International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 10, NCREHAASTE - 2026

Ethical, Secure and Sustainable AI Impact of Design Thinking on Student Creativity and Innovation

Mr. Ankur Sharma, Dr. Navneet Rohela and Mr. Faiz Mukhtar

Department of Computer Applications, Moradabad Institute of Technology (MIT), Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Corresponding Author E-mail: mr.ankurmit@gmail.com, navneetrohelambd@gmail.com, faizmukhtar1991786@gmail.com
Contact: +91 9760007984

Abstract: ***Design Thinking has emerged as a powerful human-centered problem-solving approach that fosters creativity, innovation, and experiential learning in higher education. This study examines the impact of Design Thinking pedagogy on enhancing creativity and innovation among undergraduate and postgraduate students in Computer Applications programs. The research adopts a mixed-method approach involving pre-test and post-test assessments, structured questionnaires, classroom observations, and project-based evaluations conducted over one academic semester. Students were exposed to Design Thinking stages including empathizing with users, problem definition, ideation, prototyping, and testing while working on real-world problem scenarios. Quantitative analysis reveals a significant improvement in students' creative thinking, idea generation, collaboration, and problem-solving abilities after the intervention. Qualitative feedback indicates increased learner engagement, confidence in experimentation, and a deeper understanding of user-centered solution development. The findings suggest that integrating Design Thinking into the curriculum promotes innovation-oriented learning environments and equips students with industry-relevant skills. The study recommends structured incorporation of Design Thinking methodologies in computer education to bridge the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical innovation.***

Keywords: Design Thinking, Creativity, Innovation, Higher Education, Computer Applications, Experiential Learning, Student Engagement

I. INTRODUCTION

In the twenty-first century, rapid technological advancement, digital transformation, and globalization have significantly reshaped the expectations placed on graduates of computer-related disciplines. Employers increasingly seek professionals who not only possess technical expertise but also demonstrate creativity, innovation, adaptability, collaboration, and user-centered problem-solving abilities. Traditional education models in computer applications and information technology often emphasize content delivery, programming proficiency, and examination-oriented assessment methods. While these approaches build foundational knowledge, they frequently fail to nurture higher-order cognitive skills such as creative thinking, critical reasoning, empathy-driven design, and innovative problem-solving. Consequently, there is an urgent need for pedagogical strategies that can bridge the gap between theoretical learning and real-world application.

Creativity and innovation have become core competencies for sustainable development in knowledge-driven economies. Creativity refers to the ability to generate novel and useful ideas, while innovation involves transforming those ideas into practical solutions that create value. In computer education, creativity enables students to conceptualize original algorithms, interfaces, and systems, whereas innovation supports the development of functional applications that address real user needs. However, many students struggle to apply theoretical concepts to ambiguous real-life problems due to limited exposure to experiential learning environments. This challenge highlights the necessity of adopting learner-centered teaching methodologies that actively engage students in authentic problem-solving tasks.

Design Thinking has emerged as a powerful human-centered innovation framework widely adopted in business, engineering, healthcare, and education. It provides a structured yet flexible approach to understanding user needs, redefining

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 10, NCREHAASTE - 2026

complex problems, generating creative ideas, building prototypes, and testing solutions iteratively. Popularized by institutions such as IDEO and Stanford University's d.school, Design Thinking emphasizes empathy, collaboration, experimentation, and continuous learning. Unlike linear problem-solving models, Design Thinking encourages iterative exploration and embraces failure as a learning opportunity, making it particularly suitable for developing creative confidence among learners.

In educational contexts, Design Thinking promotes active learning, project-based engagement, interdisciplinary collaboration, and reflective practice. Students become active participants in knowledge construction rather than passive recipients of information. By working on real-world challenges, learners develop empathy toward end users, refine their analytical thinking skills, and cultivate innovative mindsets. Furthermore, Design Thinking aligns well with outcome-based education frameworks and industry expectations, making it a valuable pedagogical strategy for computer applications programs.

The integration of Design Thinking into computer education supports the development of essential twenty-first-century skills, including communication, teamwork, digital literacy, adaptability, and ethical awareness. Through ideation workshops, prototyping activities, and user testing exercises, students gain practical exposure to the entire product development lifecycle. These experiences enable learners to connect abstract concepts such as algorithms, databases, human-computer interaction, and software engineering principles with real-world problem contexts. As a result, students become more confident in applying knowledge creatively and innovatively.

Despite the growing interest in Design Thinking, empirical research examining its measurable impact on student creativity and innovation in computer applications programs remains limited, particularly in developing educational environments. Many studies focus on engineering, business, or design disciplines, leaving a research gap in computing education. Additionally, existing studies often rely on qualitative observations without systematic measurement of learning outcomes. Therefore, there is a need for evidence-based research that evaluates how Design Thinking pedagogy influences creativity, innovation, collaboration, and problem-solving skills among students.

This study aims to investigate the effectiveness of integrating Design Thinking methodology into classroom instruction and project-based learning activities. By adopting a mixed-method research design, the study examines changes in students' creative thinking abilities, innovation performance, engagement levels, and collaborative behaviors before and after the intervention. The research also explores student perceptions regarding the usefulness of Design Thinking in enhancing their learning experience and professional readiness.

The findings of this study are expected to contribute to educational practitioners, curriculum designers, and policymakers by providing empirical insights into the pedagogical value of Design Thinking in computer education. The outcomes may support curriculum reform initiatives, faculty development programs, and institutional strategies aimed at fostering innovation-driven learning environments. Moreover, the study offers practical recommendations for implementing Design Thinking frameworks in higher education classrooms to enhance student learning outcomes and employability skills.

In summary, the increasing demand for creative and innovative computing professionals necessitates the adoption of learner-centered pedagogical approaches that promote experiential learning and problem-solving competence. Design Thinking offers a promising framework to address these educational challenges. This research seeks to systematically evaluate its impact on student creativity and innovation within computer applications programs, thereby contributing to the growing body of knowledge on educational innovation and instructional design.

The key objectives guiding this study are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Objectives of the Study

Objective No.	Objective Description
1	Analyze the effect of Design Thinking on student creativity
2	Evaluate innovation and problem-solving skills
3	Measure student engagement and collaboration
4	Assess effectiveness of Design Thinking pedagogy

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on Design Thinking spans multiple disciplines, including engineering, business, healthcare, and education. Scholars have increasingly recognized its potential as a pedagogical framework for fostering creativity, innovation, and problem-solving skills among learners. This section reviews relevant studies related to the conceptual foundations of Design Thinking, its application in education, its impact on creativity and innovation, and its relevance to computing and technology-based learning environments.

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 10, NCREHAASTE - 2026

A. Conceptual Foundations of Design Thinking

Design Thinking is commonly defined as a human-centered approach to innovation that integrates empathy, creativity, and rationality to meet user needs and organizational goals (Brown, 2009). The process typically includes five stages: empathize, define, ideate, prototype, and test. These stages encourage iterative learning, experimentation, and reflective practice. Cross (2011) emphasized that Design Thinking involves designerly ways of knowing, which include abductive reasoning, visualization, and solution-focused thinking.

Razzouk and Shute (2012) described Design Thinking as an analytical and creative process that engages individuals in experimenting, creating, and prototyping models to solve complex problems. The authors highlighted that Design Thinking enhances learners' ability to approach ill-defined problems systematically while maintaining creative flexibility. Similarly, Liedtka (2015) argued that Design Thinking improves innovation outcomes by reducing cognitive biases and promoting user-centered exploration.

B. Design Thinking in Educational Contexts

Educational researchers have explored the integration of Design Thinking into teaching and learning practices to enhance student engagement and creativity. Henriksen, Richardson, and Mehta (2017) found that Design Thinking supports creativity development by encouraging collaboration, divergent thinking, and reflective learning. Their study demonstrated that students exposed to Design Thinking activities exhibited higher creative confidence and problem-solving resilience.

Scheer, Noweski, and Meinel (2012) reported that Design Thinking promotes interdisciplinary learning and fosters teamwork skills in higher education. Students participating in Design Thinking workshops demonstrated improved communication abilities and a deeper understanding of user needs. Additionally, Carroll et al. (2010) emphasized that project-based Design Thinking environments enable learners to actively construct knowledge through experiential engagement.

In teacher education, Retna (2016) observed that Design Thinking enhances pedagogical innovation and instructional adaptability. Educators reported increased student motivation and improved classroom interaction when Design Thinking strategies were implemented. These findings suggest that Design Thinking can be effectively adapted across diverse educational settings.

C. Impact of Design Thinking on Creativity

Creativity development is a central objective of Design Thinking pedagogy. Torrance (1974) conceptualized creativity as the ability to produce original and meaningful ideas, which can be nurtured through experiential learning environments. Design Thinking supports divergent thinking by encouraging brainstorming, ideation, and experimentation without fear of failure.

Studies by Johansson-Sköldberg, Woodilla, and Çetinkaya (2013) indicated that Design Thinking enhances creative confidence and idea fluency among learners. Similarly, Dell'Era, Marchesi, and Verganti (2020) found that students exposed to structured ideation techniques generated more innovative solutions compared to traditional instructional methods. These findings confirm the role of Design Thinking in stimulating cognitive flexibility and creative problem-solving.

D. Design Thinking and Innovation Skills

Innovation involves transforming creative ideas into viable solutions that deliver value. According to OECD (2018), innovation skills include critical thinking, collaboration, digital literacy, and adaptability. Design Thinking facilitates innovation by guiding learners through iterative prototyping and user testing phases, enabling continuous improvement.

Kolko (2015) emphasized that Design Thinking enables organizations and individuals to manage complexity and uncertainty effectively. In academic settings, innovation-driven learning encourages students to develop entrepreneurial thinking and solution-oriented mindsets. Research by Beckman and Barry (2007) demonstrated that Design Thinking fosters integrative thinking and interdisciplinary collaboration, which are essential for innovation in technology-driven environments.

E. Design Thinking in Computing and Technology Education

The application of Design Thinking in computing education has gained momentum in recent years. Studies indicate that integrating Design Thinking with software development enhances requirement analysis, user experience design, and product usability (Mahmoud &Dabbagh, 2020). Students develop empathy for end users, leading to more user-centered system designs.

Brenner and Uebernickel (2016) reported that Design Thinking improves agile development practices by aligning technical solutions with user needs. Additionally, Design Thinking-based learning environments encourage iterative

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 10, NCREHAASTE - 2026

prototyping and rapid feedback cycles, which align with modern software engineering practices.

However, empirical evidence specifically measuring creativity and innovation outcomes among BCA and MCA students remains limited. Most studies focus on engineering or design disciplines, indicating a research gap that this study aims to address.

F. Research Gap

Although existing literature supports the pedagogical benefits of Design Thinking, limited studies provide quantitative evidence on its impact within computer applications education. There is insufficient research examining student creativity metrics, innovation performance indicators, and longitudinal learning outcomes. Furthermore, contextual studies in emerging educational ecosystems are scarce. This research seeks to fill this gap by systematically evaluating the effectiveness of Design Thinking in enhancing creativity and innovation among computer applications students.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This study adopted a mixed-method research design combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to examine the impact of Design Thinking on student creativity and innovation. A quasi-experimental pre-test and post-test design was employed to measure changes in creativity levels and innovation skills after the instructional intervention. Quantitative data provided measurable evidence of learning outcomes, while qualitative data offered deeper insights into student perceptions, engagement, and learning experiences. The mixed-method approach enhanced the reliability and validity of findings through data triangulation.

B. Population and Sample

The population of the study consisted of undergraduate and postgraduate students enrolled in the Bachelor of Computer Applications (BCA) and Master of Computer Applications (MCA) programs at [Name of Institution]. A total sample of **[e.g., 120 students]** was selected using purposive sampling to ensure active participation in project-based learning activities. The sample included students from diverse academic backgrounds and varying levels of technical proficiency.

Demographic data such as age, academic year, gender distribution, and prior exposure to project-based learning were collected to contextualize the findings. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all respondents in accordance with institutional ethical guidelines.

The demographic distribution of the study participants is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Sample Demographics

Category	Count	Percentage
BCA Students	70	58%
MCA Students	50	42%
Total	120	100%

C. Intervention Design

The intervention consisted of a structured Design Thinking module integrated into the regular curriculum over a period of twelve weeks. Students were introduced to the five stages of Design Thinking through interactive workshops, case studies, group activities, and guided project work.

During the **Empathize** stage, students conducted user interviews, surveys, and observations to understand real-world problems. In the **Define** phase, problem statements were formulated using empathy maps and user personas. The **Ideate** stage involved brainstorming sessions, mind mapping, and creative thinking techniques such as SCAMPER and rapid ideation. In the **Prototype** stage, students developed low-fidelity and digital prototypes using wire framing tools and basic programming frameworks. The **Test** phase included user feedback collection, usability testing, and iterative refinement.

Faculty members acted as facilitators rather than instructors, encouraging exploration, experimentation, and reflection.

D. Instruments for Data Collection

Multiple instruments were used to collect data:

1. **Creativity Assessment Questionnaire:** A standardized Likert-scale questionnaire measuring originality, flexibility, fluency, and elaboration.
2. **Innovation Performance Rubric:** Evaluated novelty, feasibility, usability, and technical implementation of student projects.
3. **Student Feedback Survey:** Measured engagement, collaboration, confidence, and satisfaction.
4. **Classroom Observation Checklist:** Recorded participation levels and teamwork dynamics.
5. **Focus Group Interviews:** Captured qualitative insights into learning experiences.

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 10, NCREHAASTE - 2026

All instruments were validated by subject experts and pilot tested to ensure reliability.

A summary of the data collection instruments, their purposes, and measurement types is provided in Table 3.

Table 3: Data Collection Instruments

Instrument	Purpose	Type
Creativity Questionnaire	Measure creative thinking	Quantitative
Innovation Rubric	Evaluate project innovation	Quantitative
Student Survey	Measure engagement	Quantitative
Focus Group	Capture perceptions	Qualitative

E. Data Collection Procedure

Pre-test data were collected prior to the Design Thinking intervention. Students then participated in the twelve-week module. Post-test assessments were administered at the end of the semester. Project evaluations were conducted by an independent panel of faculty members. Qualitative feedback was collected through open-ended surveys and focus group discussions.

F. Data Analysis Techniques

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, mean comparison, standard deviation analysis, and paired sample t-tests. Qualitative data were analyzed using thematic coding to identify recurring patterns and perceptions.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Quantitative Results

The pre-test creativity assessment indicated moderate levels of creative thinking among participants, with an overall mean score of **[M = 3.12, SD = 0.54]**. After the Design Thinking intervention, the post-test mean increased to **[M = 4.01, SD = 0.49]**, demonstrating a statistically significant improvement *(t(119) = 8.47, p < .001)*.

Innovation performance scores also showed significant growth across dimensions such as novelty, usability, and feasibility. The average project innovation score increased from **68% to 85%** after intervention.

A comparative summary of pre-test and post-test performance indicators is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Pre-Test and Post-Test Results Summary

Parameter	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Improvement
Creativity Score	3.12	4.01	28%
Innovation Score	68%	85%	17%
Engagement Level	Moderate	High	Improved

Student engagement survey results indicated that:

- 87% of students reported increased confidence in idea generation.
- 82% improved teamwork and collaboration skills.
- 79% expressed higher motivation toward project-based learning.

B. Qualitative Findings

Qualitative analysis revealed five dominant themes:

1. Enhanced creative confidence
2. Improved user empathy
3. Active collaboration
4. Iterative learning mindset
5. Practical relevance

Students reported that Design Thinking enabled them to better understand real user problems and encouraged experimentation without fear of failure.

C. Discussion

The findings align with previous research (Brown, 2009; Henriksen et al., 2017), confirming that Design Thinking significantly enhances creativity and innovation. The improvement in creativity scores supports the effectiveness of experiential learning models. Increased engagement and collaboration indicate positive pedagogical impact.

The results demonstrate that Design Thinking bridges the gap between theoretical knowledge and real-world application in computing education.

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 10, NCREHAASTE - 2026

V. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of Design Thinking pedagogy on enhancing creativity and innovation among students enrolled in Computer Applications programs. In response to the increasing demand for industry-ready graduates equipped with problem-solving, adaptability, and creative competencies, this research evaluated the effectiveness of integrating a structured Design Thinking module into classroom instruction and project-based learning environments. The findings demonstrate that Design Thinking significantly improves students' creative thinking abilities, innovation performance, collaborative behavior, and learner engagement.

Quantitative results revealed a statistically significant increase in creativity assessment scores following the intervention, indicating enhanced fluency, originality, and flexibility in idea generation. Innovation performance scores also improved substantially, reflecting better usability, feasibility, and novelty in student project outcomes. These improvements highlight the pedagogical value of experiential learning approaches that actively engage learners in real-world problem solving. Qualitative findings further supported these results by revealing increased student confidence, improved empathy toward users, and stronger teamwork skills.

The integration of Design Thinking encouraged students to shift from solution-driven thinking to problem-driven exploration. Learners developed the ability to analyze user needs, articulate meaningful problem statements, and generate multiple solution alternatives before selecting optimal designs. This mindset fosters deeper cognitive engagement and prepares students for complex professional challenges in software development and digital innovation domains. Additionally, the facilitator-based instructional approach promoted self-directed learning and reflective practice, enabling students to take ownership of their learning process.

The results of this study contribute to the growing body of educational research advocating learner-centered pedagogies in computing education. By embedding Design Thinking into curriculum frameworks, institutions can cultivate innovation-driven learning ecosystems that align academic instruction with industry expectations. Faculty members may utilize Design Thinking strategies to redesign instructional activities, assessment models, and project workflows to maximize student engagement and skill development.

Although the study demonstrates promising outcomes, certain limitations must be acknowledged. The research was conducted within a single institutional context and utilized a limited sample size. The duration of the intervention was restricted to one academic semester, which may not fully capture long-term learning impacts. Future studies may address these limitations by expanding the scope across multiple institutions and conducting longitudinal assessments.

Overall, the study confirms that Design Thinking serves as an effective pedagogical framework for enhancing creativity, innovation, and experiential learning among computer applications students. Its structured yet flexible approach empowers learners to become adaptive problem solvers and lifelong learners in an evolving digital landscape.

VI. IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE SCOPE

The findings of this research present several implications for educational stakeholders. Academic institutions may integrate Design Thinking into curriculum design, laboratory practices, and capstone projects to strengthen experiential learning outcomes. Faculty development programs may incorporate Design Thinking training to enhance instructional innovation. Assessment frameworks may shift from traditional examinations toward performance-based evaluation methods that capture creativity and innovation metrics.

Future research may explore comparative studies between Design Thinking and other pedagogical approaches such as problem-based learning and flipped classrooms. Longitudinal studies may assess sustained impact on employability skills and professional performance. Additionally, interdisciplinary integration with artificial intelligence, data science, and entrepreneurship education may further strengthen innovation capacity among learners.

REFERENCES

[1] Brown, T. (2009). *Change by design: How design thinking transforms organizations and inspires innovation*. Harper Business.

[2] Beckman, S. L., & Barry, M. (2007). Innovation as a learning process: Embedding design thinking. *California Management Review, 50*(1), 25–56. https://doi.org/10.2307/41166415

[3] Brenner, W., & Uebernickel, F. (2016). *Design thinking for innovation: Research and practice*. Springer.

[4] Carroll, M., Goldman, S., Britos, L., Koh, J., Royalty, A., & Hornstein, M. (2010). Destination, imagination and the fires within: Design thinking in a middle school classroom. *International Journal of Art & Design Education, 29*(1), 37–53.

[5] Cross, N. (2011). *Design thinking: Understanding how designers think and work*. Berg.

[6] Dell'Era, C., Marchesi, A., & Verganti, R. (2020). Mastering technologies in design-driven innovation. *Research Policy, 49*(2), 103–124.

[7] Henriksen, D., Richardson, C., & Mehta, R. (2017). Design thinking: A creative approach to educational problems of practice. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 26*, 140–153.

[8] Johansson-Sköldberg, U., Woodilla, J., & Çetinkaya, M. (2013). Design thinking: Past, present and possible futures. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 22*(2), 121–146.

[9] Kolko, J. (2015). Design thinking comes of age. *Harvard Business Review, 93*(9), 66–71.

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14, Issue 10, NCREHAASTE - 2026

[10] Liedtka, J. (2015). Perspective: Linking design thinking with innovation outcomes. *California Management Review, 57*(1), 5–15.
[11] OECD. (2018). *The future of education and skills: Education 2030*. OECD Publishing.
[12] Razzouk, R., & Shute, V. (2012). What is design thinking and why is it important? *Review of Educational Research, 82*(3), 330–348.
[13] Scheer, A., Noweski, C., & Meinel, C. (2012). Transforming constructivist learning into action: Design thinking in education. *Design and Technology Education, 17*(3), 8–19.
[14] Torrance, E. P. (1974). *Torrance tests of creative thinking*. Scholastic Testing Service.

(This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.)