website for access to the definitive, published version.

### Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/416097>

### Link to published version

<https://auc.edu.au/everyworld/about/>

### Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

# Augmented and Virtual Reality for Spatial Reasoning

Daniel Della-Bosca  
Queensland College of Art  
Griffith University

Parklands Drive Southport, QLD 4222 226 Grey St. South Brisbane, QLD  
d.della-bosca@griffith.edu.au

Paul Bardini  
Queensland College of Art  
Griffith University

4101  
p.bardini@griffith.edu.au

## Abstract

The utilisation of mixed reality technologies in the classroom is proving to be of great pedagogical benefit. It is not just the tools, devices and techniques of Augmented virtual and mixed reality that have an impact on student learning it is the ontological shift in learners that is afforded by these technologies. This paper outlines the procedures of implementing AR and VR in a tertiary course for the express purpose of contributing to an accelerated understanding and application of spatial reasoning. The paper discusses the outcomes of two years of teaching a particular second year University course in 3D modelling.

## Keywords

Augmented Reality, Virtual Reality, Spatial Reasoning, Learning and Teaching, iPad

## Introduction

As an educator and educational designer for a range of courses in computer aided design, a frequent challenge is implementing strategies to build and strengthen the capacity for spatial reasoning. Thinking spatially is a capacity that is essential for a student to exercise in product, interior, immersive, games and interaction design.

One of the courses I convene and teach is called *3D Modelling for Interaction*. It is a second year course in the Bachelor of Creative and Interactive Media at the Queensland College of Art/ Griffith University. The protocols for the course are to build skills in Three Dimensional Modelling, particularly in parametric modelling and polygonal or mesh based modelling. Conventionally one single course would not teach two markedly different software platforms. This course however is unique in that the theoretical foundations for it are introduced in a first year course where students are exposed to the ontological implications of the technologies and processes of design using computers. The affordances and constraints of design using computers are explored in other subjects within the degree, but in this course the ontological positions are directly negotiated whilst training in two markedly different applications for three-dimensional modelling, namely Autodesk Fusion 360 and Autodesk 3DS Max.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission. Copyright 2020 AUC EveryWorld.

Mathematically speaking the differences are that Fusion 360 is a solid modeller and 3DS Max uses boundary representation (Requicha 1980) (Requicha and Voelcker 1983). Both software platforms will permit objects and environments to be created through multi variant processes, but those processes can vary fundamentally in their mathematical origins. Conventionally a product design student would follow the conventions of the engineering paradigm and learn solid/ parametric modelling, whereas a games design student would learn boundary representation or mesh-based modelling. This course is not bound by convention and strives to introduce students to the different strategies for three-dimensional modelling as afforded by the different platforms, for the express purpose of challenging constraints imposed by insulation. Descriptive Geometry as an ontological constraint is also discarded in this course. That is not to say however, that it has no use. Descriptive geometry in the form of protocols and techniques for orthographic projection is a necessary and relevant form of communication to others (González 2018) (Huang, Chen, and Lin 2017). The parametric interface of solid modellers however were based upon the rules of descriptive geometry and in turn these rules constrained the ways in which the user interpreted and manipulated form.

Terry Winograd and Fernando Flores write of this concern using the standpoint of design. 'In the act of design, we bring forth the objects and regularities in the world of our concern. We are engaged in an activity of interpretation that creates both possibilities and blindness (Winograd and Flores 1987). Descriptive Geometry although powerful in building the capacity for spatial reasoning also suffers the constraints of reasoning within a Euclidean paradigm, that is describing the three dimensional interpolation of two dimensional forms through processes such as extrusions, revolutions, and Boolean operations. Solid modellers are wonderful tools for designing, but they can reveal the blindness of the descriptive process. Similarly, polygon modelling software can reveal new possibilities at the expense of accurate and easily repeatable methods of description.

## Course Structure

The goal of the course is to expose students to the technical and theoretical potential and pitfalls of two somewhat contradictory computer aided design processes. This is achieved not by burying the students in theory that they don't understand yet but by experiential learning through problem-based projects. If the course began with reiterating the rules of descriptive geometry very little would be achieved as the constraints placed on the modelling process would limit the outcomes.

In terms of course objectives, *3D modelling for Interaction*, comprises two components, six weeks of individual projects using solid modelling and six weeks of group projects using polygonal modelling. Students are provided with a set of assignment options for both projects and given the opportunity to deviate from or add to that list. It is imperative that individual students and groups work on projects that motivate them<sup>1</sup>. As student motivation is a complex but necessarily personal set of issues, a suite of options to draw from has proved effective in previous courses. A secondary factor in allowing students to choose and help define their projects is that the time involved in one course is not enough to encompass the breadth of the software taught. It is imperative that students seek deeper learning of the components of the applications that they are learning and apply those components to solve problems that are meaningful for themselves. It is easy to become complacent as teacher in what is usually a pragmatic set of technical tasks in other institutions. Retaining a focus on problem based learning provides an opportunity for the otherwise mundane tasks of leaning software parameters to be enjoyable and challenging.

In 2018 and 2019, 126 students had completed in 3D modelling for interaction, divided amongst two campuses, serviced by two lecturers, Paul Bardini, specialising in solid modelling and myself, specialising in polygonal modelling. This offering was the second time in which a course had been split into two modules, so although the successes had been made in another course, this was the first time in which a computer aided design course had been so radically changed. From an external observer's position, this course may seem to exhibit novelty in many respects, but it is as a result of a long experience of teaching computer aided design that from our point of view the newly implemented elements of course design are logical decisions based upon student need. The decisions to implement somewhat contradictory modelling platforms in one course were in response to the diverse set of potentials we need to offer to our students in the newly formed Bachelor of Creative and interactive media. The graduate outcomes of the student contingent are diverse and not explicitly constrained to one discipline. One student, for example may graduate and require product design skills, and so skills in solid modelling will be of benefit. Whereas another student may build skills in projection mapping so polygonal modelling skills would be necessary. A course such as this is necessarily written to allow for a diverse set of experiences to be undertaken so that a great many opportunities be revealed to students. What is of importance, as well as course structure is the flexibility of delivery and the adaptability and guidance of the lecturers, a framework that could be construed as a Cognitive Apprenticeship (Brown, Collins, and Duguid 1989) (Huang, Chen, and Lin 2017) (Wu et al. 2012). The learning framework is firmly entrenched in Constructionist philosophies as espoused by Seymour Papert (Papert 1993), as building on Jean Piaget's theories of Constructivism. In regard to this course a guided tutorial is delivered at the commencement of each class to negotiate key technical and conceptual issues pertaining to the task and the rest of the class is devoted to guidance and problem solving whilst students applied newly learnt procedure to their individual or group project. The crucial test of modelling

abilities in a technical and conceptual sense is for students to realise their solutions to project problems in a tangible sense. Papert's ideas of experiential learning are crucial to how this course functions as the entire course is concerned with building the students skills and confidence not just in using software effectively but applying it to tangible problems.

The key concern of a course such as this is how students can experience a tangible solution to two diverse problem based assignments, within a short period of time. A previous solution to providing tangible solutions to problems incorporated the use of additive fabrication or 3D Printing. This occurred in a course entitled *advanced fabrication*. It was necessary in this present course to have faster solutions as 3D printing firstly can still take significant time to acquire the requisite skills, and secondly 3d printing is much more time consuming to adapt to modelled forms of larger scale and intricacy.

## Virtual Prototyping

Augmented and Virtual solutions offer viable and seemingly tangible outcomes to a three dimensionally modelled product and particularly a modelled environment filled with furnishings and artefacts and mapped in materials. The decision to implement the use of augmented technologies in the classroom were based purely on purpose and not novelty, as it has been noted by other researchers that the use of AR by educators can be ad hoc (Billinghurst and Dünser 2012). Having spent research time experimenting with various AR frameworks, it was a calculated decision to use *Sketchfab* as the platform to experience and test 3D modelled outcomes (<https://sketchfab.com>). A professional *Sketchfab* account was procured for the University and in the classroom, students were guided in the creation of personal accounts so that as they worked towards resolved outcomes, they could effectively export and upload models to *Sketchfab* for experience and testing using a suite of the latest *iPads* using *ARKit*. *Sketchfab* is an ideal platform for experiencing modelled objects as it is multiplatform, using web, iOS and android platforms effectively to view objects and scenes in AR and VR.



Figure 1 Chair Modelled in 3DS Max by Cam Scott

Simple singular objects such as the chair in figure 1 were the first to be tested in AR as these types of objects could be tested for scale against a backdrop of real world proportions. Furniture items could first be tested for scale and secondly for application for material and texture. The impact on experiential learning is almost immediate not because the object in AR appears real but because it is believable, and it is believable because the barriers to disbelief are stripped away. The objects and environments modelled do not just reside within the computer in an abstract sense, they appear tangible as they can now be experienced at human scale against the backdrop of the real world. The experience of the object or environment in AR becomes, ontologically speaking, not just a visual representation, but a sensorial representation.

The object, in this case the chair can be experienced visually and haptically, it can be experienced and assessed in relation to the body that experiences it. It may seem like a novelty to a newcomer to these technologies but for students learning the procedures of three dimensional modelling and applying these procedures to seemingly tangible outcomes it provides a leap in spatial reasoning. In turn the AR frameworks simply become the new tools to model and test in increasingly swift design iterations. The successes of 3D modelling for interaction are not in the resolved and polished outcomes but in the flaws unveiled by testing quickly in AR.

There are multiple sets of interrelated procedures for modelling valid forms using solid and polygonal modellers, but little tolerance for error is acceptable for export for use in additive and subtractive manufacturing processes. The use of *Sketchfab* to import FBX files from *Autodesk Fusion* and *3DS Max* helps reveal errors and inefficiencies within the design process, in terms of scale, proportion, modelling procedure and operands using boolean union, intersection and subtraction to name but a few. Figure two demonstrates a well modelled replica of a Roman stool which in *3DS Max* is quite convincing and shows careful attention to procedure and detail. Import to *Sketchfab* however reveals issues with the polygon mesh for the fabric that is then transferred to the UVW map for the material. If the teaching and learning experiences remain fixed to one software application the students would experience what is possible and what is blinding within that software application (Winograd and Flores 1987). Translating to other platforms and experiencing forms in AR helps to expose that blindness.



Figure 2 Roman Stool Modelled in 3DS Max by Emily Zamattia

Contextually modelling a roman era stool and situating it within a contemporary environment also enables a correlation between ergonomic principles applied to furniture from differing eras. Hannah Schraffenberger and Edwin van der Heide write of the relationships between the virtual and the real, inclusive of spatial relationships and content-based relationships (Schraffenberger and van der Heide 2014) (Schraffenberger and van der Heide 2013).

Emily Zamattia's Roman stool demonstrates the potential for coexistence of the virtual object in physical space, both in terms of spatial relationships and content-based relationships, of the physiological correlation to form and of the tactile associations to materials and textures. Such an unravelling of potential is not easily possible in a conventional computer aided design course, but the immediacy of negotiating the relationships of virtual content in physical space permits this possibility.

A directly haptic association of virtual object and the human body is demonstrated in figure 3. This example was carefully crafted in *Autodesk Fusion* and exported as an FBX file to *Sketchfab*. The modelled set of objects demonstrate proportional structures relative to the human body designed and modelled quite accurately. Accessing the *Sketchfab* file using the *iPad* and *ARKit* help reveal and validate the relationship between the model and the body



Figure 3 Gauntlet modelled in Autodesk Fusion by Emily Zamattia

As Schraffenberger and van der Heide accurately state. 'The virtual not only relates to the real, the real also relates to the virtual. The spatial and /or content based relationships are *between* them (Schraffenberger and van der Heide 2014); Emily Zamattia's gauntlet evidences what the interactions between real and virtual can offer. It is in this liminal space that rapid advances can be made in the acquisition of new skills by their examination and verification using AR platforms.

The interactions of the object modelled in computer and the physical body is a very difficult and time consuming task particularly for novices just beginning to learn the software. The gauntlet is on of our best examples of rapid acquisition of technical skills in modelling, and conceptual skills in spatial reasoning that we have witnessed.



Figure 4 Gauntlet by Emily Zamattia captured using ARKit.

Some of the outcomes from the 3D Modelling for Interaction class, particularly environments modelled in *3DS Max* were best accessed in VR devices, for that purpose the entire models were exported prior to resolution to *Sketchfab* and navigated via Browser with the *HTC Vive* headset. The environments were the most difficult assignment of the course as it requires careful adherence to modelling protocols and the appropriate sharing of files inclusive of models and materials within groups. The environments are a real test of modelling ability and export to VR is certainly not designed to penalise students for error but rather to reveal problems through navigation in VR so that they could be amended by returning to the modelling process.

The Villa as shown in figure 5 is not perfect but is easily navigable in VR so that modifications can be made to the Max file and retested.

Navigation of the *Sketchfab* file is quite straightforward in VR using the *HTC Vive* and its teleport function. The immediacy of navigation affords almost instantaneous feedback as to the validity of the file, particularly its spatial connection to the viewer. Scale and proportion are the first to be tested as the students navigate their created space for the first time.



Figure 5 Roman Villa by Sarah Bidlake, Eva Chan, Jeffrey Handebo, Ning Yi Yeoh and Emily Zamattia

Many students reported that they knew instantly what to fix as soon as they could view their environment in VR, and student groups were eager to return immediately to their files to modify their models and return to navigating and testing the environment in the next class. As an educator it was inspirational to witness such remarkable advances in spatial reasoning. I have taught polygon modelling for many years and know from experience how difficult it is for most students to grasp the essentials of computer aided design let alone achieve mastery.

Future iterations of this course will begin translation of objects and scenes into virtual spaces earlier. More *iPad* and portable VR headsets have been purchased for class use and will be available for continuous experience and testing. This being the first run of this particular course some of the outcomes can be introduced early to discuss the potential of the use of AR and VR. It is also expected that many more

student users enrolled in this course from next year will have personal devices able to utilise ARKit or ARCore thus rendering the technologies further into the background of learning activities whilst permitting more time for experiential learning.

## The Ontology of Prototyping

Students were informally surveyed in 2019.

Many students reported that they knew instantly what to fix as soon as they could view their environment in VR, and student groups were eager to return immediately to their files to modify their models and return to navigating and testing the environment in the next class.

In 2020 students were formally surveyed with ethics approval GU ref no: 2020/375. The results, although impacted by the rapid shift to fully online classes, showed that

1. Students reported that using augmented reality had helped with spatial thinking
2. Students reported a small improvement in understanding the 3D modelling process by using Sketchfab and AR.

Students noted in the survey that they wish that they had access to VR devices in the first half of 2020 to better understand their models and environments. But interestingly those that commented still presumed that only a high-end viewer is capable of VR and had not tried their own mobile devices.

Apart from the technical challenges of 3D Modelling and subsequent translation to Sketchfab, all students in the course have a set of journal tasks to complete that are critical and contextual. There are two theory readings to comment on. One concerns affordance and the second is a paper by Udo Kannengeisser, called 'The Ontology of Computer Aided Design'. Students are not required to read Kannengeisser's paper, but those who do take up the significant challenge that it is, fare better in their technical tasks.

Students are asked to reflect twice on the readings at different stages, and perhaps the best acknowledgement of learning comes from students such as this who recognised what went wrong by evaluating it with Kannengeisser's 'Three world structure'

*'In my works, my focus is more Object-centred then Process-centred. I focus on the object as it is and forget about the rest of the environment as a whole. this became apparent when I changed the size of the environment. I might have gotten more space but I failed to take into account how that would effect the other objects. My interpreted world was far different from my expected world'. (Journal extract from a student in 2019)*

The best outcome one could ask for is a continued and considered use of mixed reality platforms to test and communicate 3D models. What we now see after the conclusion of this course is the continued and refined use of Sketchfab by our students. The technologies themselves, (Autodesk software and Sketchfab) afford the depth in learning. but the student's critical analysis of theory, object and process influences ontological position. There are student outcomes from this course that evidence the growing awareness of an individual's stake in the construction of their reality. Spatial thinking is part of that ontological position. The modelling, testing and evaluation of computer designed objects and environments helps in the understanding that reality is not separate from knowledge.

## References

- [1] Bowman, M., Debray, S. K., and Peterson, L. L. 1993. Reasoning about naming systems. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* 15, 5 (Nov. 1993), 795-825. DOI= <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/161468.16147>.
- [2] Ding, W. and Marchionini, G. 1997. *A Study on Video Browsing Strategies*. Technical Report. University of Maryland at College Park.
- [3] Fröhlich, B. and Plate, J. 2000. The cubic mouse: a new device for three-dimensional input. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (The Hague, The Netherlands, April 01 - 06, 2000). CHI '00. ACM, New York, NY, 526-531. DOI= <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/332040.332491>.
- [4] Tavel, P. 2007. *Modeling and Simulation Design*. AK Peters Ltd., Natick, MA.
- [5] Sannella, M. J. 1994. *Constraint Satisfaction and Debugging for Interactive User Interfaces*. Doctoral Thesis. UMI Order Number: UMI Order No. GAX95-09398., University of Washington.
- [6] Forman, G. 2003. An extensive empirical study of feature selection metrics for text classification. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 3 (Mar. 2003), 1289-1305.
- [7] Brown, L. D., Hua, H., and Gao, C. 2003. A widget framework for augmented interaction in SCAPE. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* (Vancouver, Canada, November 02 - 05, 2003). UIST '03. ACM, New York, NY, 1-10. DOI= <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/964696.964697>.
- [8] Yu, Y. T. and Lau, M. F. 2006. A comparison of MC/DC, MUMCUT and several other coverage criteria for logical decisions. *J. Syst. Softw.* 79, 5 (May. 2006), 577-590. DOI= <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2005.05.030>.
- [9] Spector, A. Z. 1989. Achieving application requirements. In *Distributed Systems*, S. Mullender, Ed. ACM Press Frontier Series. ACM, New York, NY, 19-33. DOI= <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/90417.90738>.

