

A CAD-Based Research Platform for Design Thinking Studies

Molla Hafizur Rahman

Department of Mechanical Engineering
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72701
mhrahman@email.uark.edu
ASME Student Member

Corey Schimpf

Concord Consortium
25 Love Lane, Concord, MA 01742
cschimpf@concord.org

Charles Xie

Concord Consortium
25 Love Lane, Concord, MA 01742
qxie@concord.org

Zhenghui Sha¹

Department of Mechanical Engineering
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72701
zsha@email.uark.edu
ASME Member

ABSTRACT

Design thinking is often hidden and implicit, so empirical approach based on experiments and data-driven methods has been the primary way of doing such research. In support of empirical studies, design behavioral data which reflects design thinking becomes crucial, especially with the recent advances in data mining and machine learning techniques. In this paper, a research platform that supports data-driven design thinking studies is introduced based on a computer-aided design (CAD) software for solar energy systems, Energy3D, developed by the team. We demonstrate several key features of Energy3D including a fine-grained design process logger, embedded design experiment and tutorials, and interactive CAD interfaces and dashboard. These features make Energy3D a capable testbed for a variety of research related to engineering design thinking and design theory, such as search

¹ Corresponding author: zsha@uark.edu.

strategies, design decision-making, AI in design, and design cognition. Using a case study on an energy-plus home design challenge, we demonstrate how such a platform enables a complete research cycle of studying designers' sequential decision-making behaviors based on fine-grained design action data and unsupervised clustering methods. The results validate the utility of Energy3D as a research platform and testbed in supporting future design thinking studies and provide domain-specific insights into new ways of integrating clustering methods and design process models (e.g., the function-behavior-structure model) for automatically clustering sequential design behaviors.

Keywords: Sequential design decision, design thinking, computer-aided design, unsupervised learning, and data clustering

1. RESEARCH BACKGROUND AND PAPER OVERVIEW

1.1 Engineering Design and Design Thinking

Design is a purposeful activity that aims to meet a set of requirements for an artifact [1, 2]. It typically involves *defining* problems and *solving* them [3]. The former stage usually transforms design from ill-defined problems to well-defined ones, from which both design variables and constraints can be identified, and the design space is determined. This step often requires design ideation, conceptualization, and requirement analysis. The later stage relies on different strategies of searching to find the most appropriate solutions within the identified design space. In both stages, design heavily relies on a designer's knowledge consisting of not only explicit knowledge that can be obtained from encoded information, such as text and drawings, but also tacit knowledge that is difficult to visualize and mainly accumulated




Figure 1. Engineering design process and design thinking

from experience [4]. In addition, designers are bounded rational due to human's limited information processing capability [5]. In this process, engineering design thinking (EDT), as shown in **Figure 1**, plays an important role in bridging design knowledge and design problems, given the bounded rationality of designers, to guide designers' operations to navigate through the design space in a stepwise but iterative manner (a.k.a. sequential decision-making), in order to achieve the design objective. According to Dym et al. [6], EDT is a complex process of inquiry and learning that designers perform in a systems context, making decisions as they proceed and often working collaboratively.

1.2 The Significance and Challenges

A deeper understanding on designers' thinking and decision-making is critical to the discovery of generalized design processes and heuristics that can, in turn, be used to facilitate design process and enhance design automation. This is particularly useful to the development of computational design methods. For example, evidence has shown that human beings are quite successful, in heuristically solving design problems with large solutions space and often nonconvex objectives. Recent studies [7, 8] also show that human search displays a different pattern as compared to computational algorithms. Therefore, integrating human intelligence into current computational design frameworks can initiate a new paradigm of human-intelligence computational design.

However, the challenges of studying EDT naturally follow because thinking often resides tacitly inside the mind of designers and is difficult to make it explicit [9]. Therefore, empirical study and data-driven approaches are common pathways to study EDT. Existing literature has demonstrated the use of various types of data (e.g., texts, drawings, and videos) for design

thinking studies, such as design knowledge acquisition [10], design creativity assessment [11-13], and search patterns [14]. Sha et al. [15] also demonstrated the effectiveness of using behavioral data for studying designers' sequential decision-making strategies under competition. Even if extensive research has been conducted in this field, significant challenges remain. For example, design problems are often complex and must be decomposed into subtasks. Therefore, systems thinking plays a critical role in organizing and iterating through tasks *across different design stages*. The essence of system thinking and its role in EDT are rarely studied due to the lack of research platform that supports the collection of quality behavioral data in a complete system design cycle (see **Table 1** for details). The insights drawn from those studies cannot be easily transferred to practical engineering design context. In addition, current research pays little attention to the temporal granularity of the behavioral data, yet, this is critical to probe into the dynamics of EDT. Valuable information that could reflect design strategies might have been overlooked if data is only collected after large time intervals.

To address these challenges, this paper introduces a new research platform based on a computer-aided design (CAD) software, Energy3D [16]. Energy3D is originally developed by Xie (one of the team members of this project) for CAD of solar energy systems. But, it has been recently adapted and unique features (e.g., built-in experiment modules) have been added to transform it to a research platform and testbed for EDT studies and data-intensive design research. See more detailed discussion in Section 3.

1.3 Overview of The Paper

The **primary objective** of this study is to develop a research platform based on Energy3D in support of fine-grained data-driven research of designers' thinking and decision-making. With a case study on automatically clustering designers' sequential decision-making behaviors, we demonstrate how this new platform enables a complete research cycle in studying EDT, and facilitates the development of an integrated approach to automatically clustering designers' sequential design behaviors.

The **contribution of this work** lies in three aspects: 1) the identification of a set of data requirements that is critical to the validity of EDT research; 2) a new open-source research platform that facilitates researchers to conduct design experiments and collect high-quality design behavioral data in support of EDT studies; and 3) an integrated approach based on three unsupervised learning and clustering methods (i.e., K-means clustering, hierarchical agglomerative clustering, and network-based clustering) for automatic clustering of sequential design behaviors.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents state-of-the-art research on EDT and data collection methods. In this section, we also summarize the major differences between the proposed platform and existing ones, and present the data requirements for EDT studies. In Section 3, we introduce the Energy3D-based research platform and its unique features for EDT studies. In Section 4, a case study on clustering designers' sequential design behaviors based on such a research platform is presented. Section 5 concludes the paper with closing insights, broader impacts, and our future work. An earlier version with preliminary results on the case study was presented at the ASME 2018 Computers and Information in Engineering Conference in Quebec City, Canada [17].

2. BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, we first present a review of existing literature on EDT studies. Then, we give a particular emphasis on the studies based on CAD software and non-intrusive data logging because these topics are relevant to the proposed research platform. At the end, we provide a summary of the typical data collection methods in these studies, from which we identify the limitations of current research and present our view on a set of new data requirements that shall be considered in the EDT studies.

2.1 Existing Research on Engineering Design Thinking

Existing literature on EDT can be primarily categorized into the following three directions¹. A more comprehensive review of state-of-the-art research on designer thinking is provided in [18].

- Protocol studies: protocol analysis relies on observation and can be categorized into in-vivo studies (e.g., the think-aloud method [19]) and in-vitro studies (e.g., interviews with designer [20]). The observational data needs to be transcribed, segmented and coded, and then post-analyses can be performed to generate insights into design thinking. Typical topics of study include design creativity [13, 21-23] and fixation [24-26], example modality [11, 27, 28], the role of sketches [29-32], and differences of thinking patterns between experts and novices [33-36]. Since the coding scheme is a critical step,

¹ Brain-mapping techniques, mainly the electroencephalogram and the functional magnetic resonance imaging, have been adopted to investigate the neurological basis of design thinking. These studies are particularly interested in understanding how cognitive functions are supported by different brain areas. However, this research stream is not comparable to our research thus is not summarized.

extensive research is carried out in evaluating different coding methods (e.g., the FBS scheme [37, 38]), and sketch coding methods (e.g., the C-sketch method [39]).

- Controlled experiment: controlled lab experiments are very effective for validating the causality between factors of interest and design outcomes. As experimental settings need to be well designed beforehand, controlled experiments often offer greater intrinsic validity [18]. The results are often generalizable and extensible [40]. Typical subjects of study in this area include the effects of design cost [7, 15] and designers' expertise [41-44] on design outcomes, team effects in design [12, 45, 46], analogical reasoning [47, 48], and provocative stimuli [49, 50]. The design field recently has a trend of using gamified design scenarios [15, 51-55] to study design behaviors and thinking.
- Simulation trials: Recently, research has been pursued to "replay" designer thinking, particularly the sequential decision-making, using computer simulations. For example, McComb et al. study designers' sequential learning abilities using Markov chain [14, 56] and simulated annealing [46, 57, 58]. Gero and Peng [59] also use Markov chain to study the behaviors of a constructive memory agent. Sexton and Ren [8] leverage human searching capability to fine-tune the parameters in Bayesian optimization for enhanced performance. Panchal and Sha [7] integrates Gaussian Process model and game theory to study designers' strategies in sequential decision-making under competition.

2.2 Design Thinking Studies Using CAD Software and Non-Intrusive Data Logging

Non-intrusive data logging is a method that automatically logs a designers' actions in real time as they use an interactive simulation or design environment without interrupting their design process. On one hand, this can be realized by commercial CAD software which often has

an explicit data schema for logging designers' actions and relevant metadata, e.g., timestamps, and structures of design artefacts, e.g., geometry hierarchy, in generic data storage formats such as XML. Data captured through these platforms can be processed and sometimes analyzed computationally to accelerate research. For example, Jin and Ishino [60] proposed a data-mining framework, DAKA, which can extract designers' design activity and knowledge from CAD event data. Gopsill et al. [61] used CAD as a sensor to collect design action logs and studied micro design patterns which showed the implications of operations, such as "deletion" and "reversing", in design iteration. Sen et al. [62] presented a non-intrusive protocol study with the aid of a software on measuring information content when designers perform free-hand sketching of design concepts. On the other hand, many researchers have developed their own applets for data collection. For example, in order to explore design heuristics and sequential design patterns, McComb et al. [56] collect design behavioral data with two configuration design experiments with the aid of self-developed applets for truss design and cooling systems design. Sha et al. [15] developed an economic decision game applet based on z-Tree and studied the effects of design cost on designers' sequential decision-making under competition.

Additionally, logged data may be processed in real time to offer designers immediate feedback or suggestions for advancing their design process [63, 64]. Sivanathan et al. [65] extend the data logging method to what they call ubiquitous multimodal capture that incorporates CAD logging, keyboard and mouse logging, eye tracking, screen and environment video, galvanic skin resistance, electroencephalogram, and electrocardiogram. They demonstrate the feasibility of this collection scheme through case examples of bracket design and collaborative design review. While ubiquitous multimodal capture collects extensive data

from a designer, it comes at the cost of being disruptive for the designer and expensive to implement.

In summary, CAD-based non-intrusive data collection method offers a great opportunity to EDT research. However, many self-develop applets have limited functionalities and only address a particular design phase, e.g., conceptual design. In addition, commercial CAD software is a tool and not designed for research purpose *per se*. The data collected from such software are typically drawing or sketch commands (e.g., circle, extruding), and are not able to produce a continuous flow of research data in a complete design process. Yet, design has a life cycle and contains many design stages, such as concept generation, preliminary design, embodiment design, engineering analysis, design validation, etc. Many facets of EDT due to the systems design essences (often require systems thinking) can be hardly assessed. Therefore, the insights obtained from the research based on those platforms are difficult to draw generic insights. The data collected from self-developed applet is also ill-structured without using standard data structure and schema. This creates burdens for data processing and sometimes causes missing data, which inevitably hinders the major effort at the core of research. More importantly, these applets are often in closed form and not accessible from public, which causes barriers in repeating and reproducing the research findings for cross-validation. In **Table 1**, we summarize the representative research platforms used in design literature. While existing work sets standards and guidelines for many ongoing research projects, our proposed research platform addresses the above limitations and therefore, well complements the existing ones, and thus provides an alternative engineering system design testbed where many new and developed approaches for EDT studies can be investigated and tested. In the following section,

we introduce the unique features of the proposed research platform and show how those features complement current platforms and how they can ease the research cycle of design thinking studies.

Table 1. Representative research platforms for EDT studies based on the literature review

Reference	Design problem	Design platform/ software	Data format	System or component design	Design information data	Built-in experiment materials
McComb, et al. 2015 [57]	Truss design	Self-developed and closed source	Not reported	System - configuration design	Not reported	External tutorial; No built-in materials
Yu, et al. 2016 [66]	Desalination system/sea water reverse osmosis	Self-developed and closed source	Not reported	System - parametric design	Design parameter values; timestamp	External tutorial; No built-in materials
Egan, et al. 2015 [67]	Myosin design	Self-developed and closed source	Not reported	System – parametric design	Text; Design parameter values	External tutorial; No built-in materials
McComb, et al. 2017 [14]	Truss design and home cooling system	Self-developed and closed source	Not reported	System – configuration design	Design actions	No built-in materials

Jin, et al. 2006 [60]	Car front door	Commercial and open source	Not reported	Component design	CAD drawing commands	No built-in materials
Gopsill, et al. 2016 [61]	Pulley	Commercial and open source	Not reported	Component design	CAD drawing commands	No built-in materials
Ritchie, et al. 2008 [68]	Cable organization system	Commercial and closed source	Yes (XML)	Component design	Design actions in virtual reality	No built-in materials
Sha, et al. 2015 [15]	Function minimize	Self- developed and closed source	Not reported	Component or System - parametric design	Design parameter values	No built-in materials
Sivanathan, et al. 2015 [65]	Bracket support	Commercial and open source	Yes (XML)	Component design	Design actions and video	No built-in materials
Sen, et al. 2017 [62]	Burger maker	Commercial and closed source	Yes (Excel)	System – conceptual design	Design sketches; timestamp	No built-in materials
Toh, et al. 2014 [11]	Milk froth device	No software platform	Not reported	System – conceptual design	Sketches	No built-in materials
Gero, et al. 2018 [21]	Wheelchair assist device	No software platform	Not reported	System – conceptual design	Sketches and video	No built-in materials

This paper (Energy3D)	Solar energy systems	CAD-based platform	Yes (JSON)	System – multiple design stages	Design actions, design config., text, artifact, etc.	Built-in experiment materials
--------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	---------------	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------

3. THE RESEARCH PLATFORM

In this section, we introduce our research platform for EDT studies based on Energy3D and discuss the key features that make it a suitable and powerful tool in supporting ETD research. Before demonstrating the details, we first summarize our view on the data requirements that shall be met for EDT research in order to address the limitations of existing methods identified in Sections 2.2 and 2.3.

3.1 Data Requirements for EDT Research

To successfully execute the proposed research and achieve the objective, the data is critical and specific requirements deserves careful attention. We identified five requirements based on our literature review performed in Section 2.

- 1) Intra-stage and inter-stage design iteration. Design iteration does not only occur within each stage but also between stages [69]. For example, designers often utilize science simulation to refine their designs in concepts generation [70]. The decisions made during such an iteration play a vital role in assuring a successful design. A tool that supports the collection of design process data and design actions in both intra-stage and inter-stage iterations is needed.
- 2) High fidelity. In a design process, ad-hoc decisions are often made. Unnoticeable actions could be nontrivial information reflecting useful decision-making strategies. It would be

ideal if every single movement of designers can be recorded. The data should be a collective memory of the complete output and all iterations in design.

- 3) Non-intrusive. Intrusive data collection (e.g., interviews) is time-consuming, and thus restricts research scale [52, 71]. Such a process could easily add cognitive load to designers, thus possibly contributing biases toward the observed behaviors [72]. These limitations can diminish the validity of the data.
- 4) Rational behavior. Most decision theories assume rational behaviors, but designers have bounded rationality [73]. When collecting design behavioral data, designers' irrationality should be accounted for and decision-supporting tools (e.g., simulations) shall be leveraged to inform rational decisions to improve the quality of design data.
- 5) Multiple forms. The data should be a combination of operational, textual and even video data to support the cross-validation of research approaches or methodologies.

3.2 Using Energy3D as a Research Platform for EDT Studies

With the aim of meeting these requirements, we introduce a new research platform based on Energy3D, a computer-aided design software developed by Xie [16], one of our team members. It was developed as a tool for solar energy systems design and analysis as well as for K-12 education research. To make it applicable to support engineering design research, specific features, such as built-in experimentation, tutorial and templates, new computational modules, and additional data collection methods, have been added. In summary, as a platform for design research, Energy3D has unique features in three aspects:

a) Features for data collection

First, Energy3D can continuously and automatically log and sort every user action and design snapshots (computer models, *not* images²) in a fine-grained resolution. These data represent the smallest transformation possible on a design object that changes how it looks or performs. That means the design process and even the design artifact can be entirely **reconstructed without losing any important details**. Therefore, it works as a “sensor” of design behaviors so as to capture the design processes in detail, and in a non-intrusive manner, i.e., designers are not aware of the data collection and can concentrate on their design activities without any hindrance to their design thinking.

Second, Energy3D logs the data in JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) format. JSON is a generic machine-readable data storage format that relies on two common data-structures, arrays and key-value pairs, to encode a variety of data schemas. In Energy3D, each logged action contains the action itself, e.g. adding a wall, and metadata about the time and date when the action was taken. Central design attributes associated with each action are recorded as well, such as the size of a window or the results of an energy simulation. Such a standard data format makes it possible to translate any design activity, logic, or strategy into computer code and vice versa. JSON data can be readily processed by most programming languages and statistical platforms like R, making it convenient for researchers to analyze the data with their preferred toolset. Standardization and automation make the design research cost-effective and scalable.

² Energy3D has a design replay feature. The design artifacts are saved as Energy3D files and later can be used for replaying the entire design process. This allows researchers to check designers’ design processes in detail and will help validate against mined design knowledge and strategies from log data.

The diagram illustrates the Energy3D platform as a research tool, categorized into three main functional areas:

- Features for data collection:**
 - Fine-grained design action logger
 - Design artifact logger
 - JSON format
 - Design replay
 - Electronic notepad
- Features for engineering systems design:**
 - User-friendly CAD interface
 - High-fidelity simulation
 - built-in financial evaluation
 - Interactive visualization
 - Supporting various types of design
- Features for design experiment:**
 - Built-in design tutorials
 - AI design agent
 - Built-in design examples
 - :
 - :

All these features feed into a central outcome: **Large volume of design behavioral data for EDT research that embodies high volume, high velocity, high variety and high veracity**.

Fourth, in addition to CAD modeling, Energy3D has built-in modules of engineering analysis, scientific simulation, and financial evaluation that realize a seamless design environment. This ensures the collection of design data during intra- and inter-stage iterations, for example, how designers make decisions with economic considerations, i.e., design with rationality. These data are important to the study on designers' thinking in complex systems design and the role of system thinking in engineering design.

The interface of Energy3D is intuitive to operate [75]. Energy3D encompasses several pre-designed components (i.e., doors, window, solar panel, etc.) that ease the design difficulty such as drawing components from scratch. This ensures participants can focus on the design




Figure 3. Energy3D supports various solar systems design. (a) The user interface of Energy3D. (b) A rooftop photovoltaic system for Boeing's South Carolina factory. (c) Parabolic troughs in Hawaii

process and employing design thinking instead of time-consuming drawing process. In addition, easy operation will help shorten participants' learning curve, which often influences the validity of behavioral data in design research.

It is worth noting that, simulations in Energy3D are very accurate and trustworthy as it provides real-world design configuration and materials [76]. For example, the building simulation engine is calibrated with DOE's BESTEST benchmarks. This feature ensures authentic and high-fidelity design practice. Moreover, during simulations, Energy3D graphically illustrates

the results through interactive visualization and animation, which allows designers to easily and efficiently get formative and immediate feedback. This is critical to their rational decision-making and exploration of design space in engineering systems design.

Energy3D supports various solar energy system designs (see **Figure 3**). Design can be conducted in various contexts with different options of solar harvesting devices including solar panel, heliostat, and parabolic trough, and different solar panel brands. With these capabilities, researchers can create different experiments covering a wide range of design scenarios in different levels of design complexity, such as single component design, geometric design, layout design, material design, and architectural design.

c) Features for human-subject experiments in design research

To facilitate experiments for design research, Energy3D contains many built-in tutorials for designers to get acquainted with the domain knowledge of solar science, building science, and engineering design. These tutorials can be used as pre-session before experiment in order to account for the variation of learning curves among participants. In addition to these tutorials, a set of design experiments have also been made publicly available through the authors' websites [77, 78]. The researchers can easily adapt these examples to create new ones for their own research purpose and data collection.

With all the above features in three aspects, as summarized in **Figure 2**, Energy3D can support the collection of a large volume of fine-grained design




Figure 4. A typical cycle for data-driven engineering design thinking research

behavioral data which is essential to big data mining and machine learning of EDT. Such fine-grained data possess all four characteristics of big data [79]: 1) High volume. A large amount of design process data will be generated. 2) High velocity. One of the characteristics of big data is velocity which means how fast the data is collected. Energy3D collects, processes and visualizes data in real time at the scale of seconds. Such an improvement on the continuity of behavioral data can help improve the understanding of the flow of design thinking. 3) High variety. The data encompasses multiple forms involving design actions, parameters, analyses and simulations. 4) High veracity. The data is comprehensive to ensure fair and trustworthy assessments of designer performance. These big data have the potential to yield direct, measurable evidence of design thinking at a statistically significant level. This is fundamentally different from existing studies [60, 61, 63, 64] using CAD logs that contain merely drawing commands. Xie and colleagues' prior work [80-82] has shown that the data collected from Energy3D is capable of measuring the level of engagement, revealing gender differences, and distinguishing the iterative and non-iterative cycles in design.

With Energy3D as the platform, we follow a typical scientific research cycle as shown in **Figure 4** to conduct EDT research. As indicated in the figure, the step of research experiment and data collection are critical links in this cycle yet their rigor and validity have received little attention. As introduced above, those unique features of Energy3D will provide researchers with strong support.

4. AUTOMATICALLY CLUSTERING SEQUENTIAL DESIGN BEHAVIORS: A CASE STUDY

In this section, we demonstrate a case study using Energy3D as the research platform where each of the research steps in **Figure 4** is followed. First, we present our research problem

and the research question we investigated in this particular study. Then we discuss how Energy3D is used to set up the experiment for design behavioral data collection. In this study, we develop an approach based on unsupervised learning based approach that integrates Markov chain model to automatically cluster designers' sequential design behaviors. Finally, based on the results, we answer the question and conclude the case study.

4.1 The research problem and the research question

Engineering system design is a decision-making process where a series of inter-related operations are determined by designers. During a design task, designers sequentially make decisions in order to explore the design space, and iteratively improve their designs' quality. Therefore, sequential decision making is an important factor in achieving quality design outcomes. In-depth understanding of sequential behaviors, especially their design patterns, help to uncover useful design heuristics to improve existing algorithms of computational design, design automation, and advance AI in engineering design

However, modeling design decision-making is scientifically challenging because human decisions are the result of a mental process that is hidden, implicit, and sometimes tacit [9]. Such a challenge is even more complex in a system design context that consists of a large number of coupling design variables. To address the challenge, we adopt a data-driven approach and use unsupervised clustering methods to mine designers' sequential design patterns. This case study is motivated by answering the following research question: *What are the sequential design behavioral patterns that most designers would follow in systems design?* To answer the research question, a human-subject experiment is conducted and sequential

design behavioral data are collected based on the research platform, Energy3D. In the following sections, we present this case study in detail.

4.2 Design Experiment and Data Collection using Energy3D

In this section, we first give a brief description of the design problem. Next, we introduce our experiment procedure, and the sequential design action data collected.

4.2.1 The Design Problem

The design problem in this case study is to build a solarized energy-plus home for a client in Dallas. See an illustrative example in **Figure 5**. The design objective is to maximize the annual net energy (ANE). The budget for the house is \$200,000. The house should have a minimum height of 2.5 *m*, and the roof must be pitched. The building needs to have at least four windows and one door. The solar panel must be placed on the roof. The other constraints are shown in **Table 2**.

Table 2. The requirements of the energy-plus home design project

	Items	Requirements
Build height	Story	1
	Height of wall	$\geq 2.5 \text{ m}$
Roof	Roof style	Pitched
Window	Number of windows	≥ 4
	Size of window	$\geq 1.44 \text{ m}^2$
Door	Number of doors	≥ 1
	Size of door (Width×Height)	$\geq 1.2 \text{ m} \times 2 \text{ m}$
Solar panel	Distance between edge/ridge and solar panel	$\geq 0 \text{ m}$

This design is a system design problem that involves many components (e.g., windows, roof, solar panel, etc.), many design variables (e.g., the number of solar panels, the cell efficiency of solar panel, etc.), and complex coupling relations among the variables. Therefore, the design space is very large. This is why the requirements and the constraints are developed to reduce designers' action space to a manageable level.

During the design process, designers make trade-off decisions. For example, there is no restriction on the area of the house. But if the area is too small, designers will not be able to place enough solar panel on the roof. As a result, the ANE will be insignificant. On the other hand, if the area is too large, the cost may exceed the budget. So, designers follow their own strategies during the design process to sequentially make decisions guiding the exploration and exploitation of the design space so as to improve the ANE as much as possible.

4.2.2 The Experiment Procedure and Data Collection

A human-subject experiment was conducted where in total 38 students from the University of Arkansas participated. The participants were indexed based on which session they were in and which laptop they used; thus, A02 means the participant was in Session A and sit in laptop #2.

Each session consists of two phases: pre-session and in-session. The pre-session is 30 minutes³ for participants to practice Energy3D with the built-in



Figure 5. An energy-plus home design from one of the participants

³ Our pilot study has shown that participants are able to master the operations of Energy3D for the energy-plus home design project in 30 minutes with the aid of the tutorial.

design tutorials. The pre-session is designed to account for the learning curves of humans. The data generated in pre-session is not used for analysis. At the end of the pre-session, the participants are guided to transition to the in-session stage. The in-session stage lasts about 1.5 hours. The design statement and the design requirements are provided at the beginning of this session, and a record sheet is provided for participants to record the ANE and cost whenever they iterate their designs.

Many of the Energy3D features, especially the CAD design features and the design experiment features, allow designers to explore the design space effectively and efficiently. For example, the graphical representation of construction cost and ANE analysis helps them to interpret their underlying tradeoff. Moreover, the interactive visualization shows heat flux and sun path, which aid designers in making effective decisions on the location of solar panels and the orientation of the buildings.

Monetary rewards are provided at the end of the session to incentivize the participants to search the design space as much as they can. The participants are rewarded based on the amount of time they spend as well as the quality of their final designs, which are quantified by the ANE value and the construction cost. In this study, we are able to collect design behavioral data using Energy3D at a fine-grained level. For example, the design artifact logger collects 220 intermediate Energy3D files and the design action logger collects 1500 line of actions per participant on average. This ensures a sufficient amount of data for later statistical analysis and data analytics. The JSON file includes entries in the following format: time-stamps, design action, and its corresponding parameters and/or analysis values, such as the coordinate of an object and/or ANE output. An example of the data entries is shown below:

- "Timestamp": "2017-11-14 12:51:27", "File": "EnergyPlusHome.ng3", "Add Rack": \("Type": "Rack", "Building": 2, "ID": 23, "Coordinates": [\("x": -28.863, "y": -49.8, "z": 20.799)].
- "Timestamp": "2019-02-22 09:07:44", "File": "EnergyPlusHome.ng3", "Edit Window": \("Type": "Window", "Building": 1, "ID": 66, "Coordinates": [\("x": -33.647, "y": -3.783, "z": 19)].

4.3 The research approach

A general approach to automatically clustering sequential design behaviors is presented in **Figure 6**. From the raw design in JSON format, 115 unique design actions are identified based on the data from 38 participants⁴. Analysis of such a high dimension action space would yield results hard to interpret. In order to reduce the dimensionality and to better understand designers' sequential design thinking, the FBS-based process model is adopted to transform the action space into a design process space that consists of seven design process stages.




Figure 6. Overview of the approach to automatically clustering sequential design behaviors

The FBS is constructed with three classes of ontological variables: Function, Behavior, and Structure. Later, two additional variables are added for better representation of the design process: Requirements and Descriptions. Based on the five FBS ontological variables, a design

⁴ In this study, only design actions, e.g., "Add Rack", "Edit Wall", etc. are considered for analysis. Trivial actions that do not affect the design quality, such as "Camera", "Edit human" etc., are ignored.

process can be characterized by eight process stages: *Formulation, Analysis, Evaluation, Synthesis, Documentation* and *Reformulation 1, 2 and 3*. The definition and interpretation of each design process stage are listed in **Table 3**. According to the FBS model, a coding scheme is established (third column of **Table 3**) to transcribe different types of design actions to the corresponding design process stages (see details in [17] about how each type of design actions corresponds to the design process stages in the FBS model).

Table 3. The FBS model and the proposed coding scheme for design actions

Design process	Definition and interpretation	Types of design action
<i>Formulation</i>	Generate Function from Requirement and from Function to Expected Behavior.	Add any components
<i>Analysis</i>	The process generated from Structure.	Analysis of annual net energy
<i>Synthesis</i>	Generate and tune Structure based on the Expected Behavior.	Edit any components
<i>Evaluation</i>	The comparison between the Expected Behavior and the behavior enabled by the actual Structure.	Cost analysis
<i>Reformulation 1</i>	The transition from one Structure to a different Structure.	Remove structure
<i>Reformulation 2</i>	The transitions from Structure to Expected Behavior.	Remove solar device
<i>Reformulation 3</i>	The transition from Structure to Function.	Remove other components

With the FBS-based transcription, the sequence of how the design space is explored (design action space) can be therefore mapped to a design process (design thinking space). Then, the first-order Markov chain model [83] is adopted to quantitatively characterize the sequential design process of each participant into a transition probability matrix. An entry (π_{ij}) of this matrix defines the probability that design process i transitions to j , which is calculated by $\pi_{ij} = \frac{n_{ij}}{n_i}$, where n_{ij} is the number of times design process j is followed by process i , and n_i is the total counts of the design process i occurs during the entire design. An example of the transition probability matrix of the first-order Markov Chain for participant C14 is shown in

Figure 7. The max probability is 0.75, indicating that the most occurred design pattern for this designer is *Reformulation 1* $\rightarrow$ *Reformulation 1*. This implies that the designer C14 was involved in removing structure (wall, window) significantly more frequent than other transitions. The value

zero means that the designer never made that transition in his/her design. For example, the value from *Synthesis* to *Reformulation 1* is zero. This indicates that after editing or changing the parameters of any structural components (such as walls), this designer never removed those components.

Once the quantified design behavior, i.e., the 7×7 transition probability matrix, is obtained, it can be converted to a 49×1 vector. For n designers, a new $49 \times n$ matrix will be formed, thus different clustering methods can be applied to these n designers to group those




Figure 7. Transition matrix of the first-order Markov chain for participant C14

with similar sequential behavioral patterns. In this study, we apply three different clustering methods: K-means clustering [84], hierarchical agglomerative clustering (HAC) [84], and network-based clustering [85]. These clustering methods are selected as representatives from three different clustering categories, i.e., hard clustering, flat clustering and network clustering [86], that covers most commonly-used clustering methods. K-means clustering works on Euclidean distance between data points and partitions dataset into K separate, non-overlapping clusters such that the total within-cluster variation, summed over all the clusters, is minimum [84]. Since K-means requires the number of clusters as input, a separate algorithm (e.g., elbow plot method [87]) is often needed to determine the optimal number of clusters. The number of clusters obtained from the elbow plot method is used to guide the implementation of the other two clustering methods for fair comparison. Different from K-means, HAC produces a tree-based representation of the data, called dendrogram, from which a researcher can “cut” it into the desired number of clusters.

In [17], we developed a network-based clustering approach based on network community detection techniques [85]. In this method, a similarity network of designers is first constructed, in which, nodes represent designers and links represent the distance between designers. In this study, two common distance metrics, residual sum of squares (RSS) [88] and cosine similarity (CS) [88], are adopted. In order to retain the strong similarities, a threshold value is selected to binarize the similarity network. Once the network is ready, different network community detection algorithms can be applied. We utilize the most popular and robust method [89], modularity maximization algorithm [90] to partition the network into different communities. Since the algorithm will automatically cluster the network into an




Figure 8. Cluster analysis using three different unsupervised clustering methods

optimized number of clusters, no pre-determined number of clusters are needed. To enable the comparison between the three clustering methods, we trial and error the threshold value of similarities (i.e., the RSS and the CS values) until the number of clusters in the network matches the one obtained from K-means elbow plot. **Figure 8** illustrates the whole process and the connection between the network-based and K-means clustering methods.

Since different clustering methods could produce different clustering results, a verification approach is needed. In this study, a method based on the metric of *variation of information* (VI) [91] is developed for the verification and generation of the final clusters. VI measures the information lost and gained when it changes from one cluster to another. The lower a VI value is, the better is the partial agreement between two clusters. After obtaining the VI values for each pair of the clustering methods, the methods that have significantly large partial agreement can be identified, and the designers who have been always grouped together regardless of the clustering methods can be found and therefore similar behavioral patterns can be mined from the data. In the following sections, we apply our approach to cluster designers' sequential decision-making behaviors in the solar energy system design project

presented in Section 4.2.1. It's worth noting that each step shown in **Figure 6** can be programmed and seamlessly connected to turn the approach into an automatic clustering tool.

4.4 Clustering Analysis Results and Discussion

With the first-order Markov chain model introduced above, all the 38 participants' transition probability matrices are obtained, and can be converted to a 49×38 matrix on which different clustering methods are applied. The optimum numbers of clustering are 4, 5, and 6, which are obtained from the elbow plot method. In this study, we evaluate the performance of all the different clustering methods (i.e., K-means, HAC, network-based clustering with RSS, and network-based clustering with CS) at each of these cluster numbers. In total, we come up with 12 different ways of doing the clustering analysis.




Figure 9. K-means clustering of four groups plotted in two principal dimensions

Figure 9 represents the K-means clustering result with four clusters. The clusters are indicated by four different symbols (1, 2, 3, and 4). The number of designers in each cluster is 15, 11, 10 and 2, respectively. The plot shows the data points in two principal dimensions. From the figure, it is observed that designers B13 and C06 in Cluster 3 are situated far from the other clusters in the Euclidean space. It is inferred that their sequential behaviors are quite different from the other designers.

HAC method clusters the designers by forming a dendrogram, as shown in **Figure 10**. The height of the dendrogram indicates the designers' behavior similarity. To get 4 clusters, the dendrogram is cut at the height of 2.1. The resulting clusters contain 15, 14, 9 and 2 members,

respectively. Figure 8 indicates that designers A12 and D08 have at the lowest height than any other pairs on the dendrogram. Therefore, they share the most similarity in sequential behaviors. Like K-means-4 clustering, HAC-4 clustering proves the similarity between B13 and C06. While in K-means-4 clustering, A10 and A14 are in the same group, they are located at two different groups in the HAC-4 clustering. This reveals the inconsistency between different clustering methods.




Figure 10. Dendrogram produced by hierarchical agglomerative algorithm

For the network-based clustering, we calculate the RSS and CS similarities between each pair of designers using the vectors obtained from the transition probability matrix. This process produces two 38×38 similarity matrices from which the RSS-based network and the CS-based network can be obtained, respectively. To obtain the desired

number of clusters (i.e., 4, 5 and 6 determined by elbow plot method), we trial and error the RSS and CS values together with the modularity-maximization algorithm to determine the threshold. The results suggest that the values 1.24, 1.23 and 1.22 of RSS similarity are able to yield 4, 5 and 6 clusters, respectively for RSS-based network. In the CS-based network, it is found that the values of 0.7, 0.75 and 0.77, are the threshold values of producing the desired number of clusters 4, 5, and 6.

Figure 11 shows the result of RSS-based network clustered in four groups indicated by different colors. The four groups consist of 14, 11, 11 and 2 members, respectively. But in this

method, the clustering results are different from K-means-4 and HAC-4. For example, E06 and E14 belong to the same group in K-means-4 and HAC-4, but in RSS-4, they are in separate groups. But results from different methods do have consistency. For example, B13 and C06 have been always grouped together in all three methods. Following the same approach of generating RSS-based network clustering, clusters can also be generated using CS-based network clustering method, which shows both similarities and dissimilarities as well. For example, B13 and C06 are clustered together in K-means-4, HAC-4 and RSS-4 methods, but are separated in CS-6 method.




Figure 11. The network-based clustering using residual sum of square similarity

Since clustering results are not always consistent from different clustering methods, the VI-based metric (introduced in Section 4.3) is adopted to measure the mutual agreement between any pair of clustering methods so as to find the one that yields the largest agreement with all the other methods. The VI values are summarized in **Table 4**. By analyzing the distribution of VI values shown in the table, the threshold of 0.7 (corresponding to the top 25% quantile) is selected as the cutoff to filter out the clustering methods that have less consistent results. During this process, we are able to a) find the most efficient clustering method and its corresponding number of clusters, and b) find the designers that have always been clustered together so as to identify their sequential behavioral patterns. Here the efficiency of a clustering method is defined in Equation (1),

$$efficiency = \sum_{i=1}^k f(VI_i), \tag{1}$$

where $f(VI_i) = 1$ if $VI_i \leq 0.7$, and 0 otherwise. $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ is the number of clustering methods used in this case study, i.e., $k = 12$.

Table 4. Variation of information between each pair of the clustering methods

	KM-4	KM-5	KM-6	HAC-4	HAC-5	HAC-6	RSS-4	RSS-5	RSS-6	CS-4	CS-5	CS-6
KM-4	-	-	-	0.55	0.69	0.71	0.45	1.20	0.95	0.76	0.27	0.31
KM-5	-	-	-	0.89	0.82	0.75	0.79	0.85	0.59	0.92	0.60	0.63
KM-6	-	-	-	1.25	1.17	1.11	0.99	0.74	0.89	0.86	0.94	0.96
HAC-4	0.55	0.89	1.25	-	-	-	0.98	1.47	1.13	1.25	0.70	0.73
HAC-5	0.69	0.82	1.17	-	-	-	1.12	1.39	1.05	1.39	0.82	0.86
HAC-6	0.71	0.75	1.11	-	-	-	1.14	1.33	0.84	1.41	0.76	0.79
RSS-4	0.45	0.79	0.99	0.98	1.12	1.14	-	-	-	0.95	0.85	1.33
RSS-5	1.20	0.85	0.74	0.47	1.39	1.33	-	-	-	0.65	1.42	0.67
RSS-6	0.95	0.59	0.89	0.13	1.05	0.84	-	-	-	0.68	1.42	0.71
CS-4	0.76	0.92	0.86	1.25	1.39	1.41	0.95	0.65	0.68	-	-	-
CS-5	0.27	0.60	0.94	0.70	0.82	0.76	0.82	1.42	1.42	-	-	-
CS-6	0.31	0.63	0.96	0.73	0.86	0.79	1.33	0.67	0.71	-	-	-
efficiency	5	3	0	2	1	0	1	2	2	2	3	3

*Note: the VI between the same clustering methods but different cluster numbers (e.g. K-means-4 vs. K-means-5) is not worth comparing, thus the corresponding VI are not available and denoted as “-”.

It is observed that K-means-4 clustering has the largest number of times in having greater partial agreement with other clustering methods. Therefore, K-means-4 clustering is the most efficient method among all the three methods in consideration. In **Table 4**, those VI values that are below 0.7 are highlighted in yellow. By checking the occurrence of the VI values being

below the threshold 0.7, we put K-means (4, 5), HAC (4, 5), RSS (4, 5, 6) and CS (5, 6) in consideration to identify the designers who have been always clustered together irrespective to the methods being used (see the results in **Table 5**). It’s worth noting that each row of designers is grouped together without any labeling or prior knowledge.

Table 5. Clustering results of design sequences irrespective of the clustering methods

A02, A05, B08, C01, C07
A03, A15, B07, C08, D02, D10, E14
A06, A12, A13, C13, D08, E15
A07, A08, C10
B06, C11
B09, D09

4.5 Insights and Conclusions

With the clustering results, we revisit the research question we aim to answer in this case study: *What are the most frequent sequential design behavioral patterns that most designers would follow in systems design?* By analyzing these clusters, it is found that the highest transition probability for every designer in one group is similar for most of the cases. These behaviors are listed and discussed below.

- *Synthesis → Synthesis*

This transition between design stages is the most frequently occurred pattern. For example, the highest transition of all the designers of the third group (A06, A12, A13, C13, D08, and E15) *Synthesis → Synthesis*. Also, the fifth group (B11, C06) uses this pattern very often. It indicates that the designers of these groups kept modifying the parameters of the components. The possible reason for this design pattern is that

designers in the experiment were trying their best to exploit the design space by sequentially changing and tuning the design parameters. Such a behavioral phenomenon could be the reflection of the reward mechanism used in the experiment.

- *Reformulation* → *Formulation*

This is another pattern that has shown frequently in many designers' data. We found that the highest transition probability of the second group (A03, A15, B07, C08, D02, D10, and E14) is *Reformulation 2* → *Formulation*. This pattern indicates that designers in this group spent a significant amount of time removing solar panels and adding them back, again. It may be due to the reason that they were trying to adjust the solar panel on the roof to a perfect condition. Also, the last group (B09, D09) followed the *Reformulation 3* → *Formulation* design pattern often. This implies that designers in this group spent most of the time adjusting the house structure by frequently removing the existing roof or others components and adding it back, again.

As a summary for this case study, with the data collected through Energy3D, we develop a general framework that can accommodate various clustering methods for identifying design behavioral patterns. Successful identification of similar behaviors as well as their design patterns has significant benefits in discovering efficient design heuristics and guiding team-based design. For example, useful design process stage frequencies and design patterns that lead to better design outcomes can be identified by correlating design quality with different behavioral groups. Also, in team-based design, to maximize the working efficiency, similar/dissimilar designers could be paired up to improve the communication and /or diversity within a group.

5. CLOSING REMARK AND FUTURE WORK

With the growing trend of leveraging data analytics and machine learning approaches in engineering design research, there is a need to create a research platform that enables the sharing of benchmark problems and testbeds, and ensures the quality of datasets for valid, repeatable and reproducible research. In this paper, we identify the challenges in data-driven engineering design thinking EDT studies and propose five important data requirements for design-driven EDT studies that must be satisfied in the first place in order to support the scientific rigor. Towards addressing these challenges and requirements, the authors take a few modest steps in this direction by creating and distributing a research platform using Energy3D – a computer-aided energy systems design software. We demonstrate the key features of Energy3D in three aspects: 1) features for data collection, 2) features for engineering systems design, and 3) features for human-subject experiments. The blending of these features can effectively help researchers obtain datasets that satisfy those critical data requirements and exhibit the 4V features of big data, thus make Energy3D a competitive candidate platform for data-driven EDT research.

Through a case study on clustering human sequential design behaviors, this paper demonstrates the capability of Energy3D as a research platform to support a typical research process of answering research questions that are of interest. We show how the design action logger, the design artifact log, and various CAD features and modeling interfaces, work together facilitate design activities in experiments and the collection of design behavioral data in a non-intrusive manner. The design examples created from this study have been made publicly

available online [78] as a testbed for other researchers to adapt and test for their own research purposes.

Despite many strengths of Energy3D, the authors respect certain limitations that this platform may have if it is not properly used for design research, especially in the study of design thinking. For example, the majority of the data collected from Energy3D is in the format of design operations/actions in a CAD environment, but not the data directly describing designers' mental process. While certain behavioral patterns do reflect design thinking, essentially the actions a person takes does not necessarily indicate what that person thinks. Experiment shall be systematically designed and additional forms of data need to be collected in support of the verification and validation so that valid conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of the fine-grained design activity data. In addition, currently Energy3D does not support team design through a web-based interface. Several web-based features, e.g., the peer-to-peer or client-server communication could be enabled for designers to communicate and exchange information for large system design project. This will help in the research on design behaviors in team-based design. Moreover, Energy3D is developed mainly for solar energy system design, so the type of design activities that can be studied and the capability of studying the effect of domain knowledge on design behaviors are limited.

Our future work will be geared towards addressing these limitations. For example, one important feature we recently added to Energy3D is a built-in artificial intelligent (AI) design agent. This feature can support the study of human decision-making behaviors in the presence of AI design assistant and human-AI interactions. For example, one question we are working on is to investigate how AI assistant can help designers handle design uncertainties by augmenting

their information-processing skills, thus better informing their design decision-making. In addition, Xie et al. have developed an auxiliary tool of Energy3D especially for aiding design behavioral research, called Visual Process Analytics [92]. With this tool, researchers can directly analyze their collected behavioral data in JSON to generate quick insights into the data. Based on the case study, we are also working to embed the clustering algorithms into Energy3D that will be beneficial to supporting team formation and collaboration. Such a feature can facilitate potential research on team-based design.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support from the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF) through grants CMMI-1842588, DUE-1348530 and DRL-1503196. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication, however, are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of NSF.

REFERENCES

1. Braha, D. and O. Maimon, *The design process: properties, paradigms, and structure*. IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics-Part A: Systems and Humans, 1997. **27**(2): p. 146-166.
2. Mostow, J., *Toward better models of the design process*. AI magazine, 1985. **6**(1): p. 44.
3. Cross, N. and R. Roy, *Engineering design methods*. Vol. 4. 1989: Wiley New York.
4. Ishino, Y. and Y. Jin, *Acquiring engineering knowledge from design processes*. AI EDAM, 2002. **16**(02): p. 73-91.
5. Herrmann, J.W., *Progressive design processes and bounded rational designers*. Journal of Mechanical Design, 2010. **132**(8): p. 081005.

6. Dym, C.L., et al., *Engineering design thinking, teaching, and learning*. Journal of Engineering Education, 2005. **94**(1): p. 103-120.
7. Panchal, J.H., Z. Sha, and K.N. Kannan, *Understanding Design Decisions Under Competition Using Games With Information Acquisition and a Behavioral Experiment*. Journal of Mechanical Design, 2017. **139**(9): p. 091402.
8. Sexton, T. and M.Y. Ren, *Learning an Optimization Algorithm Through Human Design Iterations*. Journal of Mechanical Design, 2017. **139**(10): p. 101404.
9. Brockmann, E.N. and W.P. Anthony, *The influence of tacit knowledge and collective mind on strategic planning*. Journal of Managerial issues, 1998. **10**(2): p. 204-222.
10. Ishino, Y. and Y. Jin, *Data mining for knowledge acquisition in engineering design*, in *Data mining for design and manufacturing*. Massive Computing, Springer, Boston, MA. 2001. vol **3**: p. 145-160.
11. Toh, C.A. and S.R. Miller, *The impact of example modality and physical interactions on design creativity*. Journal of Mechanical Design, 2014. **136**(9): p. 091004.
12. Toh, C.A. and S.R. Miller, *Creativity in design teams: the influence of personality traits and risk attitudes on creative concept selection*. Research in Engineering Design, 2016. **27**(1): p. 73-89.
13. Toh, C.A. and S.R. Miller, *Choosing creativity: the role of individual risk and ambiguity aversion on creative concept selection in engineering design*. Research in Engineering Design, 2016. **27**(3): p. 195-219.

14. McComb, C., J. Cagan, and K. Kotovsky, *Utilizing Markov Chains to Understand Operation Sequencing in Design Tasks*, in *Design Computing and Cognition'16*. 2017, Springer. p. 401-418.
15. Sha, Z., K.N. Kannan, and J.H. Panchal, *Behavioral Experimentation and Game Theory in Engineering Systems Design*. Journal of Mechanical Design, 2015. **137**(5): p. 051405-051405-10.
16. Xie, C., et al., *Learning and teaching engineering design through modeling and simulation on a CAD platform*. Computer Applications in Engineering Education, 2018. **26**(4): p. 824-840.
17. Rahman, M.H., et al. *Automatic Clustering of Sequential Design Behaviors*. in *ASME 2018 International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*. Volume 1B: 38th Computers and Information in Engineering Conference. pp. V01BT02A041. Quebec City, Quebec, Canada, August 26–29, 2018.
18. Dinar, M., et al., *Empirical studies of designer thinking: past, present, and future*. Journal of Mechanical Design, 2015. **137**(2): p. 021101.
19. Gero, J.S. and T. Mc Neill, *An approach to the analysis of design protocols*. Design studies, 1998. **19**(1): p. 21-61.
20. Cross, N., *Design cognition: Results from protocol and other empirical studies of design activity*. In *Design knowing and learning: Cognition in design education*. 2001: Page = 79-103.
21. Gero, J., R. Yu, and J. Wells. *Creative Design Cognition Differences between High School Students with and without Design Education*. in *The Fifth International Conference on Design Creativity*. 2018. Bath, UK.

22. Moreno, D.P., et al. *Creativity in transactional design problems: Non-intuitive findings of an expert study using Scamper*. in *13th International Design Conference, Human Behavior and Design*, Dubrovnik, Croatia. 2014.
23. Maher, M.L., et al., *Characterizing tangible interaction during a creative combination task*, in *Design Computing and Cognition'16*. 2017, Springer. p. 39-58.
24. Toh, C.A., S.R. Miller, and G.E.O. Kremer, *The role of personality and team-based product dissection on fixation effects*. *Advances in Engineering Education*, 2013. **3**(4): p. 1.
25. Moreno, D.P., et al., *Overcoming design fixation: Design by analogy studies and nonintuitive findings*. *AI EDAM*, 2016. **30**(2): p. 185-199.
26. Viswanathan, V. and J. Linsey, *Mitigation of Design Fixation in Engineering Idea Generation: A Study on the Role of Defixation Instructions*, in *ICoRD'13*. 2013, Springer. p. 113-124.
27. Viswanathan, V. and J. Linsey, *Examining design fixation in engineering idea generation: the role of example modality*. *International Journal of Design Creativity and Innovation*, 2013. **1**(2): p. 109-129.
28. Linsey, J., K.L. Wood, and A.B. Markman, *Modality and representation in analogy*. *AI EDAM*, 2008. **22**(2): p. 85-100.
29. Bao, Q., D. Faas, and M. Yang. *Interplay Of Sketching & Prototyping In Early Stage Product Design*. *International Journal of Design Creativity and Innovation*, 2018. 6(3-4): p. 146-168.
30. Bilda, Z., J.S. Gero, and T. Purcell, *To sketch or not to sketch? That is the question*. *Design studies*, 2006. **27**(5): p. 587-613.

31. Tang, H., Y. Lee, and J. Gero, *Comparing collaborative co-located and distributed design processes in digital and traditional sketching environments: A protocol study using the function-behaviour-structure coding scheme*. Design Studies, 2011. **32**(1): p. 1-29.
32. Menezes, A. and B. Lawson, *How designers perceive sketches*. Design Studies, 2006. **27**(5): p. 571-585.
33. Kavakli, M. and J.S. Gero, *The structure of concurrent cognitive actions: a case study on novice and expert designers*. Design studies, 2002. **23**(1): p. 25-40.
34. Ball, L.J., T.C. Ormerod, and N.J. Morley, *Spontaneous analogising in engineering design: a comparative analysis of experts and novices*. Design studies, 2004. **25**(5): p. 495-508.
35. Ahmed, S. and B.T. Christensen, *An in situ study of analogical reasoning in novice and experienced design engineers*. Journal of Mechanical Design, 2009. **131**(11): p. 111004.
36. Atman, C.J., et al., *Comparing freshman and senior engineering design processes: an in-depth follow-up study*. Design studies, 2005. **26**(4): p. 325-357.
37. Gero, J.S., *Design prototypes: a knowledge representation schema for design*. AI magazine, 1990. **11**(4): p. 26.
38. Goel, A.K., S. Rugaber, and S. Vattam, *Structure, behavior, and function of complex systems: The structure, behavior, and function modeling language*. Ai Edam, 2009. **23**(1): p. 23-35.
39. Shah, J.J., et al., *Collaborative Sketching (C-Sketch)—An idea generation technique for engineering design*. The Journal of Creative Behavior, 2001. **35**(3): p. 168-198.
40. Panchal, J.H. and Z. Szajnfarber, *Experiments in systems engineering and design research*. Systems Engineering, 2017. **20**(6): p. 529-541.

41. Shergadwala, M., K.N. Kannan, and J.H. Panchal, *Understanding the Impact of Expertise on Design Outcome: An Approach Based on Concept Inventories and Item Response Theory*. in *ASME 2016 International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*. Volume 3: p. V003T04A016. Charlotte, North Carolina, USA, August 21–24, 2016.
42. Gosnell, C.A. and S.R. Miller, *But Is It Creative? Delineating the Impact of Expertise and Concept Ratings on Creative Concept Selection*. *Journal of Mechanical Design*, 2016. **138**(2): p. 021101.
43. Sutera, J., M.C. Yang, and C. Elsen. *The impact of expertise on the capture of sketched intentions: perspectives for remote cooperative design*. in *International Conference on Cooperative Design, Visualization and Engineering*. 2014. Springer.
44. Cross, N., *Expertise in design: an overview*. *Design studies*, 2004. **25**(5): p. 427-441.
45. Toh, C.A. and S.R. Miller, *How engineering teams select design concepts: A view through the lens of creativity*. *Design Studies*, 2015. **38**: p. 111-138.
46. McComb, C., J. Cagan, and K. Kotovsky, *Rolling with the punches: An examination of team performance in a design task subject to drastic changes*. *Design Studies*, 2015. **36**: p. 99-121.
47. Ball, L.J. and B.T. Christensen, *Analogical reasoning and mental simulation in design: two strategies linked to uncertainty resolution*. *Design Studies*, 2009. **30**(2): p. 169-186.
48. Visser, W., *Two functions of analogical reasoning in design: a cognitive-psychology approach*. *Design studies*, 1996. **17**(4): p. 417-434.
49. Hernandez, N.V., J.J. Shah, and S.M. Smith, *Understanding design ideation mechanisms through multilevel aligned empirical studies*. *Design Studies*, 2010. **31**(4): p. 382-410.

50. Shah, J.J., *Experimental investigation of progressive idea generation techniques in engineering design*. Proceedings of ASME DETC, Atlanta, GA, Sept, 1998: p. 13-16.
51. Grogan, P.T. and O.L. de Weck, *Collaboration and complexity: an experiment on the effect of multi-actor coupled design*. Research in Engineering Design, 2016. **27**(3): p. 221-235.
52. Alelyani, T., Y. Yang, and P.T. Grogan. *Understanding Designers Behavior in Parameter Design Activities*. in *ASME 2017 International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*. Volume 7: 29th International Conference on Design Theory and Methodology. pp. V007T06A030. Cleveland, Ohio, USA, August 6–9, 2017.
53. Yao, H.H. and M.Y. Ren. *Impressionist: A 3D Peekaboo Game for Crowdsourcing Shape Saliency*. in *ASME 2016 International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*. Volume 7: 28th International Conference on Design Theory and Methodology. pp. V007T06A025. Charlotte, North Carolina, USA, August 21–24, 2016
54. Grogan, P.T. and O.L. de Weck. *Interactive simulation games to assess federated satellite system concepts*. in *Aerospace Conference*. 2015. IEEE.
55. Bayrak, A.E. and P.Y. Papalambros, *EcoRacer: Game-Based Optimal Electric Vehicle Design and Driver Control Using Human Players*. Journal of Mechanical Design, 2016. **138**(6): p. 061407 (10).
56. McComb, C., J. Cagan, and K. Kotovsky, *Mining process heuristics from designer action data via hidden markov models*. Journal of Mechanical Design, 2017. **139**(11): p. 111412.

57. McComb, C., J. Cagan, and K. Kotovsky, *Lifting the veil: drawing insights about design teams from a cognitively-inspired computational model*. Design Studies, 2015. **40**: p. 119-142.
58. McComb, C., J. Cagan, and K. Kotovsky, *Drawing Inspiration From Human Design Teams for Better Search and Optimization: The Heterogeneous Simulated Annealing Teams Algorithm*. Journal of Mechanical Design, 2016. **138**(4): p. 044501.
59. Gero, J.S. and W. Peng, *Understanding behaviors of a constructive memory agent: A markov chain analysis*. Knowledge-Based Systems, 2009. **22**(8): p. 610-621.
60. Jin, Y. and Y. Ishino, *DAKA: design activity knowledge acquisition through data-mining*. International Journal of Production Research, 2006. **44**(14): p. 2813-2837.
61. Gopsill, J., et al. *Computer aided design user interaction as a sensor for monitoring engineers and the engineering design process*. in *Proceedings of the 14th International Design Conference. DESIGN 2016*, Cavtat, Dubrovnik, Croatia, 2016.
62. Sen, C., Q. Parrish, and O. Galil, *Measuring Information Content of Freehand Sketches Using a Cognitive Chunk Visualization Protocol*. in *ASME 2017 International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*. Volume 7: 29th International Conference on Design Theory and Methodology. pp. V007T06A035. Cleveland, Ohio, USA, August 6–9, 2017.
63. Sung, R.C.W., J.R. Corney, and D.E. Clark, *Automatic assembly feature recognition and disassembly sequence generation*. Journal of Computing and Information Science in Engineering, 2001. **1**(4): p. 291-299.
64. Ritchie, J.M., et al. *The use of non-intrusive user logging to capture engineering rationale, knowledge and intent during the product life cycle*. in *Portland International Conference on*

- Management of Engineering & Technology, PICMET 2008*. Cape Town, South Africa. July 27-31, 2008.
65. Sivanathan, A., et al., *The application of ubiquitous multimodal synchronous data capture in CAD*. Computer-Aided Design, 2015. **59**: p. 176-191.
 66. Yu, B.Y., et al., *Human behavior and domain knowledge in parameter design of complex systems*. Design Studies, 2016. **45**: p. 242-267.
 67. Egan, P., et al., *Improving human understanding and design of complex multi-level systems with animation and parametric relationship supports*. Design Science, 2015. **1**.
 68. Ritchie, J.M., et al., *The Analysis of Design and Manufacturing Tasks Using Haptic and Immersive VR-Some Case Studies*, in *Product Engineering*. 2008, Springer. p. 507-522.
 69. Finger, S. and J.R. Dixon, *A review of research in mechanical engineering design. Part I: Descriptive, prescriptive, and computer-based models of design processes*. Research in engineering design, 1989. **1**(1): p. 51-67.
 70. Purzer, Ş., et al., *An exploratory study of informed engineering design behaviors associated with scientific explanations*. International Journal of STEM Education, 2015. **2**(1): p. 1-12.
 71. Dong, A., A.W. Hill, and A.M. Agogino, *A document analysis method for characterizing design team performance*. Journal of Mechanical Design, 2004. **126**(3): p. 378-385.
 72. Coley, F., O. Houseman, and R. Roy, *An introduction to capturing and understanding the cognitive behaviour of design engineers*. Journal of Engineering Design, 2007. **18**(4): p. 311-325.
 73. Simon, H.A., *Theories of bounded rationality*. Decision and organization, 1972. **1**(1): p. 161-176.

74. Greene, M.T., et al., *Design Thinking vs. Systems Thinking for Engineering Design: What's the Difference?* in 21st international conference on engineering design, ICED 2017. Vol 2: pp 467-6. Vancouver, Canada. August, 21-25 august 2017.
75. Gajewski, R. and T. Kułakowski, *Towards Optimal Design of Energy Efficient Buildings*. Archives of Civil Engineering, 2018. **64**(4): p. 135-153.
76. Gajewski, R. and Pienikazek, P., *Building energy modelling and simulations: qualitative and quantitative analysis*. in *MATEC Web of Conferences*. vol. 117, article: 00051. 2017.
77. Xie, C. *Engineering Design Projects for Students*. 2019; Available from:
<http://energy.concord.org/energy3d/projects.html>.
78. Sha, Z. *Human-Subject Experiment For Design Research*. 2019; Available from:
<https://sidilab.wordpress.com/sidi-resources/human-subject-experiment-for-design-research/>.
79. De Mauro, A., M. Greco, and M. Grimaldi. *What is big data? A consensual definition and a review of key research topics*. in *AIP conference proceedings*. 2015. **1644**(1): p. 97-104.
80. Xie, C., et al., *On the instructional sensitivity of CAD logs*. International Journal of Engineering Education, 2014. **30**(4): p. 760-778.
81. Xie, C., et al., *A time series analysis method for assessing engineering design processes using a CAD tool*. International Journal of Engineering Education, 2014. **30**(1): p. 218-230.
82. Adams, R.S., et al., *Traversing the Barriers to Using Big Data in Understating How High School Students Design*, in *Design Computing and Cognition'16*. 2017, Springer. p. 613-631.
83. Stroock, D.W., *An introduction to Markov processes*. Vol. 230. 2013: Springer Science, Business Media.

84. James, G., et al., *An introduction to statistical learning*. Vol. 112. 2013: Springer.
85. Schaeffer, S.E., *Graph clustering*. Computer science review, 2007. **1**(1): p. 27-64.
86. Singh, V.K., N. Tiwari, and S. Garg. *Document clustering using k-means, heuristic k-means and fuzzy c-means*. in *2011 International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Communication Networks (CICN)*. Gwalia, India, October 7-9, 2011.
87. Kodinariya, T.M. and P.R. Makwana, *Review on determining number of Cluster in K-Means Clustering*. International Journal, 2013. **1**(6): p. 90-95.
88. Steinbach, M., et al. *A comparison of document clustering techniques*. in *KDD workshop on text mining*. 2000. **400**(1): p. 525-526.
89. Chen, M., K. Kuzmin, and B.K. Szymanski, *Community detection via maximization of modularity and its variants*. IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems, 2014. **1**(1): p. 46-65.
90. Brandes, U., et al., *On modularity clustering*. IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering, 2008. **20**(2): p. 172-188.
91. Meila, Marina, *Comparing clusterings—an information based distance*. Journal of multivariate analysis, 2007. **98**(5): p. 873-895.
92. Xie, C., *Visual Process Analytics in @CONCORD*. 2015, The Concord Consortium: Concord.org. p. 4-6.

LIST OF TABLE CAPTIONS

Table 1. Representative research platforms for EDT studies based on the literature review

Table 2. The requirements of the energy-plus home design project

Table 3. The FBS model and the proposed coding scheme for design actions

Table 4. Variation of information between each pair of the clustering methods

Table 5. Clustering results of design sequences irrespective of the clustering methods

LIST OF FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Engineering design process and design thinking

Figure 2. Unique features of Energy3D in supporting engineering design thinking research

Figure 3. Energy3D supports various solar systems design. (a) The user interface of Energy3D.

(b) A rooftop photovoltaic system for Boeing's South Carolina factory. (c) Parabolic troughs in Hawaii

Figure 4. A typical cycle for data-driven engineering design thinking research

Figure 5. An energy-plus home design from one of the participants

Figure 6. Overview of the approach to automatically clustering sequential design behaviors

Figure 7. Transition matrix of the first-order Markov chain for participant C14

Figure 8. Cluster analysis using three different unsupervised clustering methods

Figure 9. K-means clustering of four groups plotted in two principal dimensions

Figure 10. Dendrogram produced by hierarchical agglomerative algorithm

Figure 11. The network-based clustering using residual sum of square similarity