

# Transtiff: A Stylus-shaped Interface for Rendering Perceived Stiffness of Virtual Objects via Stylus Stiffness Control

Ryoya Komatsu\*

Aoyama Gakuin University

Ayumu Ogura†

Aoyama Gakuin University

Shigeo Yoshida‡

OMRON SINIC X Corporation

Kazutoshi Tanaka§

OMRON SINIC X Corporation

Yuichi Itoh¶

Aoyama Gakuin University



Figure 1: Transtiff, a stylus-shaped interface, manipulates the perceived stiffness of virtual objects by controlling the stiffness of the interface, enabling the creation of the illusion that a hard object feels soft. a) Interaction with a tennis ball at maximum stiffness, b) with a plastic ball at medium stiffness, and c) with a sponge ball at minimal stiffness.

## ABSTRACT

The replication of object stiffness is essential for enhancing haptic feedback in virtual environments. However, existing research has overlooked how stylus stiffness influences the perception of virtual object stiffness during tool-mediated interactions. To address this, we conducted a psychophysical experiment demonstrating that changing stylus stiffness combined with visual stimuli altered users' perception of virtual object stiffness. Based on these insights, we developed Transtiff, a stylus-shaped interface capable of on-demand stiffness control using a McKibben artificial muscle mechanism. Unlike previous approaches, our method manipulates the perceived stiffness of virtual objects via the stylus by controlling the stiffness of the stylus without altering the properties of the real object being touched, creating the illusion of a hard object feeling soft. Our user study confirmed that Transtiff effectively simulates a range of material properties, such as sponge, plastic, and tennis balls, providing haptic rendering that is closely aligned with the perceived material characteristics. By addressing the challenge of delivering realistic haptic feedback through tool-based interactions, Transtiff represents a significant advancement in the haptic interface design for VR applications.

**Index Terms:** Haptic Interface, Stick Object, Stiffness, Visuo-haptic Illusion

## 1 INTRODUCTION

With the rapid advancement of virtual reality (VR) technology, haptic feedback has become increasingly important alongside visual and auditory presentation. A growing body of research focuses on simulating the sensation of interacting with virtual objects via tools [37, 41, 29, 40, 13, 17, 50]. Among these, stylus-shaped in-

terfaces [1, 30, 46, 20] have gained attention due to their ability to provide both precise control and haptic feedback during interactions.

Humans can naturally integrate tools as extensions of their bodies, and haptic information perceived through tools is processed similarly to skin-mediated sensations [27]. It has been shown that when via a stylus, haptic feedback from the stylus itself influences the perception of softness and hardness of the target object [22]. Furthermore, the stiffness of the stylus can influence the user's haptic perception of the object, even when interacting with the same object.

In this paper, we investigate how haptic perception is influenced when objects are touched via styluses with varying levels of stiffness (Sec. 3). Although previous research has extensively explored the perception of an object's stiffness and texture [22, 19, 5, 35, 14, 6, 4, 47], the role of the stylus's stiffness in shaping haptic perception remains underexplored. By investigating this, we aim to deepen our understanding of how the stiffness of a stylus influences haptic perception. We also explore the possibility of creating an illusion where touching a hard object with a soft stylus generates the perception of a soft object. This approach could enable the reproduction of haptic sensations for both hard and soft virtual objects by simply controlling the stiffness of the stylus.

Based on these findings, we propose a stylus-shaped interface with joints capable of controlling its stiffness (Fig. 1) (Sec. 4). Our interface leverages an artificial muscle mechanism to control stiffness by controlling the pressure within a flexible tube via a piston system. We evaluated the stiffness control capabilities of the interface, focusing on its ability to reproduce the sensation of touching objects with varying stiffness levels and to its effectiveness of the interface in enhancing haptic experience in VR (Sec. 5).

The main contributions of this paper are the following:

- (1) We demonstrated through our psychophysical experiment that touching a hard object with visual stimuli of object softness and a soft stylus may create an illusion that the hard object felt soft.
- (2) We implemented a stylus-shaped interface with stiffness control using a McKibben-type artificial muscle mechanism to apply the above finding for haptic rendering of various object stiffnesses.

\*e-mail: ryoya.komatsu@x-lab.team

†e-mail: ayumu.ogura@x-lab.team

‡e-mail: shigeo.yoshida@sinicx.com

§e-mail: kazutoshi.tanaka@sinicx.com

¶e-mail: itoh@it.aoyama.ac.jp

- (3) We confirmed that the proposed interface can alter the perceived stiffness of virtual objects through the user study.

The experiments described in this paper were conducted with the approval of the Ethical Review Committee of Aoyama Gakuin University (approval number: H22-008).

## 2 RELATED WORK

In this section, we review related works on stylus-shaped interfaces for haptic feedback and discuss haptic perception via the stylus. We also briefly overview the current technologies of soft actuators and mechanisms to contextualize our device design.

### 2.1 Stylus-Shaped Interface for Haptic Feedback

Several haptic systems have been proposed to generate sensations of touching virtual objects [44], one of which involves the use of stylus-shaped interfaces to deliver haptic feedback. A notable example is the Touch X [1] by 3D Systems, which provides force feedback via a stylus in an indirect manner when users interact with objects displayed on a PC screen. In contrast, Withana *et al.* introduced ImpAct, [46] an interface that can change its length when pushed directly against a surface to provide kinesthetic haptic sensation to the hand. Haptylus [30] employs similar mechanisms with ImpAct that can alter the length of the stylus, but it incorporates vibrations via a voice coil motor to simulate the texture of virtual objects. FeelPen [20] offers a wide range of sensations such as viscosity, roughness, friction, and temperature, combining various modalities to create a more immersive experience. Lee *et al.* proposed a Haptic Pen [23] that improves user interaction with touch screens by delivering localized vibrations and force cues. In a similar vein, Fellion *et al.* introduced FlexStylus [9], a stylus interface that incorporates bend input as an additional interaction modality, thereby broadening the potential applications of pen-based systems. Through these developments, stylus-shaped interfaces have demonstrated their ability to enhance touch-based interactions with screens by offering diverse haptic feedback mechanisms and interaction capabilities that are tailored to various scenarios.

In a related approach, some studies focused on altering the physical characteristics of the stylus to provide varied haptic experience. Liu *et al.* proposed the FlexStroke [25], a pen interface that uses a jamming transition mechanism to replicate the haptic sensations of a Chinese brush, an oil brush, and crayon by controlling the air pressure at the tip of the interface, thereby providing variable stiffness. Kara presented the VnStylus [16], a haptic stylus that integrates variable tip compliance to enhance haptic rendering of virtual environments. Moreover, we have been proposing a stylus-shaped haptic interface, Transtiff [32, 33], with a mechanism that incorporates an artificial muscle. The interface features a joint that controls its stiffness, thus altering the force required for bending. Although these studies successfully control haptic feedback by varying the stylus stiffness, they did not investigate how varying stylus stiffness affects the perception of objects touched via the stylus. Specifically, it remains unclear whether users perceive changes in stiffness as an attribute of the stylus or an object touched by the stylus.

Therefore, we believe that clarifying how users perceive stiffness when interacting with objects via styluses of different stiffness levels will deepen our understanding of haptic presentation via stylus-shaped interfaces and unlock new possibilities for application in VR.

### 2.2 Haptic Perception via Stylus

Regarding haptic perception via a stylus, LaMotte *et al.* demonstrated that stiffness discrimination is possible when touching a flexible object via a stylus, with discrimination accuracy particularly enhanced by making a tapping motion [22]. Similarly, Klatzky *et al.* investigated roughness perception when touching a rough surface through a rigid tool (*e.g.*, a stylus-shaped probe) and found that

roughness discrimination was achievable through a rigid body, albeit with less accuracy than when using a fingertip [19]. Chung *et al.* reported comparable results with a rubber-tipped stylus. Kato *et al.* further showed that their proposed chopstick-like device for virtual weight presentation resulted in a lower weight discrimination rate compared to the perception of real objects [18].

Numerous studies have examined haptic perception using force-sensing interfaces similar to the one such as Touch X [1]. Heather *et al.* reported that when recreating a surface in a virtual environment using a 3D haptic interface, the perceived intensity of slipperiness, stiffness, and roughness could be varied by presenting transient friction and contact stimuli along with surface textures [7]. These findings highlight the significance of combining multiple sensory modalities in creating realistic virtual environments.

While these studies focused on the mechanical properties of objects and tools, the interaction between visual and haptic cues also plays a key role in shaping users' perception of object properties even when physical feedback is constant. A notable example is pseudo-touch, in which visual cues affect haptic sensations. Although pseudo-touch has been extensively studied in fingertip interactions [45], its role in stylus-based systems remains underexplored. Our findings bridge this gap by showing how compliant styluses leverage visual cues to enhance haptic interaction fidelity, particularly through stiffness control.

Prior studies have largely overlooked the influence of stylus stiffness on haptic perception. This study addresses this gap by examining how varying stylus stiffness affects perception, laying the groundwork for designing haptic interfaces that use stylus stiffness as a controllable parameter to enhance virtual interaction.

### 2.3 Soft Actuators and Mechanisms

Research on soft actuators and mechanisms for joints capable of flexibly altering their stiffness has progressed, contributing to advancements in soft robotics technology and relevant fields. The commonly used actuation method is controlling the expansion, contraction, and flexion of actuators through pneumatic systems, which have been applied in robotic hands [2] and power-assist devices [49]. Among these, pneumatic actuators, specifically "McKibben-type artificial muscles" [42, 52, 39, 26], are frequently used. Devices utilizing McKibben-type artificial muscles have been applied in various applications, such as tele-surgery [24], shape-changing interfaces [36], and haptic gloves [11].

Others have proposed the combination of pneumatic soft actuators with jamming transitions. Wall *et al.* introduced a soft actuator using layer jamming, a technique that induces a jamming transition in overlapping sheets, to achieve significant stiffness changes [43]. This actuator allows for more efficient modulation of stiffness and softness than conventional approaches. However, it limits the actuators' bending direction to perpendicular to the sheet layers, making it difficult to bend parallel to them. To address this, Yang *et al.* developed a system that can 3D print variable stiffness jamming interfaces in arbitrary shapes [48]. By configuring the arrangement of membranes and beads, this system can print haptic interfaces and shape-changing controllers that function like soft actuators. However, a common challenge for jamming-based mechanisms is the need for a large external air compressor.

In response to the challenge of requiring external compressor, many soft actuators utilizing the characteristics of functional materials have been developed. For example, low-melting-point alloy (LMPA) [12] and shape-memory polymers (SMP) [51] have been used as actuators, where temperature control to adjust the stiffness variation. Magnetorheological (MR) fluids, which change the stiffness based on the strength of the applied magnetic field [8], is also widely used. Ohba *et al.* proposed a linear motion joint that enables soft motion by adjusting the holding force of a spring through the magnetic field control of the MR fluid surrounding a compression




Figure 2: Experimental overview. The participants use the HMD to receive visual stimuli showing the deformation of the stylus or object and manipulate a stylus with a rubber joint to explore objects of different stiffness (a spring-loaded cylindrical mechanism).

spring [34]. Additionally, electrorheological (ER) fluids, which change liquid viscosity by an electric field, are used in soft robots, often in contrast to MR fluids [15]. However, these functional materials can be difficult to obtain and manage, limiting their ease of use.

As another stiffness-changing mechanism, Ryu *et al.* proposed ElaStick [38], a handheld device that dynamically modulates the stiffness of four elastic tendons for 2-DoF haptic feedback, simulating flexible objects, but its size limits integration into stylus-shaped interfaces.

While methods like layer jamming and functional materials have limitations, we believe that artificial muscles, controlled by simple fluid manipulation, offer a more suitable and straightforward solution for stiffness control in stylus-shaped interfaces. Consequently, we employed McKibben-type artificial muscles to develop an interface capable of controlling stiffness. The details of the proposed interface are described in Sec. 4.

### 3 PSYCHOPHYSICAL EXPERIMENT WITH STYLUS AND OBJECTS OF VARIOUS STIFFNESSES

The aim of this work is to deepen the understanding of how stylus stiffness influences haptic perception and explore its potential for creating haptic illusions that a hard object felt soft when interacting with a hard object. Specifically, this experiment examines the effects of varying levels of stylus stiffness on the perception of objects during touch.

We examined whether users could discriminate which was softer – the stylus or the object – when they touched the object via the stylus while showing a visual stimulus of either the stylus or the object was deformed. Furthermore, we investigated the frequency with which participants experienced the illusion that a hard cylinder felt soft when via a soft stylus in combination with specific visual stimuli. We also investigated whether the presentation of visual stimuli induces cross-modal perception [28], altering the perceived stiffness of styluses and objects. Fig. 2 shows an overview of the experiments. Participants grasped a stylus with a flexible rubber joint and used it to touch an object with varying stiffness (a cylinder equipped with a spring mechanism).

#### 3.1 Experimental Condition

In this experiment, seven stylus and five cylindrical contact objects with varying levels of stiffness were prepared. Furthermore, two conditions were presented as visual stimuli through an HMD (HTC VIVE Pro2): the stylus was deformed or the cylinder was deformed when the stylus made contact with it. To investigate the relationship between stylus stiffness and haptic perception, these condi-




Figure 3: Stylus/Cylinder deformation. The visual stimuli consisted of a stylus appearing soft on the left and a cylinder appearing soft on the right, both designed to visually convey stiffness.



Figure 4: Variations of the stylus used in the experiment, showing different combinations of hardness levels (50 or 70) and joint lengths (10 mm, 15 mm, or 20 mm), along with a condition without a rubber joint.

tions were designed to enable a controlled range of stylus stiffness that induced visually discernible macroscopic deformation, effectively creating a haptic illusion that a hard object felt soft during interactions with a hard object via a soft stylus. Fig. 3 illustrates the deformation of the stylus and the cylinder. To present visual stimuli, we developed a virtual environment using Unity to simulate a stylus interacting with a cylindrical object. We controlled animations to replicate varying levels of simulated stiffness using VertExmotion<sup>1</sup> asset, which implements a shader-based soft-body system. This feature allowed us to investigate how changes in apparent stiffness influenced user interaction and perception, thereby providing a foundation for evaluating the accuracy of haptic feedback models. In the case of stylus deformation, the stylus bends when pressed against the cylinder in virtual space, providing a visual stimulus for the soft stylus. In the case of cylinder deformation, the stylus presses against the cylinder in the virtual space, causing the cylinder to concavity and providing the visual stimulus of a soft cylinder.

A rubber joint was inserted 10 mm from the stylus tip. This length was determined based on a preliminary experiment measuring the distance between the tip of the stylus and the user's fingertip when a typical pen was grasped spontaneously. The joint length was set to three values: 20 mm, 15 mm, and 10 mm. A longer joint length would impair the functionality of the stylus, whereas a shorter length would prevent sufficient bending of the stylus. The stiffness of the rubber joints was set to two conditions: “Hardness 50” and “Hardness 70,” using the softest commercially available urethane round rods and those that were not excessively stiff. The higher the hardness value, the stiffer is the material. To the above combination, a stylus with “no rubber joint” is added. Fig. 4 shows

<sup>1</sup><https://assetstore.unity.com/packages/tools/animation/vertexmotion-23930?locale=ja-JP>




Figure 5: Cylinder spring conditions and mechanism. The left side illustrates the five predefined stiffness levels of the cylinder’s spring mechanism (spring constant:  $0.5 \text{ N/mm}$ ), while the right side depicts the cylinder size and stiffness control mechanism.

the seven conditions for the stylus.

Rubber joints allow for more significant bending with longer joint lengths or lower hardness, enabling a wide range of stiffness levels to be tested under these seven conditions. The diameter of the stylus was set to 8.9 mm, based on the diameter of a standard stylus, specifically that of the “Apple Pencil” [3], which has been commonly used as a typical stylus pen in recent years. All parts, except the rubber joints, were fabricated using a 3D printer.

The cylinder mechanism was constructed by combining the two types of cylinders and a spring mechanism. An outer cylinder with a height of 295 mm and an inner diameter of 41 mm was placed around an inner cylinder with a height of 250 mm and an outer diameter of 40 mm. A spring mechanism with a diameter of 45 mm is installed at the bottom of the inner cylinder. The inner cylinder was supported by the resistance of the springs at the base, and the stiffness of the inner cylinder when compressed from above could be controlled by varying the number of springs. Fig. 5 shows five conditions for a cylinder spring mechanism.

The spring mechanism was designed such that the portion of the inner cylinder that compressed owing to the spring extended by 15 mm. When the compression exceeded 15 mm, the system behaved as a rigid body without any spring sensation. In the “no spring” condition, the inner cylinder functions as a rigid body from the outset because it is not equipped with springs. The lengths of both the outer and inner cylinders were carefully determined to ensure smooth movement of the inner cylinder within the outer cylinder and to prevent jamming even when the inner cylinder was compressed at an angle. Both the outer and inner cylinders were made of acrylic, a material chosen for its high sliding properties, ensuring that mobility is maintained even when the cylinders come into contact.

The hand postures used by humans when gripping objects can generally be categorized into two types: “Precision Grip,” where the object is grasped between the thumb and the flexed fingers, and “Power Grip,” where the object is held between the fingers and the palm while the thumb applies a counterforce [31]. Based on this understanding, this experiment adopted two conditions for gripping the stylus: Precision Grip and Power Grip.

### 3.2 Experimental Environment

Fig. 6 shows the experimental setup. VIVE trackers were attached to the bars and cylinders to reflect their positions and angles in virtual space. The table used in the experiment featured a hole with a diameter of 50 mm, which allowed the cylinder to pass through. This design enabled participants to interact with the cylinder as an “object with variable stiffness.” The cylinder was extended 50 mm above the surface of the table. To eliminate auditory cues, the participants wore noise-canceling headphones (SONY WH-



Figure 6: Experimental environment. Participants used the stylus to interact with a cylinder extending through a hole in the table, representing an object with variable stiffness.

1000XM3) and were exposed to white noise.

### 3.3 Participants

Fifteen participants (8 males and 7 females, average age  $22.4 \pm 0.9$ ) were joined this experiment. The participants were informed in advance that they would receive an honorarium based on the time spent in the experiment, which was conducted by touching rods and cylinders of various hardnesses while wearing the HMD, and that they could stop the experiment at any time.

### 3.4 Procedure

The experiment consisted of two phases: a training session to familiarize participants with the procedure, and a test session to collect data. During the training session, the participants wore HMDs and observed the visual stimuli of deforming bars and cylinders. Once the participants indicated that they were sufficiently familiar with the procedure, the test session began. In the test session, participants still wearing the HMD were given a stylus with a VIVE tracker attached and were instructed to touch the cylinder. When the stylus was soft (except in the “no rubber joint” condition), the cylinder appeared hard (in the “no spring” condition). Conversely, when the stylus was hard (in the “no rubber joint” condition), the cylinder appeared soft (except in the “no spring” condition). Visual stimuli were presented in the virtual space for both the soft stylus and soft cylinder conditions. During the measurement phase, participants used a two-alternative forced choice (2AFC) [21] method to indicate whether the sensation of softness they experienced was caused by the stylus or cylinder. Participants were required to choose between the two options in each trial. The experiment included 200 trials—five trials for each of the 10 conditions (six stylus conditions and four cylinder conditions) and two visual stimulus conditions. The condition in which a stylus without a rubber joint touched a cylinder without a spring was excluded. The order of the stimulus presentation was randomized to mitigate any potential bias from the trial order. After completing all the trials, the procedure was repeated under different stylus-holding conditions. Each participant’s experiment lasted for approximately two hours.




Figure 7: Probabilities of perception for each stylus/cylinder/visual condition in Precision Grip (\*\*:  $p < .01$ ).




Figure 8: Probabilities of perception for each stylus/cylinder/visual condition in Power Grip (\*\*:  $p < .01$ ).




Figure 9: Comparison of the correct answer rate when touching a hard cylinder with a soft stylus and when touching a soft cylinder with a hard stylus (\*\*:  $p < .01$ ).

### 3.5 Result

#### 3.5.1 Comparison of Perceived Stiffness Across Stylus and Cylinder Conditions

The percentage of correct responses was calculated for each stylus, cylinder, and visual condition. The correct response rate in this experiment was defined as the participants' ability to correctly perceive that the sensation of softness was caused by the stylus, such as when they touched a hard cylinder with a soft stylus. In other words, a higher percentage of correct responses (approaching 100%) indicates that participants accurately judged whether the perceived softness was due to the stylus or cylinder under the given condition. To investigate the incidence of the illusion, we used bar graphs to directly compare correct response rates across conditions. To compare the correct response proportions across the stylus, cylinder, and visual conditions, a McNemar's test was conducted to determine the significant differences between the visual conditions. Additionally,  $\varphi(W)$ , an indicator of the effect size in the McNemar's test, was examined. The  $\varphi$  coefficient is considered

small at 0.20, medium at 0.50, and large at 0.80 [10]. Fig. 7 presents the percentage of correct responses for each stylus, cylinder, and visual condition in the Precision Grip condition, while Fig. 8 shows the corresponding data for the Power Grip condition.

Real and virtual soft objects match when, for example, a user touches a cylinder with a soft stylus in reality, and the virtual environment presents a visual representation of the same soft stylus. In contrast, Real and virtual soft objects differ when the user touches a cylinder with a soft stylus in real life; however, the virtual environment presents a visual image of a soft cylinder instead.

Results showed that in both the Precision Grip and Power Grip, correct responses were higher when the real and virtual soft objects matched in all bar/cylinder conditions than when the soft objects differed. There was a significant difference in the percentage of correct responses between the visual conditions for all bar/cylinder conditions ( $p < 0.01$ ).

In the Precision Grip task, the percentage of correct responses exceeded 50% for the “1 spring” and “2 springs” cylinder conditions when real and virtual soft objects differed. For other conditions, the percentage was below 50%. Among the visual conditions, the effect sizes were as follows:  $\varphi = 0.411$  for “Hardness 50 & Joint length 20 mm,”  $\varphi = 0.358$  for “Hardness 50 & Joint length 15 mm,”  $\varphi = 0.307$  for “Hardness 50 & Joint length 10 mm,”  $\varphi = 0.473$  for “Hardness 70 & Joint length 20 mm,”  $\varphi = 0.347$  for “Hardness 70 & Joint length 15 mm,”  $\varphi = 0.288$  for “Hardness 70 & Joint length 10 mm,”  $\varphi = 0.268$  for “1 spring,”  $\varphi = 0.406$  for “2 springs,”  $\varphi = 0.384$  for “3 springs,”  $\varphi = 0.469$  for “4 springs.” These effect sizes were close to moderate.

In the Power Grip task, the correct response rate for the “1 spring,” “2 springs,” and “3 springs” cylinder conditions exceeded 50% when the real and virtual soft objects were different, while the other conditions resulted in rates below 50%. Among the visual conditions, the effect sizes were as follows:  $\varphi = 0.504$  for “Hardness 50 & Joint length 20 mm,”  $\varphi = 0.566$  for “Hardness 50 & Joint length 15 mm,”  $\varphi = 0.484$  for “Hardness 50 & Joint length 10 mm,”




Figure 10: Structure of the interface.

$\varphi = 0.427$  for “Hardness 70 & Joint length 20 mm,”  $\varphi = 0.547$  for “Hardness 70 & Joint length 15 mm,”  $\varphi = 0.414$  for “Hardness 70 & Joint length 10 mm,”  $\varphi = 0.268$  for “1 spring,”  $\varphi = 0.307$  for “2 springs,”  $\varphi = 0.405$  for “3 springs,”  $\varphi = 0.392$  for “4 springs.” These effect sizes were close to moderate.

These results indicate that the presentation of visual stimuli significantly affected the perception of stiffness. In all conditions, the effect sizes were medium to large, underscoring the notable influence of the visual stimuli. When a hard cylinder with fewer springs was touched with a hard stylus, a large percentage of the participants incorrectly perceived the cylinder as soft, even when the real and virtual objects differed in softness. Conversely, when a soft cylinder with more springs was touched with a hard stylus, participants perceived the stylus as soft more frequently than when they were given a visual stimulus for a soft stylus in virtual reality. In all conditions involving realistic soft styluses, the participants perceived the cylinders as soft when presented with a virtual soft stylus visual stimulus.

### 3.5.2 Effects of coincidence of visual conditions and haptic presentation on stiffness perception

To compare the sensations of touching a hard cylinder with a soft stylus and a soft cylinder with a hard stylus, we calculated the percentage of correct responses for the stylus and cylinder conditions, respectively. McNemar’s test was conducted to compare the proportions of correct responses between the two visual presentation conditions and determine significant differences between them. The left side of Fig. 9 shows the percentage of correct responses in the Precision Grip condition for the stylus and cylinder conditions, whereas the right side shows the percentage of correct responses in the Power Grip condition for both the stylus and cylinder conditions.

In the visual condition where “Real and virtual soft objects differ,” the correct response rate when touching a hard cylinder with a soft stylus was 40% in the Precision Grip and 33% in the Power Grip. The correct response rate when touching a soft cylinder with a hard stylus was 53% for Precision Grip and 54% for Power Grip. A higher proportion of the participants mistakenly perceived the virtual soft cylinder as a real soft object. In both the Precision Grip and Power Grip conditions, there was a significant difference between the “Real and virtual soft objects match” and “Real and virtual soft objects differ” conditions when touching a hard cylinder with a soft stylus and when touching a soft cylinder with a hard stylus ( $p < 0.01$ ).

These results demonstrate that when the visual representations of real and virtual soft objects are aligned, real soft objects are accurately perceived. In addition, when the visual stimuli of real and virtual soft objects differ, the virtual soft object can still be perceived as a real soft object. Furthermore, the illusion of perceiving a real hard object as soft is more likely to occur when a soft stylus touches a hard cylinder than when a hard stylus touches a soft cylinder.

## 3.6 Discussion

There was a significant difference in the percentage of correct responses between the visual conditions where “real and virtual soft objects are the same” and “real and virtual soft objects are different.” This may be because humans rely on both haptic and visual




Figure 11: Mechanism of the stiffness change.




Figure 12: Appearance of the interface (joint length 15 mm) with a VIVE Tracker.

perception as key cues when perceiving object stiffness. The difference in the percentage of correct responses for the bar and cylinder conditions is likely due to the varying degrees of haptic and visual influences depending on the stiffness of the object. In the “1 spring” and “2 springs” conditions, the cylinders were too soft, leading to a stronger haptic influence than visual influence, which resulted in a higher percentage of correct responses.

Consequently, even under the “Hardness 70,” “Joint length 10 mm,” and “4 springs” conditions—where the stylus was stiffer and less deformable than in the bar and cylinder conditions—participants were still able to perceive the visual deformation and were equally influenced by the visual stimuli across all conditions.

These results indicate that presenting a virtual visual stimulus of a soft cylinder can create the illusion that a hard object felt soft when the user perceives haptic feedback via a soft stylus.

## 4 IMPLEMENTATION & MEASUREMENT

The experiment described in Sec. 3 demonstrates the possibility that touching a hard object with a soft stylus can create the illusion that the hard object felt soft. To replicate this phenomenon, we will construct an interface that can reproduce the measured stiffness properties of the soft stylus used in the experiment.

### 4.1 Implementation of Stylus-shaped Interface with Artificial Muscle

Fig. 10 shows the structure of the interface. We used McKibben artificial muscles to control stiffness of the interface. The primary advantage of McKibben artificial muscles lies in their ability to control stiffness by modifying the length of the artificial muscle, thereby enabling macroscopic deformation. Given their use of silicone tubes, which allow for the control of stiffness, these muscles




Figure 13: Average stiffness of 10 mm & 15 mm & 20 mm joint length.

were hypothesized to effectively replicate the variable stiffness of the soft styluses used in Sec. 3 with an inserted rubber element. Fig. 11 shows the mechanism of the stiffness change of the joint. The appearance of the interface with a 15 mm stiffness-controllable joint is shown in Fig. 12. This interface had a total length of 250 mm and a weight of 144 g, and a handle diameter of 11 mm, including the VIVE tracker.

Inside the interface, a feed screw connected to a DC motor with an encoder (DC motor, 78 rpm) rotates to move the nut linearly, enabling the reciprocating motion of the attached piston. This motion pressurizes the liquid in the cylinder, pushing it toward the silicone tube located at the joint. The joint utilizes a McKibben-type artificial muscle mechanism and consists of two layers: an inner silicone tube and outer polyester braided tube. When the piston pressurizes water at the joint, the silicone tube expands radially. However, the outer braided tube constrains this radial expansion, leading to axial contraction and an increase in the overall stiffness of the joint. Fig. 11 illustrates the mechanism behind this increase in the stiffness.

Both ends of the tube were connected to the cylinder on the handle side, with a plug inserted at the tip to prevent liquid leakage. The plug and cylinder feature grooves, which allow the tube to securely cover both components. A stainless-steel wire was used to fasten the tube along the grooves. The cylinder was made of machined aluminum and a commercially available motor was used. The plug, piston, and motor mounting parts were 3D-printed.

The interface controls the direction and range of piston movement via a control board to control the stiffness and flexibility of the joint. The control board consists of a microcontroller (Arduino UNO) as the core of the interface, along with a motor driver (Toshiba TA7291P) to manage motor rotation. The direction of piston movement is controlled by reversing the rotation of the motor. The distance traveled by the piston was regulated by an encoder attached to the motor, which tracked the number of revolutions. The motor operates until the target number of revolutions is reached, thereby controlling the movement range. The stiffness of the interface was controlled using a PC control.

## 4.2 Stiffness Measurement

To evaluate the capability of the interface for stiffness control, the stiffness values produced by the system were measured and compared to the stiffness range of the soft styluses used in Sec. 3. The comparison demonstrated that the interface outputs stiffness values within the target range, thereby achieving the desired control accuracy defined in this study. To evaluate the effect of the different joint lengths, styluses with joint lengths of 10, 15, and 20 mm were used. We measured the average angles from the desk when the subjects naturally grasped the stylus using both a precision grip and a power grip, as described in Sec. 3. The average angles were 46° for precision grip and 28° for power grip. Next, we connected the stylus to a force gauge at a 46° and measured the force required

to bend the interface when vertically lowered. The tools used in Sec. 3 were measured in the same manner and compared with these styluses.

Measurements were taken five times at each displacement as the force gauge was lowered from 0 to 15 mm, and the average values were recorded. The piston displacement, from the maximum to the minimum, was divided into five segments. From these measurements, the piston displacement at which the interface could output half its maximum stiffness was determined. The maximum, half, and minimum stiffness of the interface at joint lengths of 10, 15, and 20 mm, along with the measured stiffness of the tool described in Sec. 3, are shown in Fig. 13.

The results indicated that the minimum stiffness of each joint length was softer than that of any of the tools discussed in Sec. 3. For a joint length of 10 mm, the maximum stiffness value fell between the configurations of “Hardness 70 & Joint length 10 mm” and “Hardness 50 & Joint length 10 mm.” For a joint length of 15 mm, the maximum value was close to “Hardness 70 & Joint length 15 mm,” while for a joint length of 20 mm, the maximum was similar to “Hardness 70 & Joint length 20 mm.” These findings suggest that shorter joint lengths result in higher maximum stiffness, indicating a broader range of stiffness that the interface can provide.

From the above findings, we conclude that this interface can control its stiffness to match that of the stylus used in Sec. 3. When combined with visual stimuli, the stylus in Sec. 3 was able to create the illusion that a hard object felt soft. Therefore, we believe that this interface can similarly induce the same haptic illusion.

## 5 EVALUATION

This section shows an evaluation of whether the proposed interface can accurately simulate stiffness-based haptic feedback consistent with measurable deformations in the material properties of virtual objects. We prepared three different virtual object materials to assess the interface’s ability to reproduce different virtual object materials by changing their stiffness.

### 5.1 Participants

We recruited 12 participants (7 males and 5 females) aged between 21 and 24 years (Mdn = 22.4, SD = 1.0). All participants had previously taken part in the experiment described in Sec. 3. The study aimed to investigate how the interface influences the user’s haptic perception of stiffness.

### 5.2 Experimental Conditions & Environment

The evaluation used the interfaces with joint lengths of 10 and 15 mm, capable of presenting a wide range of stiffness levels. The interfaces were tested under three conditions: maximum, half, and minimum stiffnesses. The virtual objects of contact represented different material stiffness levels: the stiffer was a tennis ball, the medium stiffness was a plastic ball (assumed to be made of



Figure 14: Left: The virtual objects used in the evaluation, showing different material stiffness levels. Right: The participant touches the 3D-printed sphere with the interface.

polyvinyl chloride, PVC), and the softest was a sponge ball. To ensure that the virtual interface stiffness corresponds appropriately to the observable macroscopic deformation of the simulated objects, we conducted a preliminary test similar to Sec. 4.2 using a force gauge to measure and calibrate the material stiffness. Based on these tests, we selected a tennis ball to approximate the maximum stiffness of the interface, a plastic ball to approximate half the stiffness, and a sponge ball to approximate the minimum stiffness. We configured the virtual environment to ensure virtual objects would deform when pressed with the stylus, using the same technique as described in Sec. 3.1. The deformation parameters were kept consistent across all materials.

The real object used in the experiment was a 70 mm diameter sphere, 3D-printed, and attached to a VIVE tracker. Its size closely matched that of the actual material of the chosen virtual object.

### 5.3 Procedure

The experimental setup and materials of the virtual objects are shown in Fig. 14. The participants wore an HMD (VIVE Pro 2) and grasped the stylus-shaped interface with their dominant hand using a precision grip. They touched the top of a virtual sphere with the interface in a pushing motion to receive haptic feedback. Participants were then asked to select the material that best matched the stiffness of the interface from the following three options: tennis, plastic, and sponge balls. Each participant completed 18 trials in total, with two conditions for the interface joint length, three conditions for the interface stiffness, and three trials for each condition. Finally, a free response questionnaire was administered. The order of presentation was randomized for each participant. To eliminate auditory cues, the participants wore noise-canceling headphones (SONY WH-1000XM3) and listened to white noise. The participants held a VIVE controller in their non-dominant hand and could change the material of the virtual object by pressing a button.

### 5.4 Result

We calculated the perceived probability of each material that participants identified as the best match under the two interface joint length conditions and three interface stiffness conditions. Fig. 15 shows a graph of the results. Generalized linear mixed models (GLMM) with Tukey’s HSD were used for multiple comparisons of the perceived probability of each material, accounting for the repeated responses of the experimental participants. We examined




Figure 15: Probabilities of perceptions for the different materials. Brackets indicate statistically significant differences (\*:  $p < .05$ ; \*\*:  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*:  $p < .001$ ). Error bars show 95% confidence intervals.

Joint length 10 mm			Joint length 15 mm			
Stiffness of the interface	Sponge Ball	Plastic Ball	Tennis Ball	Sponge Ball	Plastic Ball	
MIN -	0.556	0.444	0	0.778	0.222	0
HALF -	0.083	0.306	0.611	0.083	0.667	0.25
MAX -	0.028	0.056	0.917	0	0.167	0.833

Answered objects by the participants

Figure 16: Confusion matrix showing how participants identified the stiffness of the interface as corresponding to virtual objects in VR, for 10 mm and 15 mm. Each row represents the ratio [%] of responses for each stiffness level.

significant differences between conditions.

The analysis showed that, with a joint length of 10 mm, the probability of perceiving the object as a “tennis ball” at the minimum interface stiffness was 0%. For the 15 mm joint length, the probability of perceiving the object as a “tennis ball” at the minimum stiffness and as a “sponge ball” at the maximum stiffness were both 0%, with no significant differences due to zero variance.

For a joint length of 10 mm, the probability of selecting “tennis ball” was highest when the interface stiffness was either at its maximum or at half its maximum. Conversely, when the interface stiffness was at its minimum, the probability of selecting a “sponge ball” was highest. There was a significant difference in the probability of selecting “tennis ball” compared to “plastic ball” or “sponge ball” when the interface’s stiffness was at its maximum ( $p < 0.001$ ). A significant difference was also observed between the probability of selecting “tennis ball” and “sponge ball” when the interface’s stiffness was at half ( $p < 0.01$ ). Additionally, the probability of selecting a “sponge ball” differed significantly when the interface had minimum stiffness compared with when it had maximum or half stiffness ( $p < 0.05$ ).

For a joint length of 15 mm, the probability of selecting “tennis ball” was highest when the interface stiffness was at its maximum. The probability of selecting “plastic ball” was highest when the interface stiffness was at its half. The probability of selecting “sponge ball” was highest when the interface stiffness was at its minimum. There was a significant difference in the probability of selecting “tennis ball” compared to “plastic ball” when the interface’s stiffness was at its maximum ( $p < 0.001$ ). Furthermore, the probability of answering the “tennis ball” was significantly different when the interface stiffness was at its maximum and half ( $p < 0.001$ ). When the stiffness of the interface was half, there was a significant difference between the probability of answering “plastic ball” and the probability of answering “tennis ball” ( $p < 0.05$ ) or “sponge ball” ( $p < 0.05$ ).

( $p<0.001$ ). Furthermore, the probability of responding to a “plastic ball” was significantly different when the interface was half as stiff as when it was at maximum ( $p<0.01$ ) or minimum ( $p<0.05$ ) stiffness. Finally, there was a significant difference in the probability of selecting “sponge ball” compared to “plastic ball” when the interface’s stiffness was at its minimum ( $p<0.001$ ). The probability of selecting a “sponge ball” also showed a significant difference when comparing the minimum stiffness of the interface to its half-stiffness setting ( $p<0.001$ ).

**Fig. 16** shows the confusion matrix illustrating how different joint lengths and stiffness levels affected users’ ability to identify virtual object materials in VR. With a joint length of 15 mm, the system successfully distinguished between the three levels of stiffness in the VR environment, as confirmed by the evaluation results. However, with a joint length of 10 mm, the system was unable to differentiate between the sponge ball and the plastic ball when the stiffness was at its lowest level and was unable to successfully distinguish between the three stiffness levels in the VR environment.

## 5.5 Discussion

When the joint length is 10 mm, the probability of responding “tennis ball” increases when the interface stiffness is set to half of the maximum, while the probability of responding “sponge ball” increases when the interface stiffness is at its minimum, rather than “plastic ball,” which represents the mid-range stiffness. These results suggest that interfaces with a joint length of 10 mm do not provide sufficient haptic feedback to accurately convey the virtual object material, even when the stiffness of the interface is controlled. This may be because of the short joint length, which limits the concavity of the virtual object, making it difficult to perceive the intended haptic sensation.

In contrast, when the joint length was 15 mm, respondents were more likely to perceive the object as a “tennis ball” at maximum interface stiffness, a “plastic ball” at medium stiffness, and a “sponge ball” at minimum stiffness. These results suggest that a joint length of 15 mm allows sufficient indentation of the virtual object and that varying the stiffness of the interface provides haptic feedback appropriate to the perceived material of the object.

## 6 OVERALL DISCUSSION & FUTURE WORK

### 6.1 Influence of Stylus Stiffness and Joint Length

Although the experiments in **Sec. 3** demonstrated that all stylus could produce the illusion of softness when combined with visual stimuli, it remains unclear whether stylus with stiffness outside the tested range or with longer joint lengths can achieve the same effect. Therefore, we propose that further experiments using stylus with greater or lesser stiffness than those tested in this study will offer valuable insights into haptic perception across a broader range of stylus stiffnesses.

In **Sec. 4**, shortening the length of the stiffness-changing joint increased the maximum stiffness of the interface but reduced its bendable displacement. Conversely, lengthening the joint decreases the maximum stiffness while increasing the bendable displacement. A larger displacement allows for deeper depression of the virtual objects. Therefore, controlling the joint length of the interface based on the reproduced virtual object is expected to provide more suitable haptic feedback.

### 6.2 Limitations and Future Directions

While the proposed interface demonstrates promising results in enhancing haptic perception, several limitations have been identified.

First, the proposed interface was primarily designed for use with precision and power grips, assuming a bending motion as the primary mode of interaction. Although these standard stylus grips allow users to apply pressure naturally and intentionally, the effects of alternative interaction methods, such as pushing or compressing the

tip, remain unclear. Future studies should explore whether similar perceptual effects can be observed with other modes of interaction, expanding the versatility of the interface.

Second, although none of the participants reported discomfort or performance issues related to the device weight in the evaluation (**Sec. 5**), our work did not investigate the impact of different weight configurations. This aspect represents a limitation, as the optimal weight for usability and performance remains undetermined. Future research should compare devices with varying weights to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how weight influences user experience.

Third, another area for improvement is the relationship between the internal pressure and interface stiffness. While this relationship is essential for understanding and optimizing haptic feedback, the structural limitations of the current interface prevent the direct measurement of the internal pressure. Overcoming these limitations and integrating such measurements into future iterations of the interface will significantly enhance the precision of the stiffness control.

Finally, the motor used in this study was selected because of its high torque at a rated voltage of 12 V and rotational speed of 78 rpm. However, a trade-off exists between the torque and rotational speed. Although a higher rotational speed is necessary for real-time stiffness controls, sufficient torque is also crucial. Balancing these factors is essential for developing robust and responsive systems.

## 7 CONCLUSION

In this study, we investigated the haptic perception of objects via a stylus and, based on the findings, proposed a stylus-shaped interface equipped with joints that can control stiffness. We further investigated the effectiveness of this interface in providing haptic rendering of virtual objects.

First, we investigated whether it was possible to distinguish between the stiffness of the stylus and the object when the visual stimuli depicted either the stylus or the object being deformed, and the subject used the stylus to touch the object. The results showed that by using a soft stylus, subjects could either perceive the stylus as soft, depending on the visual stimulus, or experience the illusion that the object is soft. This confirms that the haptic perception of stiffness can be altered by manipulating visual stimuli.

Next, based on haptic perception via a stylus, we propose a stylus-shaped interface that alters the sensation felt by the hand by controlling the stiffness of its joints. The interface is equipped with a piston mechanism driven by a small motor and features a two-layer tube structure that mimics the McKibben-type artificial muscles. The stiffness of the interface was controlled by changing the rotational direction of the motor, allowing seamless transitions between softness and stiffness. This design results in a compact, grip-type haptic interface with a simple structure, overcoming the challenges encountered in previous research, such as the large interface size, complex mechanisms, limited application areas, and reliance on specialized materials. We developed interfaces with joint lengths of 10, 15, and 20 mm and measured their stiffness. The results showed that the interface could generate sufficient stiffness to create the illusion that a hard object felt soft.

Finally, we conducted a user study to evaluate whether the interface could present stiffness that accurately corresponded to the material of the virtual object. The results indicated that a joint length of 15 mm was sufficient to provide haptic rendering consistent with the perceived material properties of the virtual object. Our results encourage future research to uncover the full potential of haptic feedback for VR based on stiffness of stylus.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was partially supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid JP22K18424.

## REFERENCES

- [1] 3DSystems. Touch x. <https://ja.3dsystems.com/haptics-devices/touch-x/>, Accessed:2024-04-28. 1, 2
- [2] S. Abundance, C. B. Teeple, and R. J. Wood. A dexterous soft robotic hand for delicate in-hand manipulation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 5(4):5502–5509, 2020. doi: 10.1109/LRA.2020.3007411 2
- [3] Apple. Apple pencil (2nd generation), 2024. [Online; accessed 18-September-2024]. 4
- [4] W. M. Bergmann Tiest and A. M. L. Kappers. Cues for haptic perception of compliance. *IEEE Transactions on Haptics*, 2(4):189–199, 2009. doi: 10.1109/TOH.2009.16 1
- [5] M. Cavdan, K. Doerschner, and K. Drewing. Task and material properties interactively affect softness explorations along different dimensions. *IEEE Transactions on Haptics*, 14(3):603–614, 2021. doi: 10.1109/TOH.2021.3069626 1
- [6] C. Cellini, L. Kaim, and K. Drewing. Visual and haptic integration in the estimation of softness of deformable objects. *i-Perception*, 4(8):516–531, 2013. PMID: 25165510. doi: 10.1068/i0598 1
- [7] H. Culbertson and K. J. Kuchenbecker. Importance of matching physical friction, hardness, and texture in creating realistic haptic virtual surfaces. *IEEE Transactions on Haptics*, 10(1):63–74, 2017. doi: 10.1109/TOH.2016.2598751 2
- [8] J. de Vicente, D. J. Klingenberg, and R. Hidalgo-Alvarez. Magnetorheological fluids: a review. *Soft Matter*, 7:3701–3710, 2011. doi: 10.1039/C0SM01221A 2
- [9] N. Fellion, T. Pietrzak, and A. Girouard. Flexstylus: Leveraging bend input for pen interaction. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, UIST ’17, p. 375–385. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2017. doi: 10.1145/3126594.3126597 2
- [10] C. J. Ferguson. An effect size primer: A guide for clinicians and researchers. In A. E. Kazdin, ed., *Methodological issues and strategies in clinical research*, pp. 301–310. American Psychological Association, 4th ed., 2016. doi: 10.1037/14805-020 5
- [11] W. Franco, D. Maffiodo, C. De Benedictis, and C. Ferraresi. Use of mckibben muscle in a haptic interface. *Robotics*, 8(1), 2019. doi: 10.3390/robotics8010013 2
- [12] Y. Hao, T. Wang, Z. Xie, W. Sun, Z. Liu, X. Fang, M. Yang, and L. Wen. A eutectic-alloy-infused soft actuator with sensing, tunable degrees of freedom, and stiffness properties. *Journal of Micromechanics and Microengineering*, 28(2):024004, 2018. doi: 10.1088/1361-6439/aa9d0e 2
- [13] S. Heo, C. Chung, G. Lee, and D. Wigdor. Thor’s hammer: An ungrounded force feedback device utilizing propeller-induced propulsive force. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI ’18, p. 1–11. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2018. doi: 10.1145/3173574.3174099 1
- [14] K. Higashi, S. Okamoto, Y. Yamada, H. Nagano, and M. Konyo. Hardness perception based on dynamic stiffness in tapping. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 2019. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02654 1
- [15] H. Jing, L. Hua, F. Long, B. Lv, B. Wang, H. Zhang, X. Fan, H. Zheng, C. Chu, G. Xu, J. Guo, A. Sun, and Y. Cheng. Variable stiffness and fast-response soft structures based on electrorheological fluids. *J. Mater. Chem. C*, 11:11842–11850, 2023. doi: 10.1039/D3TC01563G 3
- [16] O. C. Kara and V. Patoglu. Vnstylus: A haptic stylus with variable tip compliance. *IEEE Transactions on Haptics*, 13(4):777–790, 2020. doi: 10.1109/TOH.2020.2967694 2
- [17] G. Kato, Y. Kuroda, I. Nisky, K. Kiyokawa, and H. Takemura. Hapsticks: Tool-mediated interaction with grounding-free haptic interface. In *SIGGRAPH Asia 2015 Haptic Media And Contents Design*, SA ’15. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2015. doi: 10.1145/2818384.2818387 1
- [18] G. Kato, Y. Kuroda, I. Nisky, K. Kiyokawa, and H. Takemura. Design and psychophysical evaluation of the hapsticks: A novel non-grounded mechanism for presenting tool-mediated vertical forces. *IEEE Transactions on Haptics*, 10(3):338–349, 2017. doi: 10.1109/TOH.2016.2636824 2
- [19] R. L. Klatzky and S. J. Lederman. Tactile roughness perception with a rigid link interposed between skin and surface. *Perception & psychophysics*, 61(4):591–607, 1999. doi: 10.3758/BF03205532 1, 2
- [20] B. L. Kodak and Y. Vardar. Feelpen: A haptic stylus displaying multimodal texture feels on touchscreens. *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, 28(5):2930–2940, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TMECH.2023.3264787 1, 2
- [21] M. Korman, K. Teodorescu, A. Cohen, M. Reiner, and D. Gopher. Effects of order and sensory modality in stiffness perception. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 21(3):295–304, 08 2012. doi: 10.1162/PRES\_a\_00114 4
- [22] R. H. LaMotte. Softness discrimination with a tool. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 83(4):1777–1786, 2000. PMID: 10758090. doi: 10.1152/jn.2000.83.4.1777 1, 2
- [23] J. C. Lee, P. H. Dietz, D. Leigh, W. S. Yerazunis, and S. E. Hudson. Haptic pen: a tactile feedback stylus for touch screens. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, UIST ’04, p. 291–294. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2004. doi: 10.1145/1029632.1029682 2
- [24] H. Li, K. Kawashima, K. Tadano, S. Ganguly, and S. Nakano. Achieving haptic perception in forceps’ manipulator using pneumatic artificial muscle. *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, 18(1):74–85, 2013. doi: 10.1109/TMECH.2011.2163415 2
- [25] X. Liu, H. Xia, and J. Gu. Flexstroke: A jamming brush tip simulating multiple painting tools on digital platform. In *Adjunct Proceedings of the 26th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, UIST ’13 Adjunct, pp. 23–24. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2013. doi: 10.1145/2508468.2514935 2
- [26] M. Meller, J. Chipka, A. Volkov, M. Bryant, and E. Garcia. Improving actuation efficiency through variable recruitment hydraulic mckibben muscles: modeling, orderly recruitment control, and experiments. *Bioinspiration & Biomimetics*, 11(6):065004, 2016. doi: 10.1088/1748-3190/11/6/065004 2
- [27] L. E. Miller, C. Fabio, V. Ravenda, S. Bahmad, E. Koun, R. Salemmé, J. Luauté, N. Bolognini, V. Hayward, and A. Farne. Somatosensory cortex efficiently processes touch located beyond the body. *Current Biology*, 29(24):4276–4283, 2019. 1
- [28] L. Moody, A. Waterworth, J. G. Arthur, A. D. McCarthy, P. J. Harley, and R. H. Smallwood. Beyond the visuals: tactile augmentation and sensory enhancement in an arthroscopy simulator. *Virtual reality*, 13:59–68, 2009. doi: 10.1007/s10055-008-0106-x 3
- [29] B. C. M. Murray, B. N. Peele, P. Xu, J. Spjut, O. Shapira, D. Luebke, and R. F. Shepherd. A variable shape and variable stiffness controller for haptic virtual interactions. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Soft Robotics (RoboSoft)*, pp. 264–269, 2018. doi: 10.1109/ROBOSOFT.2018.8404930 1
- [30] S. Nagasaka, Y. Uranishi, S. Yoshimoto, M. Imura, and O. Oshiro. Haptylus: haptic stylus for interaction with virtual objects behind a touch screen. In *SIGGRAPH Asia 2014 Emerging Technologies*, SA ’14. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2014. doi: 10.1145/2669047.2669054 1, 2
- [31] J. R. Napier. The prehensile movements of the human hand. *The Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery British Volume*, 38-B(4):902–913, 1956. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X.38B4.902 4
- [32] A. Ogura, K. Ito, and Y. Itoh. Transtiff: A stick interface with various stiffness by artificial muscle mechanism. In *Adjunct Proceedings of the 35th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, UIST ’22 Adjunct. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2022. doi: 10.1145/3526114.3558777 2
- [33] A. Ogura, K. Ito, S. Yoshida, K. Tanaka, and Y. Itoh. Transtiff: Haptic interaction with a stick interface with various stiffness. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2023 Emerging Technologies*, SIGGRAPH ’23. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3588037.3595402 2
- [34] T. Ohba, H. Kadone, and K. Suzuki. An elastic link mechanism integrated with a magnetorheological fluid for elbow orthotics. In *2012 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Sys*

- tems, pp. 2789–2794, 2012. doi: 10.1109/IROS.2012.6385612 [3](#)
- [35] S. Okamoto, H. Nagano, and Y. Yamada. Psychophysical dimensions of tactile perception of textures. *IEEE Transactions on Haptics*, 6(1):81–93, 2013. doi: 10.1109/TOH.2012.32 [1](#)
- [36] J. Pardomuan. Astrel: Prototyping shape-changing interface with variable stiffness soft robotics module. In *Adjunct Proceedings of the 35th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, UIST ’22 Adjunct. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2022. doi: 10.1145/3526114.3558733 [2](#)
- [37] J. Perret and E. Vander Poorten. Touching virtual reality: A review of haptic gloves. In *ACTUATOR 2018; 16th International Conference on New Actuators*, pp. 1–5, 2018. [1](#)
- [38] N. Ryu, W. Lee, M. J. Kim, and A. Bianchi. Elastick: A handheld variable stiffness display for rendering dynamic haptic response of flexible object. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, UIST ’20, p. 1035–1045. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2020. doi: 10.1145/3379337.3415862 [3](#)
- [39] H. F. Schulte. The characteristics of the mckibben artificial muscle. 1961. [2](#)
- [40] Y. Sun, S. Yoshida, T. Narumi, and M. Hirose. Pacapa: A handheld vr device for rendering size, shape, and stiffness of virtual objects in tool-based interactions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI ’19, p. 1–12. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3290605.3300682 [1](#)
- [41] S.-Y. Teng, T.-S. Kuo, C. Wang, C.-h. Chiang, D.-Y. Huang, L. Chan, and B.-Y. Chen. Pupop: Pop-up prop on palm for virtual reality. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, UIST ’18, p. 5–17. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2018. doi: 10.1145/3242587.3242628 [1](#)
- [42] B. Tondu. Modelling of the mckibben artificial muscle: A review. *Journal of Intelligent Material Systems and Structures*, 23(3):225–253, 2012. doi: 10.1177/1045389X11435435 [2](#)
- [43] V. Wall, R. Deimel, and O. Brock. Selective stiffening of soft actuators based on jamming. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 252–257, 2015. doi: 10.1109/ICRA.2015.7139008 [2](#)
- [44] D. Wang, K. Ohnishi, and W. Xu. Multimodal haptic display for virtual reality: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 67(1):610–623, 2020. doi: 10.1109/TIE.2019.2920602 [2](#)
- [45] Y. Weiss, S. Villa, A. Schmidt, S. Mayer, and F. Müller. Using pseudo-stiffness to enrich the haptic experience in virtual reality. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI ’23. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3544548.3581223 [2](#)
- [46] A. Withana, M. Kondo, Y. Makino, G. Kakehi, M. Sugimoto, and M. Inami. Impact: Immersive haptic stylus to enable direct touch and manipulation for surface computing. *Comput. Entertain.*, 8(2), dec 2011. doi: 10.1145/1899687.1899691 [1, 2](#)
- [47] C. Xu, S. C. Hauser, Y. Wang, and G. J. Gerling. Roles of force cues and proprioceptive joint angles in active exploration of compliant objects. In *2019 IEEE World Haptics Conference (WHC)*, pp. 353–358, 2019. doi: 10.1109/WHC.2019.8816159 [1](#)
- [48] M. Yang and J. Yamaoka. Multijam: Fabricating jamming user interface using multi-material 3d printing. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Tangible, Embedded, and Embodied Interaction*, TEI ’22. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2022. doi: 10.1145/3490149.3505565 [2](#)
- [49] H. K. Yap, J. H. Lim, F. Nasrallah, J. C. H. Goh, and R. C. H. Yeow. A soft exoskeleton for hand assistive and rehabilitation application using pneumatic actuators with variable stiffness. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 4967–4972, 2015. doi: 10.1109/ICRA.2015.7139889 [2](#)
- [50] A. Zerner and A. Krüger. Drag-on: A virtual reality controller providing haptic feedback based on drag and weight shift. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI ’19, p. 1–12. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2019. doi: 10.1145/3290605.3300441 [1](#)
- [51] Y.-F. Zhang, N. Zhang, H. Hingorani, N. Ding, D. Wang, C. Yuan, B. Zhang, G. Gu, and Q. Ge. Fast-response, stiffness-tunable soft actuator by hybrid multimaterial 3d printing. *Advanced Functional Materials*, 29(15):1806698, 2019. doi: 10.1002/adfm.201806698 [2](#)
- [52] Z. Zhang, J. Hou, D. Ning, X. Gong, and Y. Gong. Modeling and experiments on the drive characteristics of high-strength water hydraulic artificial muscles. *Smart Materials and Structures*, 26(5):055023, 2017. doi: 10.1088/1361-665x/aa6a7a [2](#)