















comparative studies between expert and novice designers were also undertaken by comparing junior students with final-year undergraduate [4, 7] or undergraduate and graduate students [35].

Some studies also included non-designers, i.e. people without specific design training, as their research subjects. Most of these studies were user studies, but Crismond [10] also investigated how ordinary people engaged in designing tasks. Archer [3] and Cross [11, 14] argued that design capability not only resided in professional designers, but it is a specific form of general problem-solving capabilities (i.e. every ordinary person can design though their levels are varied). However, it still lacks empirical evidences to support these arguments. It requests further investigation on how ordinary people design and compare it with designers' design processes.

#### 4. Discussions

Delft protocol workshop argued that "... of all the empirical, observational research methods for the analysis of design activity, protocol analysis is the one that has received the most use and attention in recent years. It has become regarded as the most likely method (perhaps the only method) to bring out into the open the somewhat mysterious cognitive abilities of designers" [16]. This review confirmed this statement. Various types of protocols, study settings and analysis approaches were identified.

However, many design protocol studies took this method for granted. Only one third of publications (N=45) explicitly reflected the pros and cons of the method they employed. Most of these criticisms just repeated the constraints of generic verbal protocol analysis; few studies considered the distinction between design protocols with original verbal protocol analysis, like the dual mode issue discussed in the introduction section. It demands more methodological reflections to make protocol analysis more fit to the requirements of design research.

#### 5. References

- [1] Akin, Ö. (1984). An Exploration of the Design Process. In Cross, N. (Ed.), *Developments in Design Methodology*: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, pp 189-207.
- [2] Akin, Ö. and Lin, C. (1995) Design protocol data and novel design decisions. *Design Studies*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp 211-236.
- [3] Archer, L.B. (1979) The Three Rs. *Design Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp 18-20.
- [4] Atman, C.J., Chimka, J.R., Bursic, K.M. and Nachtmann, H.L. (1999) A comparison of freshman and senior engineering design processes. *Design Studies*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp 131-152.
- [5] Blackler, A., Popovic, V. and Mahar, D. (2004) *Studies of Intuitive Interaction Employing Observation and Concurrent Protocol*, in *DESIGN 2004 - 8th International Design Conference*. Dubrovnik, Croatia pp 135-142.
- [6] Bouchard, C., Aoussat, A. and Duchamp, R. (2006) Role of Sketching in Conceptual Design of Car Styling. *Journal of Design Research*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp 116-148.
- [7] Christiaans, H. (1992) *Creativity in design: the role of domain knowledge in designing*, in *Industrial Design Engineering*. TU Delft.p. 230.
- [8] Coley, F., Houseman, O. and Roy, R. (2007) An introduction to capturing and understanding the cognitive behaviour of design engineers. *Journal of Engineering Design*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp 311 - 325.
- [9] Craig, D.L. (2001). Stalking Homo Faber: a comparison of research strategies for studying design behavior. In Eastman, C.M., McCracken, W.M., and Newstetter., W.C. (Eds.), *Design Knowing and Learning : cognition in design education*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd., pp 13-36.
- [10] Crismond, D.P. (1997) *Investigate-and-redesign tasks as a context for learning and doing science and technology: A study of naive, novice and expert high school and adult designers doing product comparisons and redesign tasks*, in *Graduate School of Education*. Harvard University: Massachusetts.p. 297.
- [11] Cross, N. (1982) Designerly ways of knowing. *Design Studies*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp 221-227.
- [12] Cross, N. (2001). Design Cognition: results from protocol and other empirical studies of design activity.



- In Eastman, C.M., McCracken, W.M., and Newstetter, W.C. (Eds.), *Design Knowing and Learning : cognition in design education*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd., pp 79-104.
- [13] Cross, N. (2003). The Expertise of Exceptional Designers. In Cross, N. and Edmonds, E. (Eds.), *Expertise in Design*. Sydney, Australia: Creativity and Cognition Press, University of Technology, Sydney.
- [14] Cross, N. (2008) *Designerly ways of knowing*, Basel: Birkhauser. 138.
- [15] Cross, N., Christiaans, H. and Dorst, K. (1996) *Analysing Design Activity*, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd. xi, 463 p.
- [16] Cross, N., Christiaans, H. and Dorst, K. (1996). Introduction : The Delft Protocols Workshop. In Cross, N., Christiaans, H., and Dorst, K. (Eds.), *Analysing Design Activity*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, pp 1-16.
- [17] Dong, A., Kleinsmann, M. and Valkenburg, R.C. (2009) Affect-in-cognition through the language of appraisals. *Design Studies*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp 138-153.
- [18] Dorst, K. (1997) *Describing Design - A comparison of paradigms*, in *Industrial Design Engineering*. TU Delft.
- [19] Dorst, K. and Dijkhuis, J. (1995) Comparing Paradigms for Describing Design Activity. *Design Studies*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp 261-274.
- [20] Eastman, C.M. (1969) *Cognitive processes and ill-defined problems: a case study from design*. In *Proceedings of the First Joint International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Bedford, MA: MITRE.
- [21] Eastman, C.M. (1970). On the analysis of intuitive design processes. In Moore, G.T. (Ed.), *Emerging Methods in Environmental Design and Planning*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, pp 21-37.
- [22] Eastman, C.M. (1997) Book Review: Analysing design activity. *Design Studies*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp 475-476.
- [23] Eckersley, M. (1988) The Form of Design Processes: a protocol analysis study. *Design Studies*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp 86-94.
- [24] Ericsson, K.A. (2002) Towards a procedure for eliciting verbal expression of non-verbal experience without reactivity: interpreting the verbal overshadowing effect within the theoretical framework for protocol analysis. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, vol. 16, no. 8, pp 981-987.
- [25] Ericsson, K.A. (2003). Valid and Non-Reactive Verbalization of Thoughts During Performance of Tasks. In Jack, A. and Roepstorff, A. (Eds.), *Trusting the Subject?: The Use of Introspective Evidence in Cognitive Science*: Imprint Academic.
- [26] Ericsson, K.A. and Simon, H.A. (1993) *Protocol analysis : verbal reports as data*. Rev. ed, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. liii, 443 p.
- [27] Fayena Tawil, F. (2007) *A Problem Solving Approach to Understanding thought Processes in a Creative Task: A protocol analysis comparison of artists and non-artists*, in *Department of Psychology*. City University of New York: New York.
- [28] Friedman, K., Barron, D., Ferlazzo, S., Ivanka, T., Melles, G. and Yuille, J. (2008) *Design Research Journal Ranking Study: preliminary results*. Swinburne University & RMIT University.
- [29] Gabriel, G.C. (2000) *Computer Mediated Collaborative Design in Architecture : the effects of communication channels on collaborative design*, in *Department of Architectural and Design Science, Faculty of Architecture*. University of Sydney: Sydney.
- [30] Galle, P. and Bela Kovacs, L. (1996) Replication protocol analysis: a method for the study of real-world design thinking. *Design Studies*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp 181-200.
- [31] Gero, J.S. and Tang, H.-H. (1999) *Concurrent and Retrospective Protocols and Computeraided Architectural Design*, in *99' CAADRIA (Association for Computer Aided Architectural Design Research in Asia)*, Gu, J. and Wei, Z., Editors.: Shanghai, Chinapp 403-410.
- [32] Gero, J.S. and Tang, H.-H. (2001) The Differences between Retrospective and Concurrent Protocols in Revealing the Process-oriented Aspects of the Design Process. *Design Studies*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp 283-295.
- [33] Gilhooly, K. and Green, C. (1996). Protocol analysis: theoretical background. In Richardson, J.T.E. (Ed.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for psychology and the social sciences*: Wiley-Blackwell, pp 43-54.
- [34] Goldschmidt, G. (1992). Criteria for Design Evaluation: a process-oriented paradigm. In Kalay, Y.E. (Ed.), *Evaluating and Predicting Design Performance*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, pp 67-80.
- [35] Ho, C.-H. (2001) Some phenomena of problem decomposition strategy for design thinking: differences between novices and experts. *Design Studies*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp 27-45.
- [36] Houseman, O., Coley, F. and Roy, R. (2008) Comparing the cognitive actions of design engineers and cost estimators. *Journal of Engineering Design*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp 145 - 158.
- [37] Johnston, A., Candy, L. and Edmonds, E. (2008) Designing and evaluating virtual musical instruments:

- facilitating conversational user interaction. *Design Studies*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp 556-571.
- [38] Kim, M.H., Kim, Y.S., Lee, H.S. and Park, J.A. (2007) An underlying cognitive aspect of design creativity: Limited Commitment Mode control strategy. *Design Studies*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp 585-604.
- [39] Lawson, B.R. (2004) *What Designers Know*, Oxford : Burlington: Elsevier/Architectural Press. 127 p.
- [40] Lawson, B.R. (2006) *How Designers Think: demystifying the design process*. 4th ed, Oxford: Elsevier/Architectural Press. 320 p.
- [41] Lloyd, P. and McDonnell, J. (2009) Editorial: special issue of values in the design process. *Design Studies*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp 115-118.
- [42] Menezes, A. and Lawson, B. (2006) How designers perceive sketches. *Design Studies*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp 571-585.
- [43] Newell, A. (1966) *On the Analysis of Human Problem Solving Protocols*, in *International Symposium on Mathematical and Computational Methods in the Social Sciences*. Rome, Italy pp 145-185.
- [44] Radcliffe, D.F. and Lee, T.Y. (1989) Design methods used by undergraduate engineering students. *Design Studies*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp 199-207.
- [45] Sanderson, P.M. and Fisher, C. (1994) Exploratory Sequential Data Analysis: Foundations. *Human-Computer Interaction*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp 251-317.
- [46] Schön, D.A. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner : how professionals think in action*, London Temple Smith. 374.
- [47] Schön, D.A. and Wiggins, G. (1992) Kinds of seeing and their functions in designing. *Design Studies*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp 135-156.
- [48] Seitamaa-Hakkarainen, P. and Hakkarainen, K. (2001) Composition and construction in experts' and novices' weaving design. *Design Studies*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp 47-66.
- [49] Tang, J.C. and Leifer, L.J. (1988) *A Framework for Understanding the Workspace Activity of Design Teams*. In *Proceedings of ACM conference on Computer-supported cooperative work*: ACM.
- [50] Taura, T., Yoshimi, T. and Ikai, T. (2002) Study of gazing points in design situation: A proposal and practice of an analytical method based on the explanation of design activities. *Design Studies*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp 165-185.
- [51] Valkenburg, R.C. (1998) Shared understanding as a condition for team design. *Automation in Construction*, vol. 7, no. 2-3, pp 111-121.
- [52] van der Lugt, R. (2000) Developing a graphic tool for creative problem solving in design groups. *Design Studies*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp 505-522.
- [53] Waldron, M.B. and Waldron, K.J. (1996). Methods of studying mechanical design. In Waldron, M.B. and Waldron, K.J. (Eds.), *Mechanical Design: Theory and Methodology*. New York: Springer-Verlag, pp 21 - 34.