

CLOUD USABILITY FEATURES TO SUPPORT KNOWLEDGE  
TRANSFORMATION IN DESIGN LEARNING

NUR AZIEMAH MOHAMAD

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the  
requirements for the award of the degree of  
Master of Philosophy

School of Computing  
Faculty of Engineering  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

AUGUST 2019

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In conducting the research and preparing this thesis, I was often in contact with my supervisors for their guidance. In particular, I wish to express my gratitude to my main supervisor, Associate Professor Dr Roliana Ibrahim, for her endless encouragement, support and expert guidance in terms of the research journey itself. In addition, I am also thankful to my co-supervisor, Associate Professor Dr Khairul Anwar Mohamed Khaidzir for his brilliant idea, rough critics and engaged me to see the beauty of design learning. Without their interest and encouragement, this research would not become a reality.

I am also indebted to Majlis Amanah Rakyat (MARA) for funding two years of my study and Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) for giving me chances to present my paper in a few conferences abroad and locally. In addition, I would also like to lengthen my vote of thanks to the World Islamic Economic Forum (WIEF) Foundation for giving me the opportunities and leniency to share the best of both worlds.

To my fellow postgraduate acquaintances, thank you for your supportive spirit in order for me to complete this study. Not to forget, I would like to express my appreciation to my husband and all my closest friends as they are there when the time in need. Last but not least, I would like to manifest my highest regard to both of my parents as they allowed me to embark another educational journey; a Master degree.

## ABSTRACT

Critique is one of the essential phases in Architectural design learning and lecturers often provide feedback to students regarding their proposed artefact in a studio environment. It contains tacit knowledge because of the interactions that occur between lecturers, students and the artefact. The current tools that are available and used by students such as AutoCAD, Revit and similar ones are mostly static and have limitations in capturing the interaction between the agents. The process of knowledge transformation between tacit and explicit needs to be represented in order to create a more rigorous feedback from the lecturer to improve the student's artefact. Hence, the aim of this study is to develop a knowledge transformation model for a design learning critique session starting from tacit to explicit knowledge supported by cloud usability feature which is explore. To organise this research, a design science approach was used as the methodology that relied on qualitative data for analysis. A recorded observation during the Architecture design subject was conducted to view the types of feedback that occurred during the critique session. Feedback through the dialogues underwent an initialisation process using thematic analysis. From the process, the extracted data were categorised based on an established feedback typology model, which are meaning-level feedback and error correction. Based on the observation, a knowledge transformation model using cloud usability features was developed for this research and validated by three experts from the knowledge management discipline using questionnaire. The validation encompasses three components, namely knowledge management in design learning, feedback as knowledge transformation process and use of cloud usability features to support it. All the experts agreed that cloud usability features can support the knowledge transformation in design learning. Once validated, the model was implemented in a simulated critique session of a studio class to get the Architecture participants' feedback on the knowledge representation. Another set of questionnaire comprising the same components as given to the experts were given to them. The findings showed that they agreed the use of cloud usability feature supports the knowledge transformation in design learning. Thus, based on the findings, it shows that the feedback can become more rigorous when knowledge is transformed explicitly with the assistance of a tool.

## ABSTRAK

Kritik merupakan satu fasa penting dalam pembelajaran reka bentuk Seni Bina dan pensyarah sering memberi maklum balas terhadap artifak yang dicadangkan dalam persekitaran studio. Terdapat pengetahuan tersirat disebabkan oleh interaksi yang berlaku antara pensyarah, pelajar dan artifak. Kebanyakan alat semasa yang tersedia dan digunakan oleh para pelajar seperti AutoCAD, Revit dan lain-lain adalah statik dan mempunyai batasan untuk menangkap interaksi antara agen. Proses transformasi pengetahuan daripada tersirat kepada tersurat perlu ditangani supaya pensyarah boleh menghasilkan maklum balas yang lebih mendalam dan seterusnya menambah baik artifak pelajar. Oleh itu, matlamat kajian ini adalah untuk membangunkan model transformasi pengetahuan daripada tersirat kepada tersurat dalam sesi kritik ketika pembelajaran reka bentuk dengan sokongan ciri kegunaan awan iaitu letup. Untuk menjalankan kajian ini, pendekatan sains reka bentuk digunakan sebagai metodologi kerana data dianalisis dalam bentuk kualitatif. Pemerhatian telah dicatat semasa pelaksanaan subjek reka bentuk Seni Bina untuk mendapatkan jenis maklum balas sewaktu sesi kritik berlangsung. Dialog ketika maklum balas diinisialisasi menggunakan analisis tematik. Dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa ekstrak data tersebut terdiri daripada dua jenis iaitu maklum balas tahap makna dan pembetulan kesilapan. Berdasarkan pemerhatian, model transformasi pengetahuan menggunakan ciri kegunaan awan telah dihasilkan dalam kajian ini dan disahkan oleh tiga orang pakar daripada disiplin pengurusan pengetahuan dengan menggunakan soal selidik. Pengesahan terdiri daripada tiga komponen iaitu pengurusan pengetahuan dalam pembelajaran reka bentuk, maklum balas sebagai proses transformasi pengetahuan dan ciri kegunaan awan sebagai alat bantuan. Semua pakar bersetuju bahawa ciri kegunaan awan boleh membantu transformasi pengetahuan dalam pembelajaran reka bentuk. Sebaik sahaja para pakar mengesahkannya, model tersebut dilaksanakan ke dalam simulasi sesi kritik untuk mendapat maklum balas daripada peserta studio Seni Bina tentang penyampaian pengetahuan. Set soal selidik yang mengandungi komponen yang sama seperti yang diberikan kepada para pakar telah diberikan kepada mereka. Daripada dapatan kajian, mereka bersetuju dengan penggunaan ciri kegunaan awan dalam menyokong transformasi pengetahuan dalam pembelajaran reka bentuk. Dengan yang demikian, dapatan kajian ini, menunjukkan bahawa maklum balas boleh menjadi lebih mendalam apabila pengetahuan ditransformasikan secara tersurat dengan bantuan alat yang digunakan.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
	<b>DECLARATION</b>	<b>ii</b>
	<b>DEDICATION</b>	<b>iii</b>
	<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	<b>iv</b>
	<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>v</b>
	<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>vi</b>
	<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>vii</b>
	<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>xi</b>
	<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>xiii</b>
	<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>xv</b>
	<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	<b>xvi</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	Problem Background	2
1.3	Problem Statement	3
1.4	Aim	5
1.5	Objectives	5
1.6	Scopes	5
1.7	Significance of Study	6
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1	Introduction	9
2.2	The Theory of Design	9
2.3	Design Learning	11
2.3.1	Existing Studies on Design Learning	14
2.3.2	Design Learning Process	17
2.4	Knowledge Management in Design	18

2.4.1	Design Learning and Knowledge Management	22
2.4.2	Tacit Knowledge in Design Learning	24
2.4.3	Knowledge Externalisation	25
2.5	Interactions in Design	33
2.5.1	Human-Artefact Interaction	34
2.5.2	Human-Human Interaction	35
2.5.3	Interaction for Knowledge Extraction in Design Learning	36
2.6	The Cloud	38
2.6.1	Conventional Design Learning Tools	40
2.6.2	Modern Learning Tools	43
2.6.3	Cloud Features and Qualities	45
2.6.4	Cloud-based in Knowledge Management	48
2.6.5	Cloud-based Learning	51
2.6.6	Benefits of Using a Cloud Service in Design Learning	54
2.7	Discussion	57
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>61</b>
3.1	Introduction	61
3.2	Design Science Methodology	61
3.2.1	Step 1: Investigation of Study	63
3.2.2	Step 2: Data Collection	66
3.2.3	Step 3: Model Development	68
3.2.4	Step 4: Model Evaluation	71
3.3	Data Collection Process	74
3.4	Expert Validation Process	75
3.4.1	Procedure	76
3.5	User Validation Process	78
3.5.1	Variables	80
3.5.2	Procedure	81
3.6	Summary	82

<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	<b>MODEL DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>85</b>
4.1	Introduction	85
4.2	Data Collection	85
4.3	Model Development	89
	4.3.1 Initialisation Phase	89
	4.3.2 Feedback Typology	98
	4.3.3 Data Collection Results	102
	4.3.4 Knowledge Transformation Model	105
4.3	Experts' Validation	107
4.4	Conclusion	112
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>	<b>IMPLEMENTATION OF CLOUD USABILITY FEATURE</b>	<b>115</b>
5.1	Introduction	115
5.2	Unified Modelling Language (UML) Diagrams	115
	5.2.1 Use Case Diagram	116
	5.2.2 Activity Diagram	118
	5.2.3 Sequence Diagram	120
	5.2.4 User Interface (UI)	123
5.3	Conclusion	130
<b>CHAPTER 6</b>	<b>EVALUATIONS</b>	<b>131</b>
6.1	Introduction	131
6.2	User Evaluations	131
6.3	Research Inference	139
6.4	Conclusion	141
<b>CHAPTER 7</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>143</b>
7.1	Introduction	143
7.2	Research Contribution	143
	7.2.1 Theoretical Contribution	144
	7.2.2 Methodological Contribution	145

7.3	Achievements	146
7.4	Limitations	148
7.5	Future Works	149
	7.5.1 Knowledge Management in Design Learning	149
	7.5.2 Cloud and Other Technologies	151
7.6	Conclusion	152

<b>REFERENCES</b>	155
-------------------	-----

<b>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</b>	175
-----------------------------	-----



## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Table 2.1	The differences of design and problem-based learning (Schön, 1983; Lawson, 2005; Dorst, 2011; Allen <i>et al</i> , 2011, Dong <i>et al</i> , 2012; Lazar, 2018).	12
Table 2.2	Design learning definitions and features based from various authors.	15
Table 2.3	Knowledge management frameworks in various domains.	21
Table 2.4	The tacit knowledge that exists in design learning.	24
Table 2.5	SECI model definition (Nonaka, 2000; Dubberly & Evenson, 2011, Khodakarami & Chan, 2014).	27
Table 2.6	Methods to externalise knowledge in various domains.	29
Table 2.7	Communication modes proposed by Vlăduțescu (2013).	37
Table 2.8	Cloud service models details (Wu <i>et al</i> , 2010; NIST, 2011).	39
Table 2.9	Cloud quality definitions (Sultan, 2013; Zheng <i>et al</i> , 2014).	46
Table 2.10	Previous studies on cloud in knowledge management.	48
Table 2.11	Existing researches on cloud-based learning.	51
Table 3.1	Activities of the investigation of study	63
Table 3.2	A structured meeting with the Architecture discipline lecturer	65
Table 3.3	Activities to collect data	66
Table 3.4	Activities to develop a model of cloud usability feature tool to support knowledge transformation in a critique session	68
Table 3.5	Activities to evaluate the model developed	71

Table 3.6	Brief profiles of the knowledge management experts	77
Table 3.7	Table of tools for the studio environment	79
Table 3.8	Instrument variables	80
Table 4.1	Relationships between the phases in design learning and the interaction occurred.	86
Table 4.2	A part of raw data from SID3.	91
Table 4.3	A part of the lecturer's feedback on the presentation made by SID3.	93
Table 4.4	The extracted data in a 'code' from Table 4.2.	95
Table 4.5	The extracted data in a 'code' from Table 4.3	96
Table 4.6	The 'write' part of the initialisation phase from Table 4.4.	97
Table 4.7	The 'write' part of the initialisation phase from Table 4.5	97
Table 4.8	Summary of the feedback typology implementation into the data collection	98
Table 4.9	Table of extracted observation and its chunked data from SID3.	100
Table 4.10	Feedback with its typology on SID3	101
Table 5.1	The purpose and summary of UML diagrams	116
Table 5.2	Landing page of Autodesk 360 user UI	126

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>FIGURE NO.</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Figure 2.1	DIKW Hierarchy (Intezari <i>et al</i> , 2016; Fred, 2017)	19
Figure 2.2	SECI model proposed by Nonaka (2000).	26
Figure 2.3	Feedback typology model by Scagnetti (2017).	32
Figure 2.4	A rendering from a computer model by Frank Gehry (Lawson, 2004).	41
Figure 2.5	A 3D model design sketching (Rahimian, 2011)	41
Figure 2.6	A model proposed by Delavari <i>et al</i> (2011) in integrating HCI in IT-integrated design collaboration process.	42
Figure 2.7	The framework of a cloud-based reflective learning environment based on Lin <i>et al</i> (2014).	53
Figure 2.8	A screenshot of Autodesk 360 user interface.	56
Figure 2.9	Theoretical framework inspired by Brocato (2009); Nonaka (2000); Vlăduțescu (2013); Zheng et al (2014), Lin <i>et al</i> (2014) and Scagnetti (2017).	58
Figure 3.1	Knowledge transformation using design science approach	62
Figure 3.2	Summary of model development	69
Figure 3.3	The stages in initialisation phase of thematic analysis	69
Figure 3.4	Analysis methods for model validation	72
Figure 3.5	Simulation setup for critique session in a studio environment	78
Figure 4.1	Screenshots of the observation during the critique session in the studio.	87
Figure 4.2	The snippet of one of the observation from data collection.	90

Figure 4.3	Feedback categorisation to design learning tacit knowledge	103
Figure 4.4	A snippet from the presentation of SID03 based on the extracted observation.	104
Figure 4.5	Knowledge transformation model in critique session using cloud usability feature	105
Figure 5.1	A use case diagram of interactions between actors and Autodesk 360	117
Figure 5.2	The activity diagram to view operations of user evaluation using Autodesk 360.	119
Figure 5.3	The sequence diagram for a student's interaction with Autodesk 360.	121
Figure 5.4	The sequence diagram for lecturer's interaction with Autodesk 360.	122
Figure 5.5	A screenshot of the Autodesk 360 sign in landing page	123
Figure 5.6	A screenshot of Autodesk 360 sign up landing page	124
Figure 5.7	A screenshot of the Autodesk 360 sign up essentials	125
Figure 5.8	A screenshot of Autodesk 360 landing page	126
Figure 5.9	A screenshot to create a project via Autodesk 360.	127
Figure 5.10	A screenshot of file upload onto Autodesk 360	128
Figure 5.11	A screenshot of the sample file uploaded onto Autodesk 360.	128
Figure 6.11	The average internet speed tested by using speedtest.net and fast.com	137

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AHP	-	Analytical Hierarchical Process
API	-	Application Programming Interface
AWS	-	Amazon Web Services
CRM	-	Customer Relationship Management
DIKW	-	Data, Information, Knowledge, Wisdom
eTRIKS	-	European Translation Information and Knowledge Management Services
HCI	-	Human-Computer Interaction
IaaS	-	Infrastructure as a Structure
ICT	-	Information and Communications Technology
IT	-	Information Technology
MB	-	Megabytes
Mbps	-	Megabits per second
MOOC	-	Massive Open Online Course
NIST	-	National Institute of Standards and Technology
PaaS	-	Platform as a Service
RIBA	-	Royal Institute of British Architects
SaaS	-	Software as a Service
SECI	-	Socialisation, Externalisation, Combination, Internalisation
SWS	-	Slow-Wave Sleep
UI	-	User Interface
UKM	-	Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
UML	-	Unified Modelling Language
UTM	-	Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
UX	-	User Experience

## LIST OF APPENDICES

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Appendix A	Model Validation by Knowledge Management Experts	161
Appendix B	Model Evaluation by Architecture Domain Participants	165
Appendix C	Data Collection	169

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Overview

Design learning is one of the pedagogies in the Architectural domain. One of the subjects taught in the domain is called Architectural Design, which uses the design learning process that contains three distinct phases: propose, critique and iterate. Students design an artefact and propose it to their lecturer in a studio classroom. Then, the lecturer provides feedback, known as the critique. The critique is made so that the students can improve on their proposed idea, making it better than the previous version. This process will be iterated every now and then within a set timeframe. From both the students' presentation and the critique made by the lecturer, it shows that the session provides an extensive tacit knowledge throughout the process. Currently, students present their artefact by visualising it through hand sketches and computer software aids. These tools help students interact with the lecturer in a critique session. Based on the interactions between the students and the lecturer, knowledge management occurs between them. In addition, both parties will acquire knowledge from each other and they will capture it based on their own understanding. In present day, a lot of existing studies have demonstrated that technology can cater to knowledge representation in learning. By using tools, it can help students and lecturer interact with each other and the artefact presented at a critique session by transforming tacit knowledge into explicit. However, not all tools are suitable in transforming knowledge that occurs in a critique session. Hence, this study is conducted to investigate the supporting tools in representing tacit knowledge in a design learning critique session.

## 1.2 Problem Background

Design learning is one of the teaching and learning pedagogies mainly used in the Architectural domain. Usually, it is taught in Architectural Design subject, which often takes place in a studio classroom environment. Basically, the learning has its own process, which consists of three major phases: propose, critique and iterate. The important feature of design learning that makes it distinct between the other pedagogies is the critique phase. In each critique session, most of the interactions happen between the lecturer, students and artefact. Most of the time, learning occurs when students and the lecturer interact with each other to improve the artefact.

Generally, design learning consists of a process that includes ideation proposal, critique and iterate. Students formulate and create their artefact by using all the knowledge that they have. From the existing knowledge, they visualise it by using tools, such as hand sketch or computer-aided software. This artefact created is presented to their lecturer during the critique phase. From the proposal presented by the students, the lecturer needs to give his or her feedback. In this part of the session, learning takes place as knowledge are generated from the interactions between the lecturer and the students. The lecturer acquires knowledge regarding the artefact proposed by students and the students gain additional knowledge based on the feedback given by their lecturer during the critique session. Eventually, both phases will be iterated from time to time until the design artefact is considered done in a given duration.

In the critique phase, there will be interactions between the lecturer and students based on the artefact presented. Interactions are very crucial in the design process. From the interactions used in design learning, both students and the lecturer become the agents in this study. Though knowledge occurs in every phase of design learning, the transformation of knowledge mostly takes place in a critique session as agents need to interact with each other based on the artefact presented. Besides, the students need to interact with their lecturer in order to improve and achieve quality design artefact. The interactions creates the learning ambience and, eventually, generates knowledge sharing among both parties. Thus, to understand the tacit



knowledge from design learning itself, it must undergo a critique phase by using the interactions involved.

The contributions from the lecturer during a critique session are based on the feedback given to improve the idea proposed. During the interactions, knowledge is transferred to both agents. The tool used for the agents' interaction to represent the knowledge is dialogue. Based on the dialogue, both agents can react or anticipate the knowledge transformed in the critique session. The knowledge generated in the active interactions will be captured by the students. Nevertheless, during the presentation, the lecturer needs to capture the tacit knowledge proposed by the students using their own understanding before giving their feedback and vice versa. Sometimes, the tacit knowledge captured by the agents might have some inconsistencies with whatever is understood from the other party. Thus, a tool is needed to represent and transform tacit knowledge into explicit in order to gain more effective feedback.

By representing tacit knowledge in a critique session, agents can understand each other better as the feedback is explicitly transformed. However, there is still no suitable tool to represent knowledge especially in a design learning process. In consequence, a model should be proposed so that knowledge generated from the interactions during the critique phase can be represented.

### **1.3 Problem Statement**

From the problem background stated previously, interactions are crucial in creating knowledge during an artefact creation. Design learning has a process cycle which includes three distinct phases, known as propose, critique and iterate. It is stated that interactions mostly occur between the agents during the critique phase. The feedback from the lecturer can become an enhancement to the current artefact created by the students. However, during a critique session in the studio, it is difficult to represent the tacit knowledge in the learning environment itself. Thus, a tool is needed to represent the knowledge generated in the critique phase.

In this generation, technology is quite useful in assisting teaching and learning. This also include the use of tools in design learning. Currently, there are a few tools to view students' artefact at the proposal phase, such as Revit, SketchUp, AutoCAD and more. However, these tools can only act as a visual to represent the design concept of the artefact. There is not much direct intervention to gain knowledge from the artefact itself by using the current tools. Moreover, during the presentation, the tools used to view the artefact are quite static and it is difficult to represent the knowledge. Thus, it does not do much justice on knowledge representation. Based on previous studies, the use of tools can assist in representing knowledge management and it may support the interactions between the agents eventually.

Thus, a transformation model from tacit to explicit is needed to represent knowledge generated among the agents during a critique session. To get a more rigorous and effective feedback, the knowledge needs to be represented via cloud usability feature. Nowadays, most people are capable in adapting the current technology for their daily life. By using the proposed tool for knowledge representation, it can act as a support to transform the tacit knowledge into explicit in order to further improve the design artefact. Eventually, this can optimise the interactions in the learning environment itself. Hence, the problem statement of this research is as follows:

***“How can cloud usability features support the representation of tacit knowledge in a critique session?”***

The research questions are as follows:

- (i) What are the knowledge generated by the agents during the critique?
- (ii) How does knowledge transformation between tacit and explicit process occur?
- (iii) What is the suitable tool to transform tacit knowledge to explicit in an Architectural critique session?

## **1.4 Aim**

This research aims to propose suitable cloud usability features to support tacit representation that occur in a design learning critique session.

## **1.5 Objectives**

Based on this study, it can be concluded that the objectives for this research are as follows:

- (i) To investigate the knowledge generated by the agents during a critique session
- (ii) To identify the process of knowledge transformation between tacit and explicit
- (iii) To propose cloud usability features in representing tacit knowledge transformation to explicit in a critique session

## **1.6 Scopes**

From the aim and objectives made previously, the scopes were created as a limitation in order to complete the study. The targeted domain were the Architecture students and lecturers from the Faculty of Built Environment and Survey who were taking the Architectural Design subject. Both parties were the agents in this study.

Architectural Design subject often takes place in a studio and it usually contains three major phases, which are propose, critique and iterate. This study focused more on the representation of knowledge that exists during a critique phase. When a critique phase happen in the studio session, a lot of knowledge management takes place at the same time, such as socialisation, externalisation, combination and

internalisation. Hence, this research concentrated on the externalisation process where it transforms tacit knowledge to explicit.

As knowledge is hard to capture, the cloud is proposed as a supporting tool. Six qualities are often featured in the existing cloud application. Thus, the usability is chosen to be studied in representing tacit knowledge transformation to explicit during a critique session.

Finally, to organise everything into places, a methodology is needed in order to complete this research. In this study, the methodology used was research design science approach.

## **1.7 Significance of Study**

This study can be beneficial to the design industry as a whole. Design itself has a vast definition and can be applied across multiple disciplines. It can also be served as a future reference for the other researchers in the design domain. In addition, it gives some opportunities for the designers to communicate their design artefact to their peers by having a tool to transform their tacit knowledge. Moreover, this study can be implemented in other learning pedagogies in the future.

The findings of this study will provide information regarding the multidisciplinary between Computer Science and Architectural domain. Generally, they are two different domains that would not intertwine with each other. However, with the latest technology tools, there are possibilities that they can be used in various domains including Architecture. Besides, in this study, it shows that tools can be used to represent tacit knowledge and, later, it can be used to support the knowledge transformation from tacit to explicit. By using the interaction between students and lecturer on the design artefact in a critique session, the proposed tool can represent the tacit knowledge.

## REFERENCES

- Adi, F. M., Khaidzir, K. A. M., & Said, I. (2015). Role of Conceptualisation as a Catalyst in Capturing Urban Issues within the Studio Learning Environment. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 170, 165-176.
- Allen, D. E., Donham, R. S., & Bernhardt, S. A. (2011). Problem-based Learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. 128, 21-29.
- Alshwaier, A., Youssef, A., & Emam, A. (2012). A New Trend for E-Learning in KSA using Educational Clouds. *Advanced Computing*. 3(1), 81-97.
- Aksoy, M. S. & Algawiaz, D. (2014). Knowledge Management in the Cloud: Benefits and Risks. *International Journal of Computer Applications Technology and Research*. 3(11), 718-720.
- Armbrust, M., Fox, A., Griffith, R., Joseph, A. D., Katz, R., Konwinski, A., Lee, G., Patterson, D., Rabkin, A., Stoica, I., Zaharia, M. (2010). A View on Cloud Computing. *Communications of the ACM*. 2010. 53(4), 50-58.
- Bandera, C., Keshtkar, F, Bartolacci, M. R., Neerudu, S., & Passerini, K. (2017). Knowledge Management and the Entrepreneur: Insights from Ikujiro Nonaka's Dynamic Knowledge Creation Model (SECI). *International Journal of Innovation Studies*. 1(3), 163-174.
- Bennett, S., Agostinho, S., & Lockyer, L. (2017). The Process of Designing for Learning: Understanding University Teachers' Design Work. *Educational Technology Research and Development*. 65(1), 125-145.
- Blessing, L. T., & Chakrabarti, A. (2009). *DRM: A Design Research Methodology* (pp. 13-42). Springer London.
- Brocato, K. (2009). Studio Based Learning: Proposing, Critiquing, Iterating Our Way to Person-Centeredness for Better Classroom Management. *Theory into Practice*. 48(2), 138-146.

- Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014, September). The Use of Triangulation in Qualitative Research. In *Oncology Nursing Forum* (Vol. 41, No. 5).
- Dubberly, H., & Evenson, S. (2011). Design as Learning – or “knowledge creation” – the SECI model. *Interactions*. 18(1), 75-79.
- Delavari, N., Sheikh Said, N., Ibrahim, R., and Abdullah, M. T. (2011). HCI to Engage Design Team Members in IT-integrated Design Collaboration Process. *WSEAS Transactions on Information Science and Application*. 9(8), 341-355.
- Donate, M. J., & de Pablo, J. D. S. (2015). The Role of Knowledge-oriented Leadership in Knowledge Management Practices and Innovation. *Journal of Business Research*. 68(2), 360-370.
- Dong, A, Mounarath, R. & Lovallo, D. (2012). The language of abduction in choosing innovation. *The 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Design Creativity (ICDC2012)*. September 18-20, 2012. Glasgow, United Kingdom, 179-188.
- Dorst, K. (2011). The core of ‘design thinking’ and its application. *Design Studies*, 32(6), 521-532.
- Fehling, C., Ewald, T., Leymann, F., Pauly, M., Rütshlin, J., & Schumm, D. (2012, June). Capturing Cloud Computing Knowledge and Experience in Patterns. In *Cloud Computing (CLOUD), 2012 IEEE 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on* (pp. 726-733). IEEE.
- Fred, Y. Y. (2017). Measuring Knowledge: A Quantitative Approach to Knowledge Theory. In *Scientific Metrics: Towards Analytical and Quantitative Sciences* (pp. 155-162). Springer, Singapore.
- Ganesan, N. (2013). Migration of an E-Learning Model to the Cloud. *Journal of International Technology and Information Management*. 22(3), 19-36.
- Gunadham, T. (2015). Potential of Cloud Storage Application as Knowledge Management System. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*. 6(2), 153.
- Hall, A., & Virrantaus, K. (2016). Visualising the Workings of Agent-based Models: Diagrams as a Tool for Communication and Knowledge Acquisition. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*. 58, 1-11.
- Hendrix, D., Myneni, L., Narayanan, H., & Ross, M (2010, March). Implementing Studio-based Learning in CS2. In *Proceedings of the 41<sup>st</sup> ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education* (pp. 505-509). ACM.

- Hermans, G. (2014). Investigating the Unexplored Possibilities of Digital-Physical Toolkits in Lay Design. *International Journal of Design*. 8(2), 15-28.
- Hird, A. (2017). Externalising, Sharing and Comparing Perceptions in Design. In *Design Management Academy* (p. 1361-1371). ISBN 978-1-912294-11-4
- Hundhausen, C. D., Narayanan, N. H. & Crosby, M. E. (2008). Exploring Studio-based Instructional Models for Computing Education. *ACM SIGCSE Bulletin*. 40(1), 392-396.
- Hussein, A. (2015). The Use of Triangulation in Social Sciences Research: Can Qualitative and Quantitative Methods be Combined?. *Journal of Comparative Social Work*. 4(1), 1-12.
- Iorio, F., & Snowdon, J. L. (2011). Leveraging Cloud Computing and High Performance Computing Advances for Next-generation Architecture, Urban Design and Construction Projects. *Proceedings of the 2011 Symposium on Simulation for Architecture and Urban Design*. San Diego, CA: ACM, 118-125.
- Intezari, A., Pauleen, D. J., & Taskin, N. (2016, January). The DIKW Hierarchy and Management Decision-Making. In *2016 49<sup>th</sup> Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS)* (pp. 4193-4201). IEEE.
- Khaidzir, K. A. M., & Lawson, B. (2013). The cognitive construct of design conversation. *Research in Engineering Design*. 24(4), 331-347.
- Khodakarami, F., & Chan, Y. E. (2014). Exploring the Role of Customer Relationship Management (CRM) Systems in Customer Knowledge Creation. *Information & Management*. 51(1), 27-42.
- Lawson, B. (2004). *What designers know*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Lawson, B. (2005). *How designers think*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Lazar, L. (2018). The Cognitive Neuroscience of Design Creativity. *Journal of Experimental Neuroscience*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1179069518809664>
- Li Z., Wilson, C., Jiang Z., Liu Y., Zhao, B. Y., Jin, C., Zhang, Z., and Dai, Y. (2013). Efficient Batched Synchronization in Dropbox-like Cloud Storage Services. Eyers, D. and Schwan, K. (Eds.) *Middleware 2013* (pp. 307-327). Berlin: Springer.
- Lim. Y., Lee, S., & Kim, D. (2011). Interactive Attributes for Expression-oriented Interaction Design. *International Journal of Design*. 5(3), 113-128.

- Lin, Y.-T., Wen, M.-L., Jou, M., and Wu, D.-W. (2014). A Cloud-based Learning Environment for Developing Student Reflection Abilities. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 32, 244-252.
- Liu, P. & Rahal, G. (2016, March). eTRIKS Cloud Platform: A Platform for Knowledge Management. In *International Symposium on Grids and Clouds 2015* (Vol. 239, p. 001). SISSA Medialab.
- Marzouk, M. M., & Zaher, M. M. (2015). Tracking Construction Projects Progress using Mobile Hand-held Devices. In *Proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> Internaitonal/11<sup>th</sup> Construction Specialty Conference*.
- Mathews, J. M. (2010). Using a Studio-based Pedagogy to Engage Students in the Design of Mobile-based Media. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 9(1).
- McAfee, A. (2011). What Every CEO Needs to Know about the Cloud. *Havard Business Review*. 89(11), 124-132.
- Mell, P., & Grance, T. (2011). The NIST Definition of Cloud Computing.
- Miller, J. D. Active, Balanced, and Happy: These young Americans are not bowling alone. *The Generation X Report*. 2011. 1(1): 5-6.
- National Institute of Standards Technology (2011). *SP800-145*. Gaithersburg: National Institute of Standards Technology.
- Nonaka, I. (2000). A Dynamic Theory of Organizational Knowledge Creation. In *Knowledge Groupware and the Internet* (pp. 3-42).
- Ozdamli, F. (2013). Effectiveness of Cloud Systems and Social Networks in Improving Self-directed Learning Abilities and Developing Positive Seamless Learning Perceptions. *Journal of Universal Computer Science*. 19(5), 602-618.
- Oztok, M. (2013). Tacit Knowledge in Online Learning: Community, Identity and Social Capital. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*. 22(1), 21-36.
- Panahi, S., Watson, J., & Partridge, H. (2013). Towards Tacit Knowledge Sharing Over Social Web Tools. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 17(3), 379 – 397.
- Puusa, A. & Eerikäinen, M. (2010). Is Tacit Knowledge Really Tacit?. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*. 8(3).
- Rahimian, F. P. & Ibrahim, R. (2011). Impacts of VR 3D Sketching on Novice Designers' Spatial Cognition in Collaborative Conceptual Architectural Design. *Design Studies*. 32, 255-291.
- Scagnetti, G. (2017). A Dialogical Model for Studio Critiques in Design Education. *The Design Journal*, 20 (sup1), S781-S791.



- Schmitt, U. (2013). Knowcations – Conceptualising a Meme and Cloud-based Personal 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation Knowledge Management System. *Looking into the Future of Creativity and Decision Support System*, 07-09.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Simonova, I. & Poulova, P. (2015). Cloud and m-Learning: Longitudinal Case Study of Faculty of Informatics and Management, University of Hradec Kralove. *Proceedings of the 7th Asian Conference, ACIIDS 2015, Part II*. 23-25 March. Bali, Indonesia: Springer, 411-420.
- Stolterman, E. (2008). The Nature of Design Practice and Implications for Interaction Design Research. *International Journal of Design*. 2(1), 55-65.
- Sultan, N. (2013). Knowledge Management in the Age of Cloud Computing and Web 2.0: Experiencing the Power of Disruptive Innovations. *International Journal of Information Management*. 33(1), 160-165.
- Vaismoradi, M., Jones, J., Turunen, H., & Snelgrove, S. (2016). Theme Development in Qualitative Content Analysis and Thematic Analysis. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*. 6(5), 100.
- Vlăduțescu, Ș. (2013). Communication Beings: Four Communication Prototypical Figures. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(11), 1-8.
- Weiser, P., & Frank, A. U. (2013, September). Cognitive transactions – A communication model. In *Spatial Information Theory* (pp. 129-148). Springer, Cham.
- Wilhelm, I., Rose, M., Imhof, K. I., Rasch, B., Büchel, C., & Born, J. (2013). The Sleeping Child Outplays the Adult's Capacity to Convert Implicit into Explicit Knowledge. *Nature neuroscience*. 16 (4), 391.
- Wu, C. H., Kao, S. C., & Shih, L. H. (2010). Assessing the Suitability of Process and Information Technology in Supporting Tacit Knowledge Transfer. *Behaviour & Information Technology*. 29(5), 513-525.
- Wu, Y. W., Lin, Y. A., Wen, M. H., Pernh, Y. H., & Hsu, I. T. (2016). Design, analysis and user acceptance of architectural design education in learning system based on knowledge management theory. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education*, 12(11).

- Yusof, Z. M., Ismail, M. B., Ahmad, K., & Yusof, M. M. (2012). Knowledge Sharing in the Public Sector in Malaysia: A Proposed Holistic Model. *Information Development*, 28(1), 43-54.
- Zheng, X., Martin, P., Brohman, K., & Da Xu, L. (2014). CLOUDQUAL: A Quality Model for Cloud Services. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 10(2), 1527-1536.
- Zollars, R. L., Carter, A. S. and Hundhausen, C. (2012). The Impact of Studio-based Learning on the Delivery of Course Information. *ASEE Annual Conference*. 10<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> June 2012. San Antonio: ASEE.