Created by the human mind cultural studies essay

Computer-aided design (CAD), is the use of computer technology for the process of design and design-documentation. CAD software, or environments, provides the user with input-tools for the purpose of streamlining design processes; drafting, documentation, and manufacturing processes. CAD may be used to design curves and figures in two-dimensional (2D) space; or curves, surfaces, and solids in three-dimensional (3D) objects. Fashion can be defined as the ideal of beauty that is currently accepted by a given segment of the population. Fashionable apparel is a group of garments that are more or less new and are accepted by a group of people as desirable and beautiful. The aesthetics of garment design are difficult to define specifically. Fashion is constantly changing, and as a new fashion becomes popular, a new standard of beauty becomes desirable. Often, a new fashion begins when the proportion of a garment is altered-for example, a silhouette is changed or a skirt is lengthened. When a truly innovative fashion begins, it usually takes a long time for the general public to retrain its eye and develop an appreciation for the new look. People tend to emulate trendsetters and fashion leaders, so more and more people will accept and wear the new style. As more people wear the item and interpret it in many different ways, the mass of people finds it easier to accept the fashion as beautiful. Then, as the fashion saturates the marketplace and is interpreted in many inexpensive versions, fashion leaders tire of it and reject the style as passé. Then these leaders experiment with a new style. Because of this constant cycle, the criteria for a beautiful garment are constantly changing. The human body comes in many shapes and sizes. Design principles should be interpreted for each figure type. When people deviate from what is decreed beautiful by current fashion, they try to minimize the difference

between their appearance and the ideal by clothing their bodies to resemble the ideal. The current ideal for women is a tall, slender, youthful body. Most women wish to emulate the fashion models they see in magazines and movies and on television. Today, most successful clothing uses visual devices to make the wearer seem taller and more slender than she actually is. Yet, a woman who is very tall may wish to minimize her height visually so that she will look more like a person of average height. A short, overweight woman will try to emulate the ideal as closely as possible, given her figure. Clothing can greatly alter a person's appearance and can compensate for discrepancies between an average body and the current fashion ideal. Software can help to draw, create woven textures, drape models to create patterns, adjust sizes and even determine fabric colors. By Introducing this technological aspect will enable students to understand a lot better and try various combinations in their design. This also cuts down the time factor i. e. by use of CAD methods students can learn a lot faster and more software in less time but Fashion Design is not an easy profession. Its not that one should neglect the manual design methods and completely focus on CAD methods. State-of-the-art technology is important, but a sound understanding of the methods behind production is also essential. Manually figuring size adjustments and cutting pattern pieces instills that knowledge. Software programs constantly evolve. A program used today may be obsolete within several years.[2] This is the age of design. Even as recognition of its social, economic and cultural force grows, however, the design field's largely unseen 'edges' are increasingly becoming its driving forces.[3] Design and Culture examines these developments, looking for rigorous and innovative critical frameworks to explore 'design' as a cultural

phenomenon today. Peer-reviewed, full-color and handsomely designed throughout, Design and Culture is the official journal of the Design Studies Forum. The myth of innovation is that brilliant ideas leap fully formed from the minds of geniuses. The reality is that most innovations come from a process of rigorous examination through which great ideas are identified and developed before being realized as new offerings and capabilities. This book introduces the idea of design thinking, the collaborative process by which the designer′s sensibilities and methods are employed to match people′s needs not only with what is technically feasible and a viable business strategy. In short, design thinking converts need into demand. It′s a human centered approach to problem solving that helps people and organizations become more innovative and more creative. Design thinking is not just applicable to so called creative industries or people who work in the design field. It′s a methodology that has been used by organizations such as Kaiser Permanente to increase the quality of patient care by re examining the ways that their nurses manage shift change, or Kraft to rethink supply chain management. According to the Design-Based Research Collective (2003): " First, the central goals of designing learning environments and developing theories or " prototheories" of learning are intertwined. Second, development and research take place through continuous cycles of design, enactment, analysis, and redesign. Third, research on designs must lead to sharable theories that help communicate relevant implications to practitioners and other educational designers. Fourth, research must account for how designs function in authentic settings. It must not only document success or failure but also focus on interactions that refine our understanding of the learning issues involved. Fifth, the development of such accounts relies on methods

that can document and connect processes of enactment to outcomes of interest." More recently, special issues of Educational Researcher (e. g. Kelly 2003), the Journal of Learning Sciences (e. g. Barab 2004) and the Educational Psychologist (e. g. Sandoval & Bell 2004) reopened the debate. In addition some researchers joined in the Design Based Research Collective. For Anderson and Shattuck (2012: 24), " DBR seems have been used to make a difference—but mostly at the level of small-scale interventions and in the lives of individual teachers and schools." The authors " concure with Dede, Ketelhut, Whitehouse, Breit, and McCloskey’s (2009) claim that " DBR offers a ‘ best practice’ stance that has proved useful in complex learning environments, where formative evaluation plays a significant role, and this methodology incorporates both evaluation and empirical analyses and provides multiple entry points for various scholarly endeavors"" The concept of mass customization is gaining popularity day by day through the innovation of designers ideas. A large no. of boutiques owners, fashion houses, export houses, entrepreneurs etc. are found to be involved in customization of digital embroidery designs on fashion apparels, with the emergence of fashion houses and boutiques, there is need to develop an e-catalogue to visualize the customized designs on fashion apparels and module on Digital Embroidery Design to enhance the knowledge of untrained and semi skilled technical personals involved in the process of design development and manufacturing of fashion apparels in fashion trend. Mass customization is a hybrid of mass production and customization. Pine (1993) defines mass customization as the mass production of individually customized goods and services. The changing characteristics of todays consumer interests and industrial competition, mass production systems

cannot satisfy both manufacturers and consumers; however, a mass customization system may achieve both manufacturer and consumer satisfaction, providing a low-cost customized product. The prerequisite of implementing mass customization is the application of advanced technology, such as the flexible manufacturing system, computer-integrated manufacturing, computer-aided design, and advanced computer technology.

Techniques of Garments Manufacturing - An Overview

By : Tanveer Malik & Shivendra Parmar

The clothing industry has always been characterized by change and variety, but never so much as today. Until recent times, changes in styles of dress were very gradual and a popular fashion could have a very long life, at the same time, the variety and types of clothing produced were limited by the life-styles and conventions of the day. During the past three decades or so this situation has undergone a complete turn around and now the reverse is true. Today fashion changes are dramatic and frequent and they are coupled to an unending variety of clothes for every occasion and activity. As a result the clothing pr0ducer has to reconcile the conflicting requirements of the market and of his manufacturing facilities in order to stay in business. The key to optimizing this conflict of interest's lies in the ability of management to maximize the productivity and to decrease response time. This can only be achieved by increasing the effectiveness of the operational performance levels of every department with updated technologies within the company. For solving all the present problems there has been advancements made in the field of garment manufacturing. One vital example being the integrated use of CAD in garment making from designing to production process. A CAD

system enables to create design ideas quickly & easilyInnovation implies newness. To define and measure innovation better, we investigated three dimensions of newness: what is new, how new, and new to whom? Drawing on prior research by Schumpeter and Kirzner, we developed a scale that addresses six areas of innovative activity: new products, new services, new methods of production, opening new markets, new sources of supply, and new ways of organizing. Using factor analysis on data from two separate field studies - 684 firms from eight industries and 200 information technology firms - we found that innovation as newness represents a unidimensional construct, distinguished only by the degree of radicalness. The growing importance of innovation to entrepreneurship is reflected in a dramatic increase in literature that addresses the role and nature of innovation (Drazin and Schoonhoven, 1996; Drucker, 1985). In spite of this increase and the resulting vibrancy within the field, prior research has not yielded a widely-held consensus regarding how to define innovation. Additionally, without a good working definition, we still lack good measures of innovation. Kotabe and Swan (1995) argue that one of the greatest obstacles to understanding innovation has been the lack of a meaningful measure. Without adequate measures, theory development is impeded and it becomes difficult to suggest appropriate interventions for firms seeking to pursue innovations. To address these issues, the overarching research question considered in the present study is, what is innovation and how should it be operationalized? As a starting point, we note that nearly every definition of innovation focuses on the concept of newness. Slappendel (1996) argues that the perception of newness is essential to the concept of innovation as it serves to differentiate innovation from change. The newness

theme is especially important to understanding the link between innovation and entrepreneurship as suggested by prior studies that emphasize its pivotal role in new venture creation and management: " new business startup" (Vesper, 1988), " new entry" (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996), " new organizations" (Gartner, 1988) and " organizational renewal" (Stevenson and Jarillo, 1990). Thus, we suggest that, in order to isolate a useful definition and measure of innovation, we need to address three newness-related questions: what is new, how new, and new to whom? Two different mailed surveys were conducted among Norwegian firms - a " general" study to which 696 CEOs from eight industry groups responded, and a " knowledge sector" study that yielded 200 CEO respondents from the information technology sector (IT-sector). Most of the widely-used definitions of innovation focus on novelty and newness. For example, the European Commission Green paper on innovation defines innovation rather broadly as a synonym for " the successful production, assimilation and exploitation of novelty in the economic and social spheres" (European Commission, 1995, p. 9). Nohria and Gulati (1996) defined innovation to include any policy, structure, method or process, or any product or market opportunity that the manager of an innovating unit perceives to be new. Damanpour defined innovation as " the generation, development, and adaption of novel ideas on the part of the firm" (1991, p. 556), and Zaltman et al. defined it as " any idea, practice, or material artifact perceived to be new by the relevant unit of adoption" (1973, p. 10). Although newness is a theme in all of these definitions, they do not agree on three basic questions about the nature of newness: what is new, how new, and new to whom? Several of the definitions suggest a theme of " successful adoption", for example, but are

vague in terms of what is adopted and what constitutes a success. Specifying what is new is important for distinguishing innovation from mere change (Slappendel, 1996) because all innovation presupposes change, but not all change presupposes innovation.[5] Additionally, none of the above definitions addresses the issue " how new?", that is, the degree or extent of newness that constitutes an innovation. Finally, the issue of new to whom? is also unresolved in the above definitions. Nohria and Gulati's (1996) definition seems confusing because it is unclear whether the newness of an innovation applies to the manager of an innovating unit or to the innovating unit itself. Damanpour's (1991) emphasis on newness to the firm seems to exclude the kind of innovation that might be associated with individuals or emerge from systems of innovation outside the firm. As a starting point, this study embraces Zaltman et al.'s (1973) definition of innovation as " any idea, practice, or material artifact perceived to be new by the relevant unit of adoption" to guide our examination of what is new, how new, and new to whom? Evidence of vagueness in specifying what about innovation is new can be found by analyzing how innovation has been operationalized in prior studies. A European example illustrates this well. In 1991, the European Commission stated the following: " economic performance depends upon the progressive introduction over time of innovations in products and processes ... " (European Commission, 1991, p. 8). This notion was elaborated in the European Commission Green Paper on innovation which emphasized " the successful production, assimilation and exploitation of novelty in the economic and social spheres" (1995, p. 10). When it came to operationalizing the construct, however, the Green Paper used proxie's as measures of innovative activity rather than explicitly addressing what is new.

These proxie's include, among other measures, total expenditure on R&D, proportion of R&D scientists and engineers, and number of patents. Similar measures can be found in other innovation research: Daft and Becker (1978) analyzed the number of innovations adopted within a given period of time, Blau and McKinley (1979) investigated the number of patents, Miller (1987) measured the relative amount spent on R&D, and Miller and Friesen (1978) used the number of new product and service introductions. The measures in these earlier studies often had limited face validity and tended to foster a narrow view of innovation. Such operationalizations are rather weak indicators of what is new and they generate several levels of problems for research. First, these measures indicate a general lack of consistency between definition and measurement. Second, a heavy focus on R&D suggests a linear approach to the innovation process, although most contemporary research emphasizes circular processes (e. g. Nelson and Winter, 1982; Edquist, 1997). Third, by focusing on the proportion of scientists and engineers, they leave out other members of the organization who may be equally important to the innovative activity within a firm (Johannessen and Hauan, 1994). Fourth, by using patents as measures of innovative activity, they ignore those who argue that patents are often not commercialized (Manu and Sriram, 1996), and that innovations may take other forms than only those that it is possible to patent. It may also be argued that all innovations are not patented. Hence, the operationalizations and measurement of innovation in prior research provide little guidance to the question " What is new?" The standard of 'Design' in a society reflects its intellectual, technological and organizational capabilities. Thus, India 300 years ago exhibited its excellence through its high quality traditional

products like 'textiles and other products like ‘ craft ware' which attracted the West. Today countries like Japan, Germany or France reflect through their products the sound industrial structures they have a built. India has been building its industrial structure rapidly since independence. Import of technical know-how is imperative to catch up with the latest advancements in Science and Technology. The technological transfer has led to design transfer as well resulting in low development in design abilities. This 'design dependency' has made our products less competitive in the world market. In addition, continuous transfer of 'Western' design has brought into the country Western habits and value systems, creating a crisis in our cultural identity. Seen in this broad perspective it is necessary to understand 'Design' as a 'creative force', functioning with the technological and socio-political structures of a society. Conducive structures of society can enable 'Design' to mould society for better 'values'. Thus 'design' has a fundamental role of questioning and assimilating technological advancement for better quality of life in the society.(WGSN) is free to fashion students who are on a registered fashion course -I want to make same motif in different software, so I decided to use Corel Draw, Wilcom and Reach Fashion Studio Softwares. I take a motif of Ducky, when I started: First in corel draw open a new file. Then by using pen tool I make thisBut this shape is not the shape I want. So with the help of Shape Tool I did some modification, then with the help of shape and pen tool I make the final motif and fill the colourI make the same motif in Reach Fashion Studio softwareI used Create Surface and Create Curve tool to make the initial drawing then with the help of Modify Clip Border I gave the shape and then fill the original fabric in different parts, it is mainly looks like a patch work, In corel Draw it is a flat sketch but in Reach Fashion Studio its

like a fabric and we can give 3D effects also. Then I make that motif with embroidery on Wilcom Software. With the help of Input A, Input B, Fusion Fill and Complex and Input C tool I make this motif. I use motif fill in head. These can be done but I try to use fabric in Corel Draw but it is not so easy, I tried so many tools and then I want to use Reach Fashion Studio Fabric Library, but it is in . txr format and I am unable to open it, so I download some fabrics, open it in Photoshop and trim it according to the shape like this: According to these method, I make all shapes and make motif in Corel Draw and fill fabricSo we can fill fabric in all the motifs by using this method. Corel Draw is mainly use for flat sketches. Flat sketches can be made in Reach Fashion Studio also. But in RFS we can use fabric as well as grid, that’s why it look like a 3D. So I want to fill same fabric in Corel Draw also like RFS, because there is no tool in Corel Draw, so I use Adobe Photoshop, first, I make some pattern with fabric and make same shape with the help of selection tool(lasso tool) and fill the fabric pattern and save it as . jpg. open it and copy then paste in Corel Draw and the arrange these shapes and group them. Next I use Wilcom Embroidery Software to make embroidery motifs. It is used mainly for embroidery purpose, but I is not possible to make embroidery in Corel Draw and Reach Fashion Studio Software, So I can try this on both softwares.