

# **Exploring the Impact of Rule Algorithms on Designers' Cognitive Behaviour in a Parametric Design Environment**

By

Rongrong Yu

*A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
(Architecture)*

May, 2014



School of Architecture and Built Environment  
Faculty of Engineering and Built Environment  
The University of Newcastle  
Callaghan, 2308, Australia

*This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.*

---

*(Rongrong Yu)*

## Acknowledgements

At this moment, I have to say that a PhD is such a wonderful journey. Four years ago when I started, I thought it was just about the completion of one particular research study. At this very end of my thesis, I realise that it is far more than that. From all the ups and downs, all the struggling, what I have obtained is a new way of thinking, of reasoning and solving problems, and most importantly, a positive attitude when facing difficulties. On my way, I also gained lots of precious friendships, and lots of generous help from many people. This thesis could not be possible without the support and encouragement from my supervisors, colleagues, friends and family.

First and foremost, I would like to express my greatest gratitude to my principal supervisor Dr. Ning Gu. He led me to enter the field and supported me all these years to reach the completion of my PhD. His insightful guidance, strong belief and positive attitude helped me to go through those “dark” days. I wouldn’t have arrived where I am without him. I would also thank my co-supervisor Prof. Michael Ostwald for his kind support and encouragement during my study. He is always ready to help whenever I am in need: his impressive wisdom and passion in research has inspired me all the time.

I would like to particularly thank Prof. John Gero, for his great contribution to this study. He served as my external supervisor in the past two years. He was always very patient and generous to offer advice. His valuable suggestions and criticism were of great help in the development of my research.

I would like to grateful acknowledge the China Scholar Council (CSC) for providing the financial support for my PhD study. And also thanks to the University of Newcastle for providing me with the opportunity to study here. The Faculty of Engineering and Built Environment greatly assisted me with the Postgraduate Research Support Scheme.

I wish to extend my appreciation to all the staff and research students in the School of Architecture and Built Environment. Thanks for their support and company to make my stay such a pleasant experience. Especially thanks to Dr. Ju Hyun Lee, who provided lots of valuable suggestions for my research. Whenever I encountered difficulties, he was always there for me. My appreciation will also go to all the participants involved in my experiment for their kindness in dedicating their time to this study. I also wish to express my appreciation to all the academics I met in the conferences, who have provided valuable suggestions for my research.

Finally, I give my deepest gratitude to my parents and my husband. I am so grateful for everything they have done for me: thanks for all your love and sacrifice. I couldn’t get here without your support and company all these years.

## Abstract

Parametric design has been increasingly applied in the architectural industry in recent years. Researchers have studied the designers' behaviour in parametric design environments using various methods. However, there is a lack of empirical evidence to support the understanding of how parametric design affects designers' ways of thinking.

This research aims to explore the impact of the rule algorithm feature in parametric design environments on designers' behaviour. To achieve this, a protocol study was conducted comparing designers' cognitive behaviour in a parametric design environment (PDE) with their cognitive behaviour in a traditional geometric modelling environment (GME). Eight professional architects participated in the experiment in which each of them was required to complete two design sessions with design tasks at similar complexity level, one in each environment. A "think aloud" method was used to collect data during the design experiment. By employing protocol analysis, the collected data were coded and analysed using the function-behaviour-structure (FBS) ontology.

From a comparison of the protocol analysis results of designers' behaviour in the PDE and the GME, there are limited differences found between the two. From these results, we can infer that designers' high level thinking does not vary significantly in response to the tools they use. That is, whatever environment they are in, their design thinking shares some commonalities in how they approach design. However, in terms of the impact of rule algorithm use in the PDE three major differences have been revealed by this study as follows.

First, designers express an exchange of cognitive behaviour between the two levels of activities – design knowledge level and rule algorithm level. The results indicate that the design knowledge-related activities dominate the parametric design process for all cognitive issues. Therefore, we can infer that in the parametric design process, designers still expend most effort on design knowledge; parametric scripting is mainly used to support their intention of generating models.

Second, by calculating the transition probabilities between FBS design issues, we found the transition probability from F to S is much higher in the PDE. F to S is a typical design pattern which is derived from designers' existing knowledge/experience. That is, designers tend to use the existing design patterns more frequently in the PDE. Three types of design patterns in the PDE have been identified and discussed.

Third, in parametric design environments, the design problem formulation is more tool-oriented. Based on the division of two levels of design activities, and by calculating the frequency of transitions between the design problem and solution spaces, characteristics of problem-solution co-evolution processes in the PDE have been discussed. For example, the co-evolution process typically occurs at the individual design knowledge level or rule algorithm level, and only relatively infrequently do transitions occur across the two levels. The most representative activities of parametric design (activities on the rule-algorithm level)

seems to play more important roles in design in the later stage of the design session. Based on these findings, a model which illustrates the main co-evolution process in the PDE has been proposed.

Results of this research enhance our understanding of parametric design: although parametric design tools have many advantages related to its rule algorithm feature, such as flexibility, and efficiency, architectural design knowledge is still essential for defining/formulating the design problem. The design patterns identified from this cognitive study could be deliverable to students, which could possibly assist in learning parametric design more efficiently and systematically. Results of this study also imply that the way in which designers use parametric design tools is a critical point determining whether parametric design would benefit their design processes. The proposed research outcome will be beneficial for design educators, designers, design researchers, and also software developers.

# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .....	3
Abstract .....	4
Table of Contents.....	6
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	10
1.1 MOTIVATION .....	10
1.2 AIM AND OBJECTIVES .....	11
1.2.1 Research Aim .....	11
1.2.2 Research Objectives .....	12
1.3 RESEARCH SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS .....	13
Chapter 2: Literature review I – parametric design.....	16
2.1 DEFINITION OF IMPORTANT CONCEPTS .....	16
2.1.1 Parametric design .....	16
2.1.2 Parametric modelling .....	17
2.1.3 Parametric variations.....	17
2.2. PARAMETRIC DESIGN PRACTICE IN ARCHITECTURE .....	18
2.2.1 Brief history of parametric design.....	18
2.2.2 Parametric design tools .....	20
2.2.3 Limitations of parametric design practice in architecture .....	21
2.3 LATEST TRENDS IN PARAMETRIC DESIGN RESEARCH .....	22
2.3.1 Parametric design and form-finding.....	22
2.3.2 Parametric design and building performance.....	24
2.3.3 Collaboration in parametric design .....	25
2.4 PARAMETRIC DESIGN THINKING .....	26
2.4.1 Changes of designers’ activities in a PDE.....	26
2.4.2 Characteristics of parametric design thinking .....	27
2.5 PARAMETRIC DESIGN ENVIRONMENTS AS TWO OVERLAPPING CONCEPTUAL DESIGN SPACES.....	28
Chapter 3: Literature review II – protocol studies on designers’ cognitive behaviour .....	30
3.1 OVERVIEW OF PROTOCOL ANALYSIS .....	30
3.1.1 Protocol analysis as a research method for design cognition .....	30
3.1.2 Procedure of applying protocol analysis .....	31
3.2 DESIGN PROTOCOL STUDIES .....	31
3.3 OVERVIEW OF CODING SCHEMES APPLIED IN PROTOCOL STUDIES .....	33
3.3.1 Protocol studies using Suwa’s coding scheme .....	34
3.3.2 Protocol studies using the FBS coding scheme.....	35
3.3.3 Discussion about existing coding schemes .....	35
3.4 FUNCTION–BEHAVIOUR–STRUCTURE (FBS) ONTOLOGY .....	36

3.4.1 Studies into the design process in design thinking.....	36
3.4.2 FBS ontology .....	37
Chapter 4: Research methodology and research design .....	38
4.1 JUSTIFICATION OF PROTOCOL ANALYSIS .....	38
4.2 EXPERIMENT SETTING.....	39
4.2.1 Selection of subjects.....	39
4.2.2 Design environments: PDEs VS. GMEs .....	40
4.2.3 Design brief.....	41
4.2.4 Experiment procedures.....	42
4.3 CODING SCHEME DEVELOPMENT BASED ON FBS ONTOLOGY .....	43
4.3.1 Justification of FBS ontology for coding scheme development.....	43
4.3.2 Development of a coding scheme to study designing in PDEs .....	43
4.3.3 Interpretation of FBS coding in the rule algorithm space .....	44
4.4 A PILOT STUDY.....	46
4.4.1 Summary and result of the pilot study .....	46
4.4.2 Considerations based on the pilot study results.....	49
Chapter 5: General results .....	51
5.1 GENERAL OBSERVATIONS FROM THE EXPERIMENT .....	51
5.2 GENERAL RESULTS OF THE CODING .....	52
5.2.1 Reliability of coding.....	52
5.2.2 Descriptive statistics of design issues .....	54
5.2.3 Descriptive statistics of syntactic design processes.....	56
5.2.4 Qualitative description of individual design processes .....	57
5.3 COMPARISON OF DESIGN ISSUES DISTRIBUTION .....	63
5.3.1 The overall distribution of design issues.....	63
5.3.2 Impact of rule algorithm in the PDE .....	64
5.3.3 Design issues distribution across different design stages.....	65
5.4 COMPARISON OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF SYNTACTIC DESIGN PROCESSES..	73
5.4.1 The overall distribution of syntactic design processes .....	73
5.4.2 Syntactic design processes across different design stages.....	74
5.5 STRUCTURE OF DATA ANALYSIS .....	78
Chapter 6: Analysis I – Cumulative analysis during parametric design.....	81
6.1 ANALYSIS METHOD: CUMULATIVE OCCURRENCE OF DESIGN ISSUES .....	81
6.2 CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS COMPARING THE GME AND THE PDE .....	82
6.2.1 Cumulative analysis of design issues in the GME and the PDE .....	82
6.2.2 Commonalities of the cumulative analysis.....	89
6.3 IMPACT OF RULE ALGORITHMS IN THE PDE THROUGH CUMULATIVE ANALYSIS .....	89
6.3.1 Cumulative analysis of design issues at two levels of design activities in the PDE	

.....	89
6.3.2 Relative effort on the two levels of design activities in the PDE .....	98
Chapter 7: Analysis II – Markov model analysis of parametric design.....	102
7.1 ANALYSIS METHOD: MARKOV MODEL.....	102
7.2 MARKOV MODEL ANALYSIS COMPARING THE GME AND THE PDE .....	103
7.2.1 1 <sup>st</sup> order Markov model analysis in the GME and the PDE .....	103
7.2.2 1 <sup>st</sup> order Markov model analysis across different design stages .....	105
7.3 DESIGN PATTERNS.....	107
7.3.1 Design patterns exhibited in the parametric design process.....	107
7.3.2 Three types of design patterns in the PDE .....	108
7.3.3 Design patterns across different design stages .....	111
Chapter 8: Analysis III – Co-evolution of problem and solution spaces in parametric design .....	114
8.1 DESIGN PROBLEM AND SOLUTION SPACES.....	114
8.1.1 Problem/solution driven design.....	114
8.1.2 Co-evolution of design problem and solution .....	114
8.2 PROBLEM/ SOLUTION DRIVEN DESIGN IN THE GME AND THE PDE .....	117
8.2.1 Problem/Solution division using FBS ontology .....	117
8.2.2 Problem-solution index in the PDE and the GME .....	117
8.3 CO-EVOLUTION OF PROBLEM AND SOLUTION SPACES IN THE GME AND THE PDE.....	118
8.3.1 Discontinuity ratio in GME and PDE .....	118
8.3.2 Comparing the co-evolution process in the GME and the PDE.....	120
8.4 THE IMPACT OF RULE ALGORITHMS ON THE CO- EVOLUTION PROCESS IN THE PDE .....	122
8.4.1 Transition patterns between the design problem and solution spaces in the PDE	122
8.4.2 Transition patterns across the whole design session .....	124
8.4.3 A model of the co-evolution process in the PDE.....	125
Chapter 9: Discussion and conclusion.....	129
9.1 MAIN FINDINGS .....	129
9.1.1 Commonalities in digital design.....	129
9.1.2 Impact of rule algorithms on designers’ behaviour .....	131
9.1.3 Summary .....	132
9.2 FURTHER IMPLICATIONS FOR DESIGN.....	133
9.2.1 Implications for design education and practice.....	133
9.2.2 Implications for parametric design software development .....	134
9.2.3 Implications for cognitive design research.....	135
9.3 FUTURE STUDY .....	135
References .....	138



Appendix 1: Design brief .....	148
Appendix 2: Ethics approval .....	151
Appendix 3: Design outcomes.....	153
Appendix 4: Coding .....	155
Appendix 5: Publications arising from this research.....	279