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Figure 1: MorpheesPlug is a toolkit to prototype shape-changing interfaces. (a) Users first use software to design a widget that can express shape-change, such as length or curvature change. (b) They then 3D print the widget with an off-the-shelf 3D printer. (c) They plug the widget into a control module that can adjust air pressure in the widget and actuate the widget. (d) An example application. The printed shape-changing interface holds the umbrella and gently pushes the umbrella towards user so that users can be reminded to take the umbrella.

ABSTRACT
Toolkits for shape-changing interfaces (SCIs) enable designers and researchers to easily explore the broad design space of SCIs. However, despite their utility, existing approaches are often limited in the number of shape-change features they can express. This paper introduces MorpheesPlug, a toolkit for creating SCIs that covers seven of the eleven shape-change features identified in the literature. MorpheesPlug is comprised of (1) a set of six standardized widgets that express the shape-change features with user-definable parameters; (2) software for 3D-modeling the widgets to create 3D-printable pneumatic SCIs; and (3) a hardware platform to control the widgets. To evaluate MorpheesPlug we carried out ten open-ended interviews with novice and expert designers who were asked to design a SCI using our software. Participants highlighted the ease of use and expressivity of the MorpheesPlug.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Shape-changing interfaces (SCIs) are emerging as a new generation of devices that can change their shapes to support dynamic affordances [9], leverage human dexterity [37], and support the personalization of physical interfaces [22]. The current design space of SCIs covers a wide range of features [20], including variable length [9], volume [22], curvature [50], and porosity [5]. The literature has featured numerous prototype systems exploring a huge variety of shapes, shape-changes, interactions, implementation techniques, and applications.

Despite the potential of SCIs to enhance the development of the next generation of interactive devices, there are still many challenges faced by the field [2]. One major barrier to the creation of SCIs is the lack of standardized toolkits for exploration and development [2]. Current approaches require substantial time, effort, domain-specific knowledge, and complex tools to create even simple SCIs. Unlike software-only user interfaces, physical UIs—including
SCIs—interact with physical reality, requiring the addition of hardware components. Researchers have developed physical toolkits to simplify creating physical UIs, providing standardized hardware widget libraries [3, 11] and tools to ease the communication between the digital and physical worlds [17].

SCIs introduce new problems, because there are no standardized widget libraries, actuation methods, or design tools. It means that to experiment with or develop such UIs requires users need to design, fabricate, and implement all aspects of shape-changing systems. As a result, the literature illustrates many one-off application-specific SCIs [44]. Alexander et al. note that a primary necessary strand of the field is to create “a standard platform for hardware prototyping”.

There are two primary challenges to creating such a standardized toolkit for prototyping SCIs. The first is actuation: given a desired shape change, how to choose a technical method to cause that transformation. Researchers have identified dozens of shape-change features [20] (e.g., length) and actuation methods [44] (e.g., servo motor), but there are no standards or guidelines for how a user can select a method to implement a desired feature.

Closely coupled with the issue of actuation is that of fabrication: how to physically instantiate an actuation method that causes the desired shape-change. Toolkits for physical UIs offer pre-made physical widgets that let users concentrate on applications [3, 11], but the bulk of the SCI literature focuses on novel techniques (e.g., [35]) or applications rather than broadly reusable widgets. The result is that SCIs tend to be one-offs, custom-made for a specific application, and require extensive technical prototyping skills.

As a first step towards addressing these challenges, we introduce MorpheesPlug, a toolkit aimed at simplifying the design, fabrication, and actuation of SCIs. MorpheesPlug does so by following in the footsteps of successful GUI and physical computing toolkits: providing physical widgets, control hardware and firmware, and a design environment. MorpheesPlug simultaneously addresses the actuation and fabrication challenges by providing six pneumatically powered shape-changing widgets which express a broad range of shape-change features from the Morphees+ framework [20]. Users can customize these widgets and incorporate them in their own SCI designs, eliminating the need to choose an actuation method for specific shape-change features and simplifying the design process. MorpheesPlug widgets are printable on commodity 3D printers with standard flexible filament, significantly lowering the barrier to prototyping SCIs.

With MorpheesPlug, we make the following contributions:

1. We provide six customizable, 3D-printable widgets that express a wide range of shape changes via pneumatic actuation.
2. We characterize widget performance over a variety of printing parameters, illustrating the range of shape changes available.
3. We implement and publically share design software and control module for the widgets.
4. We demonstrate the utility of our toolkit via five proof-of-concept applications and a qualitative user study.

2 RELATED WORK

MorpheesPlug is a toolkit that simplifies creating and exploring SCIs, using pneumatic widgets. As such, it is situated at the intersection of SCIs, physical UI toolkits, and pneumatically actuated soft UIs and robotics. In this section, we situate MorpheesPlug in the context of toolkit research, both for SCIs and physical UIs. Then we look into how pneumatic actuation was used for shape-changes.

2.1 Toolkits for Shape-changing Interfaces

Alexander et al. [2] identified twelve grand challenges in SCIs research. Although many types of SCIs have been explored in the literature [44], most are custom-made, one-off projects developed to illustrate an interaction technique, actuator, or application; hence, Alexander et al. [2] call for the development of toolkits for SCI to “dramatically lower the barrier to implementation”. They call for three advances in research: a hardware prototyping platform, a software application layer, and tools for end-user programming. To these three we add a fourth important need, adapted from Ledo et al. [25]: empowering new audiences, implying ease of acquisition or fabrication. A number of projects in the literature aim to overcome these barriers, either by explicitly presenting toolkits for SCIs or by addressing one or more of these challenges.

Ldeo et al. [25] define toolkits as “present[ing] users with a programming or configuration environment consisting of many defined permutable building blocks, structures, or primitives, with a sequencing of logical or design flow affording a path of least resistance”. While few papers in the SCI space explicitly identify their work as presenting toolkits, in this section we include research which addresses any aspects which could be useful as part of a toolkit.

Perhaps the most comprehensive example of a SCI toolkit is ShapeClip [14], a set of 1D linear actuators controlled by light emitted from standard computer screens. While it addresses Alexander et al.’s three research threads, the ShapeClip hardware consists of complex electromechanical components not readily accessible to casual users. The hardware also limits the types of shape-change to those that can be expressed via length feature.

Other systems, while not explicitly identified as toolkit research, present useful hardware building blocks for SCIs. One approach is to use electromechanical actuators as a driver of shape-change; for example, perhaps the earliest example approaching an SCI toolkit was Topobo [38], a system of passive and active (motorized) building blocks that could record and re-play movements. LineFORM [32] and ChainFORM [31] are similarly collections of actuators which can record and re-play movements, but focus on rotational rather than linear motion. Each of these systems is constrained by its actuators: using motors limits the minimum size, dictates the kinds of shape-change transformations available, and leads to high-complexity hardware, requiring custom circuitry that is unavailable to a casual user.

Another type of SCI system uses shape-memory alloy (SMA) or nitinol wires to actuate shape changes. SMA-based actuation has the advantage of small size and flexibility, but at the expense of actuation speed. One early example, Bosu [36], offered a set of frames and fabric shapes on which the SMA wires could be fixed. While these components formed a small library of transformable
shapes, Bosu required users to assemble each component manually. NURBSforms [46] operated on the same principle as Bosu, but used flexible circuit boards, providing a standardized — and potentially mass-manufacturable — format. Both of these toolkits demonstrate shape changes based primarily on the curvature feature from Morphees [20], a result of the low-amplitude length change possible with SMA.

Some systems use pneumatic actuation to transform shapes. One of the earliest projects in this space was PneUI [50], which offered a technological framework for pneumatically actuated shape-change. Although the downside was that its shape-changing objects were all manually created, it illustrated the versatility of soft, pneumatic shape-change via multiple types of transformations, including curvature, volume, and texture. Other pneumatically actuated SCIs include Printflatables [41] and AeroMorph [35], both of which require custom-built equipment to create, and Siloseam [28], which presents a manual workflow for shape-changing silicone bladders.

Aside from ShapeClip, none of these examples present themselves as toolkit research. Instead, they focus more on novel actuation schemes and possibilities for expressing shape changes. One result of this limited focus is the lack of standardized widgets to express a wide range of shape-change features: most of these systems present at most one or two reusable transforming shapes and can express a fraction of the Morphees+ [20] feature space. Our goal with MorpheesPlug is to provide a diverse set of shape-change widgets that enable experimentation with much larger coverage of the feature space, while being easily fabricated by users with minimal required equipment and expertise.

### 2.2 Physical UI Toolkits

Although few toolkits exist for SCIs, many of the same challenges are addressed by toolkits for physical user interfaces; in fact, SCIs can be viewed as a subset of physical UIs. In contrast to GUIs which take advantage of standardized hardware such as touchscreens or keyboards, physical UI toolkits aim to make novel input and output mechanisms accessible to non-expert users.

One of the earliest physical computing toolkits was Phidgets [11]. It applied the idea of GUI widgets to physical interaction controls, enabling a combination of function and interface in a reusable building-block component. Later physical UI toolkits expanded on this idea, adding novel connections between modules [3], more powerful widgets [49], or novel form-factors [18]. These examples illustrate a prefabricated approach, where the physical widgets are designed and manufactured by a third party, and end users assemble, but don’t usually modify them. The advantage of this approach is less work for users, who can experiment with a set of validated widgets. The downside is that form-factors and capabilities are limited by the widget manufacturer’s priorities.

A second approach to physical widgets is custom-fabrication. Toolkits in this category provide assistance to users in creating widgets (or widget-like components) tailored for a particular application. Midas [42], for example, provided tools to help users fabricate customized touch sensors that could wrap around objects of varying sizes; Pineal [24] added “remote widgets” to smartphones and watches via automated 3D modeling; and PaperPulse [39] fabricated predefined widgets with conductive inkjet printing. The advantage of this approach is much-greater flexibility: users can include different sizes and types of widgets in many configurations. However, customized widgets for each application can mean much greater time and effort for the user.

MorpheesPlug takes inspiration from both types of physical computing toolkit. We provide a set of predefined shape-change widgets which are customizable in the design stage, and then can be fabricated on unmodified commodity 3D printers. In this way we aim to support users with a set of pre-validated widgets that can be re-used if desired, but that have enough customizability to be tailored for a variety of applications.

### 2.3 Pneumatic Shape-Change

In order to grant MorpheesPlug widgets the broadest range of possible shape changes, while still being easily fabricatable by end users, we use air pressure as an actuation source. Many other projects in HCI and other fields have similarly used pneumatics for driving flexible interfaces and robotics.

Examples of pneumatically driven interfaces have mainly concentrated on exploring the diversity of interaction that such soft interfaces can offer. For example, Kim et al.’s Inflatable Mouse [23] illustrated multiple input and output behaviors, Harrison and Hudson’s inflatable buttons provided dynamic haptics [16], and PneUI [50] demonstrated a wide variety of shape changes possible with elastic air bags. Despite the versatility of these interfaces, they are difficult to create, involving intensive manual assembly. Recent work by Moradi and Torres [29] underscores both the versatility and difficulty of working with flexible materials, demonstrating a wide range of shape change and investing considerable effort in laying out a workflow to lessen the effort of fabrication.

Some research has investigated 3D printing for pneumatically actuated SCIs. Although subject to the limitations of 3D printers, creating SCIs this way can—at least in theory—significantly lessen the effort required to create usable transforming objects. Vazquez et al. created a series of physical widgets using 3D printing [48], and Lee et al. developed a system of Lego-compatible pneumatic blocks for experimenting with soft robotics [26]. These projects relied on high-end multi-material inkjet-based 3D printers, which are not currently easily accessible to most end users; the materials available for these printers have low stretchability. Another possibility for 3D printing flexible objects is via FDM printing, using flexible filaments such as thermoplastic polyurethane (TPU). Thus far, most progress in TPU actuators has been made in the field of soft robotics, where the emphasis has been on locomotion and grasping [51].

MorpheesPlug’s pneumatic actuation is inspired by these previous efforts. Despite the versatility of these related approaches, their main shortcoming is ease of use, requiring complex fabrication, and actuation techniques. We directly tackle these challenges in two ways. First, we provide users with an easy-to-use design environment for creating SCIs. Second, MorpheesPlug uses inexpensive off-the-shelf fabrication equipment and material to create multiple widgets, enabling a wide range of shape-change possibilities.
3 DESIGN RATIONALE

Before building MorpheesPlug, a toolkit for prototyping SCIs, we discuss what kind of design goals we wanted to achieve in MorpheesPlug in terms of toolkit design. We looked into review literature that suggests design guidelines for toolkits [25]. Here we discuss how MorpheesPlug meets four of the five goals in toolkit research.

(1) Reducing Authoring Time and Complexity. Fabricating SCIs is a challenging task. This process often entails the use of specialized equipment and requires engineering expertise. To address this challenge, we encapsulate the knowledge of the type of shape-change of our six widgets will exhibit when pneumatically actuated. This, coupled with the analysis of how each widget implements features of SCIs, allows designers to have an estimation of the expected shape-change the widgets will exhibit before fabricating them, reducing time, effort, and domain knowledge when building new SCIs.

(2) Empowering New Audiences. Complex 3D modeling and electrical engineering can be a barrier for non-expert users who want to step in the area of SCIs. To simplify the process of designing the widgets [34], we provide a plug-in for CAD software that is widely available. Without a need for manually 3D modeling the widgets, users can choose the widget type and alter the parameters of it to create 3D models with the plug-in. To evaluate if MorpheesPlug can be used by new audience than researchers in SCI field, we conduct a user study with hobby makers.

(3) Integrating with Current Practices and Infrastructures. While pneumatically actuating SCIs allows designers to create a wide range of shape-change with a single actuation method, the fabrication of these artifacts is not always a straightforward process, especially requiring manual assembly [50], or special machinery [35, 41]. Our work aims to use existing, consumer-level tools (e.g., off-the-shelf 3D-printers, materials, and design tools) to fabricate SCIs.

(4) Enabling Replication and Creative Exploration. Ideal toolkits should support easy replication of previous work [10] and exploring design spaces that has not examined before [34]. To show that MorpheesPlug has such properties, we replicate one of the SCIs that had a huge impact in the field [9] as well as suggest novel interfaces with MorpheesPlug.

Based on these design goals, we designed MorpheesPlug. We aimed to build MorpheesPlug to be easy to use for researchers as well as engineering novices to significantly reduce their iteration time and effort. One goal suggested for toolkit design that we did not aim was Creating Paths of Least Resistance, which means that toolkits should guide users to design good interfaces rather than bad ones [2, 30]. SCI field is still at the early stage, and we believe that there are too few design guidelines to be generalized (e.g., [13, 21, 47]) comparing to the vast design space of SCIs. Therefore, we planned not to guide users what kind of SCIs they should design at this stage of the research. Future studies can contribute to the design guidelines for SCIs using MorpheesPlug, as it would allow quickly implementing a wide range of SCIs.

4 MORPHEEPLUG WIDGETS

MorpheesPlug is comprised of three basic components: (1) a set of shape-changing widgets; (2) a design environment; (3) a control module. A widget is the minimum unit in MorpheesPlug that creates shape-change when 3D-printed and then pneumatically actuated. Widgets are the core of MorpheesPlug. The design interface is a plug-in for CAD software that users can create 3D models of the widgets and customize them on the software. A module is a physical interface that users can control air pressure in a widget. This section shows how we designed the widgets and how they can express shape-change features.

We designed the widgets primarily based on the features and also literature from HCI, soft robotics, and material science. Note that we excluded the speed, feature, because the feature relies on the actuation method, not the design of the widgets. Also, we did not include stretchability, granularity, and strength, because we first wanted to focus on features that involve clear visual shape-changes in the scope of the paper. Figure 2 shows the widgets we designed, and Figure 3 shows how the widgets can express shape-change features. Below, we describe how we designed each widget and how they can express the shape-change features.

4.1 Fold widget

The Fold widget is a gadget that is primarily designed to implement length change (Figure 3). It is consists of a single layer of thin chamber that is folded in 90 degrees several times. The structure was originally used in material science [4] as a dielectric elastomer actuator. When inflated, the fold slightly opens, and the whole structure elongates. We found that the widget can implement all of the shape-change features we aimed for. For example, when length-changing widgets are connected to make a rectangular shape or cube, they can also implement area and volume features under the size feature. To change modularity feature, it can be attached to a static object and elongate in a slot. It would lock the static object and slot together. To express porosity, there can be several Fold widgets and a solid surface on top of them. When the widgets elongate, they close the space between the widgets and the surface. When they shorten, they open the space and increase porosity. We considered that the widget can express amplitude and curvature features at the same time.
### Figure 3: Top: Widgets provided by MorpheesPlug. Left: shape-change features from literature [20, 40]. Middle: Illustrations of how the widgets can express the shape-change features.

#### 4.2 Spiral widget

Spiral widget is a widget that has a curved thin chamber. When looked from the top of the widget, it resembles a spiral shape. This widget is design to express changes in the curvature feature. When inflated, the curved surface unbends and changes the angle between the central point and the end points of the surface. This widget can also represent changes in the length feature. When inflated, the distance between two diametrically opposed point
We designed our auxetic widget to display porosity feature. I got inspired from the literature [12]. When inflated, the widget opens up width-wise, enlarging a central area and thus increasing its porosity. In addition, once actuated, the width of this widget increases, also displaying shape-change in the area feature. Further, when it has reach its maximum shape-change, the outer shapes of separate from each other, exhibiting the closure feature. Lastly, it is able display the modularity feature once expanded by attaching to near objects.

5 IMPLEMENTATION

MorpheesPlug comprises of three main components: (1) a set of 3D-printable, inflatable widgets that can represent seven out of eleven of the Morphees+ features [20]; (2) a design environment for makers to model SCIs; (3) a control module responsible for actuating SCIs widgets. All of the resulting output (hardware, firmware, software, and designs) will be made available online.

5.1 Design Software

Our design environment is built on top of Autodesk Fusion 360 (Figure 4) using its Python API for scripting remote command execution. In order to design a shape-changing widget using our tool, the user selects the desired widget from a drop-down list, and proceeds to modify the controlling parameters. The design automatically updates to match the user’s inputs.

Figure 4: Detail view of our design environment, based on Autodesk Fusion 360. The user is presented with a window where they can specify the sizes for the different parameters that compose our widgets.

5.2 Fabrication

All MorpheesPlug widget designs are printed as a single structure using consumer-grade FDM2 3D-printers with elastic filament (NinjaFlex, shore 85A). To test our designs, we fabricated dozens of our widgets using three different 3D-printers (Lulzbot Taz 6, Ultimaker 2, and Crealitly Ender 3 Pro). During our initial tests, we found that the default print settings for these printers would produce non-airtight objects, causing the resulting objects to exhibit very little shape-change, if at all. To address this, we explored different printing settings for each of our printers, and got best results by over-extruding our designs, lowering the print speed, and increasing the numbers of top and bottom layers to 10 and 7, respectively.

2Fused Deposition Modeling
When the overhang surface too large, we allowed support. An in detail view of the parameters can be found in Table 1.

Our explorations uncovered a trade-off between the wall thickness of our widgets, and their subsequent airtightness, and their respective shape-change capabilities: thicker walls provide better seals, but restrict the shape-changing capabilities of the widgets. We opted for maximizing the shape-change capabilities of our widgets, by using only two layers of perimeter shells throughout our designs. This decision, however, meant that on occasion our widgets would print with small imperfections on their outer walls, causing air to leak. It could be addressed by dipping the widget on flexible resin (Formlab Elastic 50A Resin), and cured it.

Table 1: List of modified printing parameters with their respective values used to fabricate our widgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(TAZ 6, Ender 3)</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>(Overhang &gt; 4 cm)</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Speed (mm/min)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Interior Fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ultimaker 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Overhang &lt; 4 cm)</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Speed (mm/min)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Interior Fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrusion Multiplier</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Combine Infill Every</td>
<td>2 layers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Solid Layers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Outline Overlap</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom Solid Layers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Outline/Perimeter</td>
<td>2 Shells</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Characterization

We developed six 3D-printable, inflatable, shape-changing widget designs. For MorpheesPlug to be of the most practical use, we wish to quantify the shape-changing capabilities of our widget designs. To do so, we explored the effects of the constructing parameters for our designs by fabricating numerous instances of our widgets, systematically varying these parameters. We constrained our explorations in two ways. First, our preliminary experiments revealed that widgets with heights of less than 2 cm display very little shape-change. Second, we were unable to print airtight overhang surface wider than 4 cm without support. With support, widgets showed less flexibility and shape-change in general. To keep the print setting the same over the widgets show the maximum possible shape-change, we decided to fabricate widget designs with sections less than or equal to 4 cm (e.g., Thickness in Figure 4). We printed the Bump widget vertically. With these constrains in place, we set to print various iterations of our designs while changing each of the constructing parameters, one at a time. Once printed, we connected each widget to our control module, and actuated it setting our compressor at 100 kPa (kiloPascals). We proceeded to record the difference in size from each of our widgets, as seen in Figure 5, repeating each measure ten times.

Figure 5: Our characterization setup. To measure the length change of the Fold widget, we placed a printed widget next to a ruler and measured the length of both deflated and inflated states.

Figure 6 presents the results of our explorations. We learned that the parameters that influence the area sections of the widgets that are perpendicular to the direction of the shape-change affect the most the behavior of the widgets, while the parameters that affect area sections parallel to the direction of the shape-change negate the shape-changing capabilities of our widgets. We believe this is because parameters that are parallel to the direction of shape-change restrict our widgets’ movement when inflated, but parameters that are perpendicular to this movement do not, while at the same time increasing the structure’s inflatable volume.

5.4 Control Module

The final part of our toolkit is an electronic control module to allow designers to easily control the actuation of our widgets (Figure 7). This module, measuring 4 cm x 4 cm x 4.5 cm, is made up of five components: (1) two electronic solenoid valves to control airflow to, and from the widgets; (2) a barometric pressure sensor; (3) a custom circuit board used to interconnect all the components from our module; (4) an LED to display to the designer the status of the valves; (5) and a micro-controller to drive all the components. Once the widgets have finished printing, the designer proceeds to connect them to our control module.

Figure 7: An exploded view of the control module. The module has two valves to let air in and out of the widgets.

6 DEMONSTRATION

We present five applications to demonstrate the capability of MorpheesPlug to express various shape-change features in different scales. These applications were created using our design environment, widgets, and modules, but were manually actuated by the authors.

6.1 Umbrella pusher

The umbrella pusher is to demonstrate the spiral widget’s ability to hold an object. It also uses the fact that widget’s character that when it unbends less when is has a lower height (Figure 8 left). To create the umbrella pusher, we first created a spiral widget with 2 cm
height and three arcs with our plug-in. We then manually lowered the height of the central part to make the part hold an umbrella even when the widget is actuated. We then 3D printed the model with zero in-fill.

The umbrella pusher can installed at an apartment entrance and hold an umbrella. On rainy days, the spiral widget gets inflated and pushes the umbrella towards users when they approach to it (Figure 8 middle, right).

### 6.2 Anti-rain phone case

The anti-rain phone case is to show that MorpheesPlug supports heterogeneous shape-changes and integration with existing 3D models. We combined three Teeth widgets and one Fold widget to create a shape that bends from back of a phone can elongate. We then combined them with a 3D model of a phone case form the Internet (Figure 9 left). When the phone case is inflated, it bend over the phone screen and block rain, strong sun-light on the phone.
It can also prevent someone from looking at private information similarly to a shape-changing phone [40].

6.3 Posture-correcting cushion

The posture-correcting cushion (Figure 10) is to show that MorpheesPlug can handle high pressure and human weight. We used the same 3x3 Accordion widget from the characterization section.

When users sit on the cushion in an incorrect posture, it can push them to remind them to sit correctly. Unfortunately, the pressure of the cushion was higher than the sensing range of the pressure sensors in the current version of our module.

6.4 Physical bar chart

The physical bar chart (Figure 11) was specifically designed to replicate pin-based SCIs (e.g., [7, 9, 15, 33, 45]). We wondered if MorpheesPlug could easily replicate existing SCIs, and pin-based SCIs have been widely used to introduce novel interactions and understandings of SCIs. Our 3D printer took 21 hours to print nine Fold widgets (2.3 hr per widget), which would take longer than using off-the-shelf parts. However, the widgets would allow less assembly time because users just need to plug tubes to the widgets and connect them to modules. Although it allowed quick prototyping, the final form is different from existing pin-based SCIs. First, they do not have the “pin” shape. To improve the form factor, users would need to print a static pin on top of each widget or assemble and hide the widgets. Second, the resolution is lower than high-resolution ones (e.g., a pin in inFORM [9] has a 9.525 mm² footprint). Currently a widget has a footprint of 625 mm² (2.5 cm x 2.5 cm) and need spaces between them. If we reduce the footprint of the widget, the widget would have less length change with the same number of folds. Additionally, we noticed the bar chart tilted slightly to one side when actuated. As a possible remedy, we could insert plastic separators between each of the fold widgets to prevent tilting on actuation.

6.5 Window blind

The window blind is designed for an aesthetic purpose. We created seven Auxetic widgets in three different sizes, and then manually combined with added connecting space between the neighboring widgets (Figure 12 left). When inflated, the widgets expand and increase porosity between and within the widgets. User can adjust the porosity by changing the air pressure in the widgets.

7 USER STUDY

We conducted a user study to evaluate MorpheesPlug plug-in. We were particularly interested if the plug-in meets the design rational we aimed. As we aimed that our toolkit enables novices to create SCIs and also integrates with current practices, we invited both novice and expert users in our study, in terms of 3D modeling skills.
7.1 Participants

Participants were recruited through an advert on a social media page used by a local maker community and the word-of-mouth. Participants approached the researcher via email and we recruited 10 participants (age 25-64, female 2).

We got participants with both expert and novice skill levels in 3D modeling. With novice users (P6-8,10, background in Computer Science, Communication, or Public Health. No or little 3D modeling experiences), we wanted to see if they can understand the toolkit and implement their ideas using our plug-in. With experts (P1-7,9, background in Architecture, Industrial Design, or Robotics. Advanced skill in 3D modeling or using 3D modeling software at work), we wanted to see if the plug-in can integrate with their experience of 3D modeling and help them save time. Four out of six expert participants had experience in Fusion 360 (P2,3,5,9).

Regarding experiences related to SCIs, P9 was both a hobbyist and also founded a small-sized enterprises in soft robotics. P4 had experiences in fabricating inflated tin foils, and P2 had experiences in compliant mechanisms [19]. We compensated each participant with a $20 worth local product.

7.2 Procedure and Tasks

The studies were performed in person for all participants aside from P9, where the study was done via video conference. Each study took around one hour and was recorded via audio, video, and screen recording with consent.

Each study consisted of three parts. First, the participants signed a consent form and answered to biographical questionnaire (10 min). Second, we showed examples of SCIs [9, 50], and asked the participants to brainstorm ideas for new shape-changing interfaces they want (20 min). To help them brainstorm, we asked them to think about their work and daily life. We also provided them a few ideas from other participants when they wanted [43]. They were then asked to choose one of the ideas to design for the rest of the user study. Lastly, we demonstrated our printed widgets and two example applications (umbrella pusher and anti-rain phone case) and asked the participants to 3D model their ideas using MorpheesPlug plug-in in a think-aloud manner (30 min). We showed them how to use the plug-in and supported them when they do not know how to use other Fusion 360 functions. After the 3D modeling, we asked them questions about strengths and weaknesses of the MorpheesPlug plug-in. Note that the Auxetic widget was not implemented in the plug-in at the moment of the study.

7.3 Results

Three of the authors analyzed the transcribed interviews from all the participants. We specifically focused on the design rationale we discussed earlier in the paper. Additionally, we wanted to understand the usability of MorpheesPlug plug-in and the potential direction for enhancing the plug-in.

7.3.1 General response. Overall, all participants were excited when seeing our widgets and example applications, showing both the potential novelty and usability of MorpheesPlug for designing SCIs. P10 stated: “It was relatively straight forward and intuitive...”.

P4 was enthusiastic in seeing all the widgets we developed and exploring their actuation.

7.3.2 Reducing authoring time and complexity. All participants agreed that the authoring time and complexity of designing from scratch is reduced by our plug-in. All participants except P8 could closely design what they sketched using the plug-in. This demonstrates the potential for fast adoption of our toolkit plug-in for designing novel SCIs. P3 emphasised that our plug-in “...only required a little bit of modification to execute my idea.” Similarly, P6 stated that they were “positively surprised at how easy it was to implement a version of my sketch using the basic shapes available.” This positive response is likely due to our plug-in providing ready to use widgets, where users do not need to design from scratch.

In terms of customisation, participants also stated that they would like to directly edit the widgets by dragging arrows (e.g., for stretching etc) and not only use numeric input for parameters when creating the widgets. Two participants also commented that they wanted to edit more parameters. For example, P3 wanted one and a half layers in Accordion and P4 also wanted to change the length of gap in Accordion, which is currently fixed to 1cm. Furthermore, some participants brought out the need of automatically generating the widget parameters by determining the dimension of shape-changing (e.g., P7 need to have X amount of length change).

7.3.3 Empowering new audiences. Complex 3D modeling can be a barrier for non-expert users who want to step in the area of SCIs. The four novice participants we recruited appreciated that our plug-in enabled them to create 3D models without expert skills required. The 3 out of 4 novices (P6, P7, P10) were able to understand the concept of SCIs, the actuation capabilities of our widgets, and design their own 3D model from their sketches.

7.3.4 Integrating with current practices and infrastructures. MorpheesPlug aimed to use existing, consumer-level tools to fabricate SCIs. To achieve this, we built the widget design software as a plug-in for Fusion 360. Participants who had experiences with Fusion 360 showed efficiency of creating their intended designs. For example, P2 was able to create a relatively complex shape in less than 30 minutes (see figure 13). They created Bump widgets and added rigid parts around them as a handle to hold a pen by squeezing one bump widget.

On the other hand, users who were not used to 3D modeling or Fusion 360 struggled with using functions other than the MorpheesPlug plug-in. They had to tell us what they want to do, and we had to tell them where the related functions are and how to use them. It hindered them from exploring and editing the 3D models. To make MorpheesPlug widespread, we need to create plug-ins for other CAD software or develop an independent software.

7.3.5 Enabling creative exploration. The plug-in enabled creative exploration by letting users explore the widgets and their parameters. As P3 explained: “Another advantage would be to see that. You know, not all the time we can imagine all the possible shapes. When you have a plug-in, you see an idea where to start with. 'Okay, this may be possible’ ... Probably I can also do something with that...just by looking at the module I can learn what are the possibilities”.

However, the difficulty of editing the widgets caused difficulties for users (especially novices) to freely explore the widgets. More
material reduced the shape-changing capability of our designs. For example, when we fabricated our Fold widget with 1 cm height, its shape varied very little when inflated. More elastic materials, such as silicone, could allow larger shape change on smaller objects, at the expense of ease of fabrication.

Continuing, although our control module only presents a single air output to actuate the widgets, designers can actuate multiple widgets in tandem by making use of Y-splitters to connect multiple widgets to a single module. Additionally, while a single computer can control multiple modules, these must be connected via USB. We plan to explore different ways to control our modules (e.g., via Bluetooth, or WiFi), and alternatives for controlling various widgets with a single module. These improvements could benefit the portability of our work.

Once printed, our widgets are airtight, and capable of holding their shape after actuation. While in our experiments we used a dedicated air compressor to power our module and widgets, in the future we wish to explore more-accessible options by testing the efficacy of miniature air pumps. A further benefit could be miniaturization by embedding pumps into the control module.

Finally, we plan to evaluate MorpheesPlug in terms of the quality of interaction. It would be interesting to compare MorpheesPlug to SCIs that have other mechanism other than pneumatic actuation, such as mechanical [1] or manual [27].

9 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we presented MorpheesPlug, a toolkit for prototyping shape-changing interfaces (SCIs). By providing six widgets and using pneumatic actuation, the toolkit expresses seven shape-change features. To make the widgets accessible to users, we implemented a plug-in for CAD software where users can change the parameters of the widgets. We presented three applications using MorpheesPlug and conducted user studies to illustrate MorpheesPlug’s ability to express shape-change features and easily prototype SCIs. We envision that MorpheesPlug can be a first step towards building a standardized toolkit for prototyping SCIs.
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