

## 國立臺灣藝術大學 101 學年度研究所博士班招生考試試題

系所別：創意產業設計研究所博士班      科目：設計原理與研究方法

說明：

- 一、本試題紙上請勿作答。
- 二、答案請依序寫在試卷上並標明題號。
- 三、本試題紙應與試卷一併繳回。

(一) 文化創意的研究發展首重追根究柢，理論建構則需要追求合理，實務應用則離不開積極創新。如就程序來看，則有研究動機、研究目標、演繹推論與實際驗證等步驟；就實際操作而言，則有收集、分析、綜合與評估等工作。就方法而言，則有質化與量化研究。

**Qualitative research** is a method of inquiry employed in many different academic disciplines, traditionally in the social science, but also in market research and further contexts. Qualitative researchers aim to gather an in-depth understanding of human behavior and the reasons that govern such behavior. The qualitative method investigates the *why* and *how* of decision making, not just *what*, *where*, *when*. Hence, smaller but focused samples are more often needed than large samples. In the conventional view, qualitative methods produce information only on the particular cases studied, and any more general conclusions are only propositions (informed assertions). **Quantitative methods** can then be used to seek empirical support for such research hypotheses. This view has been disputed by Oxford University professor Bent Flyvbjerg, who argues that qualitative methods and case study research may be used both for hypotheses-testing and for generalizing beyond the particular cases studied.

知識是先人的心得與經驗，是經過有系統的分析、整理與研究的結果。心得之可貴在於分享，經驗之可貴在於傳承，知識之可貴在於可以傳授，研究之可貴在於把心得分享，變成可以傳承的經驗，再經由分析、歸納變成可以傳授的知識。一個好的研究不只是一種

心得與經驗的陳述與分享，而是一種”from data to wisdom”的過程。

請針對上述質化與量化兩個不同的研究取向，提出你個人的評論與觀點，並可以就你本身的專長領域，提出實際的例證，來支持強化你的論述。（50分）

(二) 機能與造形是設計的兩個重要面向，1896年美國建築師蘇立文（Louis Sullivan）在其 *The Tall Office Building Artistically*

*Considered* 一文中的論述，成為引導二十世紀的重要設計思想：

...It is the pervading law of all things organic and inorganic, of all things physical and metaphysical, of all things human and all things superhuman, of all true manifestations of the head, of the heart, of the soul, that the life is recognizable in its expression, that **form ever follows function**. This is the law.

Shall we, then, daily violate this law in our art? Are we so decadent, so imbecile, so utterly weak of eyesight, that we cannot perceive this truth so simple, so very simple? Is it indeed a truth so transparent that we see through it but do not see it? Is it really then, a very marvelous thing, or is it rather so commonplace, so everyday, so near a thing to us, that we cannot perceive that the shape, form, outward expression, design or whatever we may choose, of the tall office building should in the very nature of things follow the functions of the building, and that where the function does not change, the form is not to change?...

二十一世紀初，美國設計學者諾曼（Norman）在其 *Emotional Design* 一書中，則以其劃時代的觀點，為當前的設計提供了新的思維模式：

In the 1980s, in writing *The Design of Everyday Things*, I didn't take emotions into account. I addressed utility and usability, function and form, all in a logical, dispassionate way—even though I am infuriated by poorly designed objects. But now I've changed. Why? In part because of new scientific advances in our understanding of the brain and of how emotion and cognition are thoroughly intertwined. We scientists now understand how important emotion is to everyday life, how valuable. Sure, utility and usability are important, but without fun and pleasure, joy and excitement, and yes,

anxiety and anger, fear and rage, our lives would be incomplete.

Along with emotions, there is one other point as well: aesthetics, attractiveness and beauty. When I wrote *The Design of Everyday Things*, my intention was not to denigrate aesthetics or emotion. I simply wanted to elevate usability to its proper place in the design world, alongside beauty and function. I thought that the topic of aesthetics was well-covered elsewhere, so I neglected it. The result has been the well-deserved criticism from designers: “If we were to follow Norman’s prescription, our designs would all be usable—but they would also be ugly.”

請針對上述兩個不同的設計取向，提出你個人的評論與觀點，並可以就你本身的專長領域，提出實際的例證，來支持強化你的論述。（50分）