METHODOLOGY FOR PART VISUALIZATION PROBLEM SOLVING (READING, INTERPRETATION AND CREATION OF MULTIVIEW TECHNICAL DRAWINGS)

Egoitz Sierra Uria, Mikel Garmendia, Javier Muniozguren, Isabel Larrakoetxea The Unibersity of the Basque Country

ABSTRACT

Part visualization is a fundamental skill in engineering. It comprises the reading, interpretation and creation of industrial technical drawings, interpreting the different views (multi-view) of an object/piece represented in/shown by any technical drawing. However, engineering students show certain learning difficulties and a high failure rate in subjects such as Technical Drawing and Design.

A problem solving model for visualization has first been designed and developed for all kind of industrial objects (**Methodology for Part Visualization Problem Solving**) within a constructivist framework. The Problem Solving model is the key to all technical knowledge and is an application of the scientific method.

To develop this methodology, technical drawing textbooks, research and papers from all around the world have been used. In relation with this methodology, some teaching strategies have been developed. They may be applied by drawing up a programme of specific tasks which takes into account the theoretical contents and procedures involved in part visualization as well as the students' main difficulties and deficiencies when faced with this kind of problem.

This teaching strategy has been applied over the last two years in the first course of Industrial Engineering in the Department of Engineering Graphic Design in Bilbao at the University of the Basque Country.

The main aim of this Paper is to show, reason out and discuss this new methodology for part visualization. Other aspects of this study were shown at the 2008 ASEE annual conference celebrated in Pittsburgh.

Keywords: part visualization, teaching strategy, problem solving model, constructivism

1 WHY THIS INTERVENTION?

There are three main reasons supporting this didactic intervention:

In the different subjects studied by future Engineers, some difficulties can be observed in the visualization of parts and the development of spatial capacities (Sierra Uria, Egoitz, 2005) [1].

The ability to mentally visualize and manipulate objects and situations constitutes an essential need in many engineering-related jobs. It is estimated that nowadays, at least 84 majors consider spatial visualization a fundamental need (Smith, 1964) and in some technical jobs, the ability to visualize has acquired an outstanding importance (Maier, 1994)[2].

The third reason supporting this study is that educators need to analyze and continuously look at their own ways of teaching in order to become more effective educators (Fernando Hernández, 1992) [3].

2 DIDACTIC FRAMEWORK

There is a need to analyze the specific difficulties arising from the learning of visualization. Educators have often pointed out the difficulties shown by most students in graphic courses when trying to visualize an object using multi-view drawings. These difficulties are mainly due to the inexistence of a systematic process to analyze complex forms (Luzzader and Duff 1986) [4].

The didactic strategy followed in most classrooms could be one of the main reasons for these difficulties.. This didactic strategy consists in a visualization of the problems followed by the solutions to those problems, without providing students with a clear explanation on how to solve them; this is,

the necessary reasoning during the problem-solving process (Garmendia, 2004) [5]. Students themselves confirm this lack of a problem-solving strategy. Instead, they use the trial-and-error strategy, or they simply rely on intuition.

Didactic research in problem-solving states that when students reason, different aspects of inter-related knowledge are put to work. A set of general abilities is used and applied to the different aspects of a subject, thus creating particular ways of reasoning in that subject. This proves that in teaching, besides the theoretical and conceptual knowledge, other contents such as procedural knowledge must be taken into consideration (Guisasola et al. 2003) [6].

Certain aspects must be defined when planning the teaching of specific contents and deciding on the design of the learning process through a program of activities. The intended objectives and the contents are among these aspects that ought to be defined, keeping always in mind the possible difficulties that may arise from the assimilation of the contents by the students. But at the same time, it is necessary to define the strategy that will be followed to achieve a meaningful learning, defining a logical sequence of activities specifically designed for the learning process, as well as the type of assessment that will be used to guide the students and help them improve in their learning.

We also come across students who have not developed enough spatial capacity and therefore, they have serious difficulties in understanding and manipulating the parts in space (Navarro,2004) [7].

Mathewson (1999) [8] affirms that educators often forget the importance of the spatial- visualization factor in learning. A review of most text books in this subject shows that little has been done to improve and develop the students' spatial capacity. Engineering textbooks often present orthogonal views, static concepts, theories and ideas with little or no explanation, all of this together with a lack of interpretation of spatial data. It is assumed that the student will be able to overcome the mental challenge and assemble the spatial puzzle.

According to Potter (2003) [9] students with a deficient development of spatial capacity need to learn by using static, dynamic and transformational images, as well as the way to combine them in problem solving. Spatial perception can be developed in many ways. For instance, by practicing the modelling and freehand drawing of objects (figure 1), representing objects in 3D models, manipulating objects in 3D in order to recreate their representations dimensionally, and finally, by experimenting and working with different perspectives or views of the represented part or object both on the blueprint and in the computer image.



Figure 1. Bertoline 2003 [10]

On the other hand, a thorough review of the literature in technical drawing textbooks has not been successful in finding a clear, concise, and fully developed method to solve visualization problems using procedural contents. (Sierra Uria, Egoitz, 2005) [1].

2.1 Constructivist didactic framework

This Visualization Didactic Unit and the Programming of Activities based on the new **Methodology for Part Visualization Problem Solving** has been developed under a constructivist view and within the European Higher Education Framework.

The highlights of this framework are the following:

- The student builds up his knowledge
- The new knowledge has to be significant to the student
- The student's previous knowledge must be taken into account
- The teacher must guide students in their learning process
- In the learning process, some "cognitive conflicts" are bound to arise
- The learning process will promote "zone of proximal development" [11] between the students
- The student's work is measured by the ECTS (European Credit Transfer System)

- The students will know at all times the result of their effort and their progress in the learning process, as well as the reward corresponding to their effort (evaluation)
- · The student holds the main responsibility for his own learning

2.2 Used Tools

Nowadays, ICT (Information and Communication Technology) offers a variety of complementary tools that are very helpful in the teaching/learning of every subject, including the visualization of parts. The tools used in this Visualization Didactic Unit are the following:

2.2.1 Slide animation

By using a computer (PC) with a screen output connected to a projector we can easily modify slides and go up and down in the solving process (figure 2). These slides can also have attached photos and other documents such as videos and CAD models.



Figure 2. Slide 6 of 7 from the solving process

2.2.2 Virtual models (CAD)

Virtual models created by computers with a CAD program can be easily rotated and sectioned in any moment depending on the needs of the teacher or the student. We can move from a perspective to multi-views or vice versa quickly (figure 3). In this way, the difficulties arising from the understanding of the relationship between the spatial reality of a part and its representation on the technical drawing are minimized.



Figure 3.. CAD virtual model

2.2.3 Physical models (CAD)

According to a number of authors, in order to increase the spatial capacity of students it is necessary to work in space with 3D models which can be turned, moved, and worked on mentally, for example, by obtaining their projections (Devon et al. 1994) [12] (figure 4)

Following Bertoline et al. (1995)[13], another way of improving the students' ability when visualizing an object or a 3D scene is to make their experience as realistic as possible.

Therefore, real physical models have been used. Some of them are made of cardboard but most of them are made with rapid prototyping machinery in the Product Design Laboratory in Bilbao (www.ehu.es/PDL/) at the Department of Engineering, University of the Basque Country.



Figure 4.. Physical models

3 METHODOLOGY FOR PART VISUALIZATION PROBLEM SOLVING, COMPREHENSION INDICATORS AND ACTIVITY PROGRAM

This newly developed Methodology for Part Visualization Problem Solving is mainly based on three sources:

- The analysis of the students' difficulties when faced with Visualization problems
- The analysis of the experts' solutions to Visualization problems
- The analysis of textbooks and published research papers in the area of Engineering Graphics and Engineering Education

In this new Methodology (figure 6) the Problem Solving model has become the key to articulate all the necessary knowledge for the the solving of this kind of problems [14]. The Problem Solving model, which is an application of the scientific method (figure 5), is the basis of all technical knowledge.



Figure 5. Scientific method and Problem Solving Model

When faced with a Visualization Problem, the data (multi-views) must first be analyzed and, according to these analyzed data, a strategy must be decided on. The problem can be solved element by element (sub-problems), by drawing a sketch and checking its concordance with the data. In an iterative process, all the elements of the object must be solved. Once the whole object is obtained, new views/cutting views can be created using the same method (analyzing the new viewpoint / cut viewpoint and then, solving element by element) (figure 6).

3.1 Comprehension indicators

In order to solve the visualization problems in any kind of industrial object, the following comprehension indicators must be mastered/fluently used. The first eight indicators basically correspond to conceptual knowledge and the last two indicators, while containing conceptual skills, correspond essentially to procedural knowledge.



Figure 6.Methodology for Part Visualization Problem Solving

3.1.1 Fundamentals of representation systems

These fundamentals consist of a sound knowledge of the basics of the main representation system of the orthogonal cylindrical projection (multi-view), including standardization, and how projections are created (from 3D to 2D) as well as the reason for visible and hidden lines (figure 7).

Another important aspect is achieving a sound knowledge of the basics and main features of the axonometric perspective and oblique projections (3D), (figure 7)

To visualize the piece in space (3D) it is necessary to proceed in reverse to what has been done to create the views (2D). There sound be a good knowledge of the relationship between the systems of representation.



Figure 7. Fundaments of multiview representation

3.1.2 Conditions or rules of correspondence (6 rules)

The rules derived from the type of projection (parallel projection / cylindrical and orthogonal) must be mastered. This is:

- 1. The projections of a point will be aligned in the different views.
- 2. The dimension between two points (x, y, z) will be the same for different views
- 3. Parallel lines in the different views will remain always parallel.
- 4. The form of flat surfaces remains equal in the different views unless it is seen as a line. In this case, the surface (plane) is parallel to the visual (figure 8)
- 5. Two contiguous areas separated by a line cannot be on the same plane

6. The dimension of a feature are in a true scale when it is perpendicular to the visual projection. When it is not perpendicular, it will be smaller than true scale.

3.1.3 Types of planes and characteristics of its projections

There must be a sound knowledge of the different types of planes (3D) according to their relationship with the projection (parallel, project planner and oblique) as well as of the characteristics of their projections (2D), (figure 9).

3.1.4 Types of solid primitives and characteristics of its projections

It is necessary to be very well acquainted with the various geometric main elements (3D) and the characteristics of their projections (2D) both when they are solids or surfaces (prism, cube, cylinder, cone, sphere, geometries of revolution) (figure 10).



Figure 8.Rule 4

Figure 9. Oblique plane

Figure 10. Cylinder

3.1.4 Tangency and intersection between surfaces

This means mastering the tangency between surfaces (3D) and their representation (2D) (lines of contact, finite line) as well as the various intersections between surfaces (3D) and their representation in the most basic areas (plane, cylinder, cone, sphere) (figure 11).



Figure 11. Tangent surfaces and Intersection between cylinder and plane

3.1.6 Fundamentals of vacuum (material -)

This involves having a sound knowledge of reasons for the existence of vacuum and its relationship with the material (3D) (figure 12), as well as knowing how to represent the existing vacuum in the projections (2D) (hidden lines)



Figure 12. Vacuum = material (+) – material (-)

3.1.7 Fundamentals of cuts and different types of cutting planes

These fundamentals consist of a good knowledge of the basics of cuts (3D) and their representation (2D), as well as the different types of cutting planes (normal, staggered, rotated, $\frac{1}{2}$ view $\frac{1}{2}$ cut) (figure 13)

3.1.8 Fundamentals of the industry's most characteristic features

This means mastering the most common industrial elements of industrial parts (3D), their characteristics and how to represent them (2D) (all kinds of holes, nerves, rounding off, chamfers...) (figure 14)



Figure 13. Cutting plane

Figure 14. Holes

3.1.9 Fundamentals of sketches

These fundamental involve the process of creating sketches (3D and 2D) keeping the visual, the proportions and the parallels.



Figure 15. Sketching process [15]

3.1.9 Methodology for Part Visualization Problem Solving and strategies

Qualitative data analysis. This involves learning to analyze the data of departure, the type of data and knowing how to interpret the obtained information to classify the types of pieces (solids, surfaces, vertices, features, outside / inside, intersections). This analysis will allow lead to a solution to the problem

Solving Strategy. This means choosing the most appropriate solving strategy (specific) according to the analyzed data. It also involves knowing how to validate and raise different hypotheses to solve the visualization of the various elements making up the piece.

- Elimination of volumes
- Decomposing into simple geometric elements (figure 16)
- Correspondence Method: pieces of flat faces
- Identifying the vertices and joining them with the base
- Identifying the geometries of revolution through circles (centers) and axes
- Differentiating between solid geometry (material +) and vacuum (material -)
- Interpreting the information derived from the most typical Industrial elements
- Using the cutting (data) as a reference in the sketch (figure 16)

In order to solve the piece, an iterative process must be followed to solve all the elements of the piece in a logical sequence (figure 6, table 2/step4 and table 3).



Figure 16. Decomposing and cutting view plane

3.2 "Spatial Visualization"

This capacity, which can be defined as the skill to manipulate images mentally, is an essential capacity when trying to solve a visualization problem. This teaching unit makes a very specific effort to attain the necessary level of this skill (figure 17).



Figure 17.. Spatial Visualization fast exercises [10]

4 PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES

As progress is made in the teaching unit and in order to assimilate the knowledge, the corresponding activities marked by the program (table 1) must be carried out. The degree of difficulty of each the activities (table 2, table 3, and figure 18) is directly related to the step to be accomplished in the corresponding didactic unit.

Steps	Indicator to work	Carry Out Indicators	Dimensions	Types of activity
1	1 Spatial Visualization	1, 4, 9 Spatial Visualization	2D and 3D From 3D to 2D	Elements (points, lines, surfaces,) Identifying points of view, creating views, simple sketches (table2) Working the spatial visualization (V. Test) [16]
2	2 and 3	1,2,3,4,9 Spatial Visualization	2D and 3D From 3D to 2D	Plane types, identification of planes Box-plane intersections in axonometric (Sketches) (table2)
3	10 (correspondence)	1,2,3,4,9,10 Spatial Visualization	From 2D to 3D	Solving of pieces with flat faces Sketches
4	4,5 and 10	1,2,4,5,9,10 Spatial Visualization	From 2D to 3D	Solving of pieces with simple geometric elements Sketches (table2)
5	6,7 and 10 Spatial Visualization	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,9,10 Spatial Visualization	From 2D to 3D From 2D to (3D) 2D	Solving of pieces with simple vacuums, drilling exercises(table2) Solving of cutting exercises with new views/cuts (Sketches) Spatial visualization (cutting) fast exercises
6	5 and 10	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,9,10 Spatial Visualization	From 2D to 3D From 2D to (3D) 2D	Piece solving with characteristic intersections with new views/cuts (Sketches) (table3) Working the spatial visualization(Cutting V. Test) [17]
7	8 and 10	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 Spatial Visualization	From 2D to 3D From 2D to (3D) 2D	Piece solving with Industrial characteristics elements with new views/cuts (Sketches)
8	10 Spatial Visualization	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 Spatial Visualization	From 2D to 3D from 2D to (3D) 2D	Exam exercises (figure 18) Working the spatial visualization (V. Test) [16]

Table 1. Indicators to work on and activities to be performed, step by step

Table 2. example of activities from some steps of the activity program



Table 3. (step6) Example of resolution process: the student must sketch the piece. From 2D to 3D

		 Analyzing types of views Analyzing types of pieces (prisms, symmetry, elements) Drawing the boxing-in (symmetry) 			
		 Identifying revolving axes (material) Iterative process to solve the main features (breaking down the elements) Solving (making the image) / Drawing (mental/freehand): Sketching process (principle axes/boxing-in, auxiliary points and lines, proportional) Sketching sequence (linked with the problem-solving sequence) 			
		- Identifying revolving axes (- material, vacums) - Breakdown of the analysis (sub-problems) (general-to-detail / left-to-right / top-to-bottom / outside-to- inside)			
		 Once we have solved the main features we go into the details the attributes of common features in mechanical components (rib, web, holes, lug, chamfers,) intersection between surfaces (cylinder-cylinder) 			
		Analysis of results (confirmation of the image) : - In agreement with the data			



Figure 18. [step 8] Evaluation of knowledge acquisition when solving visualization problems: the students had to do it by hand despite the formulation and the solution in this case being CAD made. From 2D to (3D) 2D

5 RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Analyzing the results of the Visualization exercises at official examinations, the average (t student) between the group that has used the described method (experimental group) and the rest of the students (control group), which has continued with traditional teaching, is significantly different (table 4 and table 5).

Table 4. Industrial Engineering exam averages (2006/2007 Nexp.= 46 and Ncont.=257) (2007/2008 Nexp. = 56 and Ncont.= 279)



Table 5. Chemical Engineering exam averages (2006/2007 Nexp.= 25 and Ncont.=20) (2007/2008 Nexp. = 25 and Ncont.= 9)



Some special tests have been performed and recorded individually with some students in both groups. These test show that the experimental group follows a reasonable method of resolution whilst the control group keeps on basing its work on experience and intuition.

It was also noted that the less the student has a prior knowledge (typical Chemical Engineering students' profile) the better (s)he works with the new methodology.

Besides, a higher attendance to the final exam and a lower demand for of private lessons at the end of the semester were registered in the experimental group.

So, the conclusions are:

- There has been an improvement in the teaching-learning process (the main aim of this new methodology)

- This intervention has motivated the students and has permitted more students to follow the teaching-learning process.

- The university has provided the necessary knowledge and resources to follow the course and teach the subject in a better way than using traditional methods.

After of two years of intervention, results are hopeful but upcoming interventions should be improved upon so that results are more conclusive and the methodology is accepted and widespread.

REFERENCES

- [1] Sierra Uria, Egoitz, Master in Engineering Design Graphic Education 2006. Análisis de la asimilación de la competencia "ver en el espacio" en el ámbito de los estudios de ingeniería. XIII Congreso Universitario de Innovación Educativa en las Enseñanzas Técnica .XIII CUIEET Canarias, Spain. 2005 pp. 30.
- [2] Kedmon Hungwe, Thomas Drummer, Sheryl A. Sorby, Paul Charlesworth. Developing 3-D Spatial Visualization Skills for Non-Engineering Students. *Journal of Engineering Education*, Jul 2000, 63(2), pp. 21-32
- [3] Fernando Hernández, Juana María Sancho, *Para enseñar no basta con saber la asignatura*. 1993 (Ed. Paidós, Barcelona, Spain)
- [4] Luzzader W.J. y Duff J.M. Fundamentos de dibujo en ingeniería. 1986 (Prentice Hall. Hispanoamericana Mexico)
- [5] Garmendia M. Análisis crítico de la enseñanza de visualización en primer ciclo de universidad y propuesta alternativa de orientación constructivista. PhD in Engineering Design Graphic Education, (2004) Basque Country
- [6] Guisasola, J., Furió C., Ceberio, M. and Zubimendi, J.L. ¿Es necesaria la enseñanza de contenidos procedimentales en cursos introductorios de física en la universidad? *Enseñanza de las Ciencias*, extra number, 17-28(2003)
- [7] Navarro R. El dibujo de croquis y la visualización espacial: su aprendizaje y valoración en la formación del ingeniero a través de las nuevas tecnologías. XII Congreso Universitario de Innovación Educativa en las Enseñanzas Técnicas. XII CUIEET 2004 Barcelona, Spain.
- [8] Mathewson, J.H. Visual-spatial thinking: An aspect of science overlooked by educators. *Science & Education*, 1999, 83(1), pp. 33-54.
- [9] Potter C.S. and Van Der Merwe, E. Percepcion, imagery, visualization and engineering graphics. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 2003, VOL 28, nº1, 117-133
- [10] Gary R. Bertoline, Eric N. Wiebe *Technical Graphics Communication. (third edition).* 2003 (Mc Graw Hill)
- [11] Vygotsky, L.S. Mind in Society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press(1978).
- [12] Devon, R., Engle, Foster, Sathianathan, Turner The effect of solid modelling software on 3D visualizations skills. *EngineeringDesign Graphics Journal*, 1994,58(2); pp. 4-11.
- [13] Bertoline G., Wiebe E., Miller C., Mohler J. *Dibujo en ingeniería y comunicación gráfica*. 1995 (Mc Graw Hill, mexico)
- [14] M. Garmendia, J. Guisasola, E. Sierra. First year engineering students' difficulties in visualization and drawing tasks. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 2007 .Volume 32 Issue 3
- [15] Frederick E. Giesecke, Alva Mitchell, Henry Cecil Spencer, Ivan Leroy Hill, Robert Olin Loving, John Thomas Dygdon "Engineering Graphics" (fourth edition) 1987 (Paramus, NJ, U.S.A., Prentice Hall)
- [16] Sarah Titus, Eric Horsman. The Visualization Survey. Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison
- [17] Dr. Claudia Quaiser-Pohl. The Mental Cutting Test "Schnitte "and the Picture Rotation Test-Two New Measures to Assess Spatial Ability. *International Journal of Testing*, Volume <u>3</u>, Issue <u>3</u> September 2003, pages 219 - 231
- [18] J. Gonzalo Gonzalo. Dibujo Técnico Enseñanzas Secundarias. 1994 (Editorial Donostiarra)

Contact: Egoitz Sierra Uria Institution/University: The university of the Basque Country Department: Graphics Design and Engineering Projects Adress : Urkixo Zumarkaela z/g, 48013 Bilbo. Spain Phone: 0034 946013963 E-mail Address: egoitz.sierra@ehu.es