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CAD as a ‘Recording’ or ‘Designing’ Tool: Evidence From User Behaviours
Aede Hatib Musta’amal, Dr Eddie Norman, and Tony Hodgson, Loughborough University, England

Abstract
Previously published research has explored the implications of using CAD for the quality of design development, and the quality of design outcomes (Fraser & Hodgson, 2007; Hodgson & Fraser, 2006; Hodgson & Fraser, 2005; Kimbell et al, 2002). Prior study has also revealed, that users’ perceptions affect how CAD is applied, and reflect the benefits received from such use (Robertson & Allen, 1991).

In order to link creativity to the use of CAD, a literature review concerning behaviours associated with creativity was conducted. This was discussed in a PowerPoint presentation presented at the 2007 Design and Technology Association International Research Conference. A framework of seven groups of creative behaviour were identified, particularly ‘Novelty’, ‘Appropriateness’, ‘Motivation’, ‘Fluency’, ‘Flexibility’, ‘Sensitivity’, and ‘Insightfulness’.

Evidence for these behaviours when using CAD was sought by a number of research methods such as interviews, protocol analysis, observations, and design diaries. This paper is reporting part of an initial study undertaken to research the implications of using CAD for creativity in designing. A small-scale case study exploration based on the masters projects by four postgraduate students from the Design and Technology Department at Loughborough University has been carried out.

The results from the current research showed that the use of CAD in designing was linked to design behaviours associated with creativity in the literature.
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Introduction
Since first developed, Computer-aided Design (CAD) has been going through a rapid technological evolution in terms of its capabilities and use in designing. Today, millions of people around the globe have easy access to and use CAD. Its wide use by designers has led to a range of views on the significant consequences it could bring to individual design ability and efficiency, and the quality of the output. For some, CAD is a useful drafting tool which could help designers to effectively communicate and present their design intent accurately (e.g. Charlesworth, 2007). But for others, it is more than just a great presentational tool, as CAD, is considered able to support designing which is also undertaken within the software (e.g. Hodgson & Fraser, 2005).

Prior studies by Robertson and Allen (1991, 1993) have explored users’ perceptions on the role of CAD and the consequent way the users exploited the software. They grouped the perceptions into three categories:
a) physical capital: seeing CAD as an electronic/automated drafting tool.
b) supporting human capital: to enhance user potential in terms of designing skill and/or creativity.
c) enabling improvements in social capital: to improve communications of design information between engineers and/or designers. (ibid.:4)

Referring to the first two categories, the CAD users can be considered within two main groups; namely users who considered CAD as a recording tool (recorder), and users who considered CAD as a designing tool (designer). A CAD recorder can be defined as a CAD user who uses the software for presenting the final design ideas without actively involving it during the development of design ideas. While, a CAD designer can be defined as a CAD user who actively involves the software during designing and also in presenting the final ideas or design intent. Although, in reality CAD users might represent a spectrum between the two categories, these definitions provide a useful starting point for the research.
Researchers have made continuous efforts to explore the potential for CAD to make a greater contribution to the performance of designers (e.g. Bhavnani & Garret, 1993). Lawson (1999) has made arguments on whether CAD would affect individual creativity through experiential examples from a number of architects. He implied that CAD could support the designer in exploring design ideas and give freedom to visualise their creative imagination. Although, expressing concern about the quality of the design outcomes, he clearly agreed that CAD enabled designers to produce convincing and original designs. However, no clear distinction was made between the CAD recorder and designer in the case studies. Further, he noted concern about the lack of research that critically investigates the consequences of using CAD in designing and called for more substantial and appropriate research to be undertaken. These concerns not only related to design practice, but also to design education.

Subsequent to the CAD/CAM in Schools Programme, research in the UK has been conducted to explore its implications for the design curriculum and student attainment. Kimbell et al. (2002) carried out a study which aimed to compare the designing approaches of students who used CAD with those who were non-CAD users. The findings clearly indicated that it promoted student motivation in designing through the ‘real imaging’ visualization features. Students were impressed by the accuracy and the high quality of presentation. Apart from this, the study has suggested that level of skill in using the software would influence students’ confidence and effort to involve CAD in designing. However, there was no discussion of the two types of CAD users (recorder and designer).

In order to understand the importance of CAD users having adequate skills for them to be able to model their product via CAD, Hodgson and Allsop (2003) initiated a research project involving a group of first year undergraduate students from the Industrial Design and Technology programme, Loughborough University. The study aimed to identify how prior CAD knowledge at school might influence students’ ability in developing more complicated CAD models using more complex software. They found that students who had sufficient skill at CAD were able to fully make use of it in the design development process and model more complicated products. These findings supported previous suggestions, that CAD skill is one of the factors that influence designers’ perceptions of CAD usage. There was however, still no distinction between the two potential types of CAD user.

Further research has been conducted by Hodgson and Fraser (2005) to determine the level of CAD capability and the nature of its implementation in UK schools. Some crucial issues such as the possibilities for the use of CAD throughout designing, CAD usage capability, CAD’s impact on workshop activity, and the primary use of CAD were explored. The data indicated that CAD was successfully applied for ‘post-processes’ e.g. virtual and/or tangible output, which gave substantial indication of CAD’s capacity as a recording tool. Still, this study was unable to definitely demonstrate that design development activities were taking place within CAD, despite users identifying the potential of CAD in a wider context.

Due to the inconclusive evidence of CAD’s contributions in designing, additional research has been undertaken to explore this matter. Fraser and Hodgson (2006) in their research had implied the occurrence of designing within CAD, but with restricted evidence, due to the poor design development recording strategy employed by participants. In a recent study, Fraser and Hodgson (2007) have continuously emphasized the potential of CAD’s capacity as a designing tool, but there is still limited evidence of its application in this way. As a ‘stepping stone’ towards such evidence, this research explored the occurrence of creative behaviours when using CAD.

A literature review was undertaken to gain understanding of creativity (e.g. Amabile, 1999; De Bono, 1999; Ward et al. 1999; Dewulf, 1999; Gilchrist, 1972). Whilst there is a vast amount of published information on creativity, little of this concerns its relationship with CAD in designing. A number of creativity characteristics were recognised, and a structured framework for creative behaviour established. It comprised seven categories which are novelty, appropriateness, motivation, fluency, flexibility, sensitivity, and insightfulness. In order to clarify the meaning of these categories, three descriptors were assigned to each of them to facilitate the observation of creative behaviours during the use of CAD (shown in Table 1).

Samples
Initially, four postgraduate students in the Design and Technology Department at Loughborough University, volunteered to participate in this study. However, only three were available for data collection activities and subsequently completed the participation.

Procedure
A series of qualitative approaches comprising interviews, protocol analysis, observations, and design diaries were carried out for data collection. Interviews were carried out before the design project commenced to give an initial overview of participants’ perceptions about the roles of CAD in their projects.
Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creative behaviours</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novelty</strong></td>
<td>uncommon</td>
<td>Ability to seek unusual idea(s) to solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unexpected</td>
<td>Ability to come up with surprising idea(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>original</td>
<td>Ability to come up with unique idea(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriateness</strong></td>
<td>useful</td>
<td>Ability to produce practical design idea(s) or solution(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sensible</td>
<td>Ability to have good judgement in making decisions for practical design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>functional</td>
<td>Ability to propose idea(s) or solution(s) that capable of being operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>enthusiastic</td>
<td>Showing excitement or interest with the activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>determined</td>
<td>Firmness in doing things to achieve satisfactory idea(s) or solution(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>risk-taking</td>
<td>Not afraid to try new ideas and willing to cope with the consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluency</strong></td>
<td>spontaneity</td>
<td>Ability to come up with sudden idea(s) or solution(s) without logical planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>open to new ideas</td>
<td>Receptive to new idea(s) and not sticking to an idea only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fluency of ideas</td>
<td>Ability to generate idea(s) to fulfil certain requirements in some space of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility</strong></td>
<td>exploring possibilities</td>
<td>Allow a variety of approaches through which problems may be solved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continuous reflection</td>
<td>Continuously evaluating and considering previous or present idea(s) or solution(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>associate remote ideas</td>
<td>Ability to combine disparate information into meaningful idea(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sensitivity</strong></td>
<td>understand problem</td>
<td>Ability to see the problem(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>display curiosity</td>
<td>Desire to ask or speculate about things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seek perfection</td>
<td>The act of perfecting previous or present idea(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insightfulness</strong></td>
<td>organizing information</td>
<td>Ability to put together old and new information to gain new idea(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intuitive decision</td>
<td>Ability to come up with a decision without support from logical reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>influence by inspiration</td>
<td>Reaction which is stimulated by instinct or intuition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Creative behaviours and their descriptors

During the progress of the design projects, observations, protocol analysis, and design diaries were completed. This allowed researchers to observe behaviours in the natural setting in which it occurred. The protocol analysis and observations were undertaken to provide real time data for analysis allowing the students’ design processes to be observed, documented and analysed. The design sessions were also audio and video recorded. Further, predetermined design diaries were provided for the participants to record the use of CAD during their project’s completion. The data have been analysed through the methods shown in Table 2.

Figure 1: Research framework
Data collection method for interviews results shown in Table 3

| Interview | Transcribed, and grouped repeated ideas into coding themes shown opposite (Britton, 1996) |

Data collection methods for creative behaviour occurrences shown in Table 4

| Protocol Analysis | Video clips were analysed and presented in PowerPoint format. |

| Observations | CAD design activities were observed and video recorded. Video data were analysed to complement the direct observations analysis. (e.g: Paterson et al, 2003; Powell and Steele, 1996) |

| Design Diaries | Data were analysed by identifying the frequency for each creative behaviour responded by the participant. |

Table 2: Creative Data Analysis Methods
Results and Discussions

It was crucial for the study that the types of user which were suggested from the literature could be distinguished. So in the preliminary interviews, participants were also asked the way they were going to involve CAD in their design projects. Some of the responses from the transcriptions are shown in Table 3. It was clear that the four participants were grouped into two types of user categories who perceived CAD as a recording tool and designing tool. This was based on the feedback that clearly presented their view on how they believed CAD would be involved in the projects. Following these judgments, the participants were observed and the data were analysed to gain insight into how the implications of users’ perception on CAD might affect their creativity.

From Table 4, it is shown that higher frequencies of creative behaviours were distinguished from P03 and P04 compared to P02. The data in Table 4 shows that 63 creative behaviour occurrences were observed for P02, 99 for P03 and 100 for P04. These figures indicate that the users who anticipated using CAD throughout designing displayed more creative behaviours than those who simply regarded it as a final design modelling tool. This supports prior research by Robertson and Allen (1991;1993).

Interestingly, the results also indicated that CAD is a tool that provides a conducive environment for creativity by supporting creative behaviours for users who had not anticipated using CAD throughout the designing whilst engaged with the software. This was shown by the creative behaviours recognized from P02 who believed CAD would only be used for presenting the final ideas through its realistic imaging capability. These findings suggest that CAD encourages creative behaviours in users whatever perception they previously had about CAD use. However, seeing CAD as a vital tool for designing would considerably increase the potential of creative behaviours being encouraged.

Table 3: Types of CAD user identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Code</th>
<th>Where CAD fits [WFT]</th>
<th>CAD user types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P01</td>
<td>‘… I mostly use CAD for just to get renders… just to get photorealistic images… the main purpose.’</td>
<td>Recording tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P02</td>
<td>‘After we’ve got the final…’</td>
<td>Recording tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P03</td>
<td>‘I think I will introduce computer (CAD) even like in the beginning of my designing [start from the beginning]…’</td>
<td>Designing tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P04</td>
<td>‘And, basically, I’m using CAD from the start to finish.’</td>
<td>Designing tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Creative behaviour occurrences between participants (Recorder vs Designer)

Amongst the descriptors of the seven creative behaviours, those such as open to new ideas, display curiosity, and intuitive decisions were displayed by P03 and P04, but not P02. The reason might be that the straightforward activity of modelling final design ideas did not facilitate the user in becoming involved with further decision making activity and/or exploring possibilities for alternative design solutions or ideas. However, it was different for P03 and P04 participants, where the use of CAD in design development had encouraged them to explore a wider range of possibilities.

The results also showed that a number of creative behaviours descriptors were not observed for both types of users i.e. uncommon, unexpected, original, useful, spontaneity, and influence by inspiration. The failure to identify these types of behaviours suggests that the established research instrument needs refinement, in particular, the definitions of observed behaviours. For example, to identify any sign of novelty occurrences, the focus of observation must not only consider the emergence of innovative aspects, but must also consider the evolutionary aspects in designing. This is suggested by Tovey (1989:27) who quoted as:

Not all product design has to be radically original. The design process for some manufactured products is concerned with creativity in respect of the appearance of the product, but little major change otherwise.

Innovative is referring to a major transformation in a new product design creation which is obviously unique in terms of its form, and/or purpose. Whilst, evolutionary, is ‘concerned with the development of existing products, with the new
design evolving out of the current product' (Tovey, 1989:30). These are essentially similar to the definitions of an archetype and evolutionary design proposal by Thistlewood (1990). This would suggest that, creativity, in design should not only be measured by its newness compared to the existing artefacts, but also, in the context of its ‘surprising’ factor as a result of the modification and/or elaboration of the existing products.

It should also be noted that the data analysis was not based on design outcome, which may be one of the reasons why the novelty criteria could not be distinguished. This is, however, to be the subject of further analysis.

Conclusions
This research has demonstrated that all the participants have displayed creative behaviours whilst using CAD. The findings also emphasised that anticipating using CAD throughout designing made the likelihood of creative behaviours being displayed during design development work greater. In the case of these users particularly significant creative behaviours were identified within their CAD activity.

What remains to be established therefore, is whether or not creative behaviours link to creativity? This will be the subject of further research in establishing the role that CAD could play in contributing to creativity in designing.
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