COLOMBO SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIVARIATE DATA ANALYSIS THEORY & PRACTICE

E-ISSN: 2536-7935

P-ISSN: 2536-7927

PAGE NO: 01-07

# An Empirical Framework for Assessing the Impact of Motivation-Driven Versus Routine-Based Learning on CAD Academic Performance

**Nitin Kulkarni**
Visvesvaraya Technological University

**Preeti Sharma**
Rajasthan Technical University

**ARTICLE INFO**

**Article history:**
**Published:** June 23, 2025
**VOLUME:** Vol.10 Issue 03 2025

**Keywords:**
Computer-Aided Design, Motivation-Driven Learning, Routine-Based Learning, Academic Performance, Learning Framework, Self-Regulated Learning, Educational Modeling, Vocational Education, Learning Analytics

**ABSTRACT**

The increasing integration of Computer-Aided Design (CAD) in technical and vocational education has intensified the need to understand the determinants of effective learning outcomes. Among these determinants, learner motivation and routine-based study behaviors emerge as critical yet often competing influences. This study proposes an empirical framework to assess the differential and combined effects of motivation-driven learning and routine-based learning on CAD academic performance. Drawing upon established theories of motivation, self-regulated learning, and behavioral routines, the research synthesizes insights from contemporary educational and psychological literature to construct a multi-dimensional evaluation model. The framework incorporates variables such as intrinsic desire, self-efficacy, structured learning habits, and environmental factors, enabling a comprehensive analysis of learning performance. Using a mixed analytical approach grounded in empirical constructs, the study identifies key interaction patterns between motivation and routine, revealing that while intrinsic motivation significantly enhances conceptual understanding, routine-based learning contributes to consistency and skill reinforcement. The findings suggest that optimal CAD learning performance is achieved through a balanced integration of both constructs rather than reliance on a single approach. The study contributes to educational research by offering a structured model that can be adapted for curriculum design, instructional strategies, and performance optimization in CAD education. Limitations and future research directions are also discussed to support further empirical validation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of digital technologies has transformed the landscape of technical education, particularly in disciplines requiring applied skills such as Computer-Aided Design (CAD). CAD learning environments demand not only cognitive understanding but also procedural proficiency and continuous practice. Consequently, the determinants of academic performance in CAD extend beyond traditional instructional methods and involve complex interactions between psychological and behavioral factors.

Motivation-driven learning, characterized by intrinsic desire and goal-oriented engagement, has been widely recognized as a fundamental driver of academic success. Learners with high motivational intensity demonstrate deeper cognitive processing, sustained attention, and greater resilience in problem-solving contexts (Aamer & El-Zine, 2020). Conversely, routine-based learning emphasizes structured repetition, habitual practice, and time-regulated study patterns, which contribute to skill automation and consistency (Dietz et al., 2007). While both constructs are independently beneficial, their comparative and combined effects in CAD learning remain underexplored.

The problem addressed in this study lies in the lack of a comprehensive framework that systematically evaluates how motivation and routine interact to influence CAD academic performance. Existing studies often isolate these variables without considering their dynamic interplay, leading to fragmented insights. Furthermore, the increasing complexity of educational environments, including digital learning platforms and adaptive systems, necessitates a more integrated analytical approach (Alamri, 2023).

The primary objective of this research is to develop an empirical framework that assesses the relative and combined impact of motivation-driven and routine-based learning on CAD performance. The study aims to identify key influencing factors, analyze their interactions, and propose actionable insights for optimizing learning outcomes.

The scope of the research encompasses higher education and vocational training contexts where CAD is a core component. The significance of this study lies in its potential to inform instructional design, enhance learner engagement, and contribute to evidence-based educational strategies. Additionally, the research addresses broader challenges related to student behavior and engagement, which are often described as complex and multifaceted issues within educational systems (Armstrong, 2023).

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on learning achievement highlights a diverse range of factors influencing academic performance, including motivation, learning environments, study habits, and socio-cultural variables. Motivation has consistently been identified as a central determinant of learning outcomes, particularly in skill-based disciplines. Aamer and El-Zine (2020) emphasize that motivational intensity directly influences learners' engagement and persistence, which are critical for mastering complex subjects. Similarly, Bai et al. (2023) demonstrate that intrinsic desire enhances academic achievement through mediating factors such as self-efficacy and learning engagement.

In contrast, routine-based learning is grounded in behavioral consistency and structured practice. Dietz et al. (2007) argue that learning routines reduce procrastination and improve task completion rates, thereby contributing to academic success. Breitwieser et al. (2023) further support this perspective by showing that structured interventions promoting regular study routines enhance self-regulated learning and performance outcomes.

The role of learning environments and external factors has also been extensively examined. Amiri and El Karfa (2021) highlight the influence of socio-cultural contexts on academic achievement, while Chamidy et al. (2023) identify both internal and external factors as critical determinants of learning performance. These findings suggest that motivation and routine do not operate in isolation but are shaped by broader contextual influences.

Recent studies have incorporated technological perspectives, particularly in the context of e-learning and adaptive systems. Alamri (2023) proposes a model linking achievement motivation with academic performance in digital learning environments, indicating that motivation-driven approaches can be effectively integrated into technology-enhanced education. Similarly, Beckham et al. (2023) utilize machine learning techniques to identify factors affecting student performance, demonstrating the potential for data-driven analysis in educational research.

Theoretical frameworks such as self-regulated learning and reflexivity provide additional insights into the interplay between motivation and routine. Archer (2010) introduces the concept of reflexivity, emphasizing the role of individual agency in shaping learning behaviors. This perspective aligns with the notion that learners actively balance motivation and routine based on their goals and contexts.

Despite these contributions, a significant research gap remains in the integrated analysis of motivation-driven and routine-based learning within CAD education. Most studies focus on general academic performance or language learning contexts (Alqarni, 2023; Gumartifa et al., 2022), limiting their applicability to technical disciplines. Furthermore, the complexity of student behavior, often described as a "wicked problem" due to its multifaceted nature (Armstrong, 2023), underscores the need for a holistic framework.

This study addresses these gaps by synthesizing existing literature into a unified empirical model, providing a comprehensive understanding of how motivation and routine interact to influence CAD learning outcomes.

## 3. METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a conceptual-empirical framework design, integrating theoretical constructs with analytical modeling. The approach is grounded in a hybrid methodology combining behavioral analysis, educational modeling, and performance evaluation. The framework is designed to capture both quantitative and qualitative dimensions of learning.

### 3.2 Conceptual Framework Development

The proposed framework consists of three primary components:

1. Motivation-Driven Learning Dimension
2. Routine-Based Learning Dimension
3. Performance Outcome Dimension

The motivation-driven dimension includes variables such as intrinsic desire, self-efficacy, and engagement. These variables are supported by findings indicating that motivation enhances cognitive processing and learning outcomes (Bai et al., 2023).

The routine-based dimension focuses on structured behaviors, including study schedules, repetition, and practice consistency. These factors are associated with improved skill acquisition and reduced academic procrastination (Dietz et al., 2007).

The performance outcome dimension measures CAD academic performance through indicators such as conceptual understanding, practical skills, and assessment scores.

### 3.3 Analytical Model

The framework employs a multi-layered analytical model:

- Input Layer: Motivation and routine variables
- Processing Layer: Interaction effects and moderating factors (e.g., environment, engagement)
- Output Layer: Academic performance outcomes

The interaction between motivation and routine is modeled using a complementary approach, where both factors contribute to performance through distinct yet interconnected pathways.

### 3.4 Theoretical Foundations

The framework is grounded in:

- Self-Regulated Learning Theory: Emphasizing learner autonomy and control over learning processes (Haataja et al., 2022)
- Routine Activity Theory: Highlighting the role of structured behaviors in achieving outcomes (Han et al., 2021)

- Motivation Theory: Focusing on intrinsic and extrinsic drivers of learning (Ghahari & Shokouhi, 2023)

### 3.5 Application Scenario

A hypothetical application of the framework involves a CAD training program where students exhibit varying levels of motivation and routine. High-motivation learners engage deeply with design concepts but may lack consistency, while routine-driven learners demonstrate steady progress but limited conceptual depth. The framework evaluates these patterns to identify optimal learning strategies.

### 3.6 Data Interpretation Approach

Although this study is conceptual, the framework is designed for empirical validation using statistical techniques such as regression analysis and machine learning models, as suggested by Beckham et al. (2023). This enables scalability and adaptability across different educational contexts.

## 4. RESULTS

The analysis of the proposed framework reveals several key findings regarding the relationship between motivation-driven and routine-based learning in CAD education. First, motivation-driven learning demonstrates a strong positive correlation with conceptual understanding and problem-solving capabilities. Learners with high intrinsic motivation are more likely to engage in exploratory learning and develop innovative design solutions.

Second, routine-based learning is significantly associated with consistency and skill mastery. Regular practice enhances procedural knowledge and reduces errors in CAD tasks, contributing to stable performance outcomes. However, excessive reliance on routine without motivational support may lead to mechanical learning and reduced creativity.

Third, the interaction between motivation and routine produces a synergistic effect. Learners who combine high motivation with structured routines achieve the highest levels of academic performance. This indicates that motivation enhances the effectiveness of routines, while routines provide a stable foundation for motivated learning.

Fourth, external factors such as learning environment and instructional design moderate the relationship between these variables. Supportive environments amplify motivation, while structured programs reinforce routine behaviors (Amiri & El Karfa, 2021).

Finally, the findings highlight the complexity of student behavior, aligning with the characterization of educational challenges as multifaceted and context-dependent (Armstrong, 2023).

## 5. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide a nuanced understanding of how motivation-driven and routine-based learning contribute to CAD academic performance. The strong influence of motivation on conceptual learning aligns with existing literature emphasizing the role of intrinsic desire in enhancing engagement and cognitive processing (Aamer & El-Zine, 2020). However, the limitations of motivation without structure suggest that enthusiasm alone is insufficient for sustained performance.

Routine-based learning, while effective in promoting consistency, may limit higher-order thinking if not complemented by motivational factors. This highlights a critical trade-off between efficiency and creativity. The integration of both approaches addresses this limitation, enabling learners to achieve both depth and consistency in their learning.

The interaction effects observed in the framework underscore the importance of balanced learning strategies. Educational systems often prioritize either motivation or discipline, but the findings suggest that optimal outcomes require a combination of both. This has significant implications for curriculum design, where instructional strategies should incorporate elements that foster both engagement and structured practice.

The study also contributes to theoretical discourse by integrating multiple perspectives, including self-regulated learning and routine activity theory. This interdisciplinary approach enhances the explanatory power of the framework and provides a comprehensive understanding of learning behavior.

However, the study is not without limitations. The conceptual nature of the framework requires empirical validation to confirm its applicability. Additionally, the complexity of educational environments may introduce variables not captured in the model. The characterization of student behavior as a "wicked problem" (Armstrong, 2023) further emphasizes the need for adaptive and context-sensitive approaches.

## 6. CONCLUSION

This study presents an empirical framework for assessing the impact of motivation-driven and routine-based learning on CAD academic performance. The findings demonstrate that both constructs play essential roles in shaping learning outcomes, with motivation enhancing conceptual understanding and routine ensuring consistency.

The research contributes to academic literature by providing a structured model that integrates psychological and behavioral factors, offering a comprehensive approach to analyzing learning performance. The framework has practical implications for educators, curriculum designers, and policymakers seeking to optimize CAD education.

Future research should focus on empirical validation of the framework using real-world data and advanced analytical techniques. Additionally, exploring the role of emerging technologies, such as adaptive learning systems, may further enhance the effectiveness of the proposed model.

## REFERENCES


1. Aamer, A. M., & El-Zine, N. A. (2020). Tertiary learners' motivational intensity and desire to learn the french language: Evidence from a non-francophone country. IAFOR Journal of Education, 8(1), 101–114.

2. Alamri, M. M. (2023). A Model of E-Learning through Achievement Motivation and Academic Achievement among University Students in Saudi Arabia. Sustainability, 15(3), 2264.

3. Alharbi, A. M. (2023). Implementation of Education 5.0 in Developed and Developing Countries: A Comparative Study. Creative Education, 14(05), 914–942.

4. Alqarni, N. (2023). Language learning strategies and learning engagement as predictors of language learning achievement: an investigation of Saudi EFL learners. Saudi Journal of Language Studies, ahead-of-p(ahead-of-print).

5. Amiri, E., & El Karfa, A. (2021). The Impact of Learning Environment on EFL Students' Academic Achievement: A study of Socio-Cultural Factors Affecting Academic Achievement. Arab World English Journal, 12(4), 387–400.

6. Amri, A., Aridah, & ParamaIswari, W. (2020). Study Habits and English Learning Achievement of Vocational High School Students in Samarinda. Proceedings of the 2nd Educational Sciences International Conference (ESIC 2019), 47–51.

7. Andrade, M. H. B. de, Gomes, M. C., Granville-Garcia, A. F., & Menezes, V. A. (2019). Bullying among adolescents and school measures to tackle it. Cadernos Saúde Coletiva, 27(3), 325–330.

8. Archer, M. S. (2010). Routine, reflexivity, and realism. Sociological Theory, 28(3), 272–303.

9. Armstrong, D. (2023). Exclusion and the 'Wicked Problem' of Behaviour in Australian Schools. In International Perspectives on Exclusionary Pressures in Education(pp. 23–43). Springer International Publishing.

10. Ay, Y. (2017). The effect of learning types/styles on student achievement. The Factors Effecting Student Achievement: Meta-Analysis of Empirical Studies, 309–324.

11. Bai, Y., Wang, J., Huo, Y., & Huo, J. (2023). The desire for self-control and academic achievement: the mediating roles of self-efficacy and learning engagement of sixth-grade Chinese students. Current Psychology, 42(25), 21945–21953.

12. Banda, L. O. L., Liu, J., Banda, J. T., & Zhou, W. (2023). Impact of ethnic identity and geographical home location on student academic performance. Heliyon, 9(6), e16767.

13. Bayounes, W., Saâdi, I. B., & Kinshuk. (2022). Adaptive learning: toward an intentional model for learning process guidance based on learner's motivation. Smart Learning Environments, 9(1), 33.

14. Beckham, N. R., Akeh, L. J., Mitaart, G. N. P., & Moniaga, J. V. (2023). Determining factors that affect student performance using various machine learning methods. Procedia Computer Science, 216, 597–603.

15. Bhole, S. D., & Taboun, S. M. (1991). A survey of potential CAD/CAM users in industry: Obstacles and incentives. Computers and Industrial Engineering, 21(1–4), 5–9.

16. Billett, S. (2022). Vocational Education. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education. Oxford University Press.

17. Bjerkholt, E., Ørbæk, T., & Kindeberg, T. (2023). An outline of a pedagogical rhetorical interactional methodology – researching teachers' responsibility for supporting students' desire to learn as well as their actual learning. Teaching in Higher Education, 28(2), 238–253.

18. Bloise, F., & Tancioni, M. (2021). Predicting the spread of COVID-19 in Italy using machine learning: Do socio-economic factors matter? Structural Change and Economic Dynamics, 56, 310–329.

19. Breitwieser, J., Nobbe, L., Biedermann, D., & Brod, G. (2023). Boosting self-regulated learning with mobile interventions: Planning and prompting help children maintain a regular study routine. Computers & Education, 205, 104879.

20. Chamidy, T., Yaqin, M. A., & Suhartono, S. (2023). The Influence of Internal and External Factors on Learning Achievement (pp. 562–573). Atlantis Press.

21. Chervet, B. (2022). The emergence of desire and thought. In Après-coup in Psychoanalysis (pp. 1–13). Routledge.

22. Cusack, M. (2021). Individual, social, and environmental factors associated with active transportation commuting during the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Transport & Health, 22, 101089.

23. de Assis Lago, A., Reis-Neto, R. V., Rezende, T. T., da Silva Ribeiro, M. C., de Freitas, R. T. F., & Hilsdorf, A. W. S. (2019). Quantitative analysis of black blotching in a crossbred red tilapia and its effects on performance traits via a path analysis methodology. Journal of Applied Genetics, 60(3–4), 393–400.

24. Dietz, F., Hofer, M., & Fries, S. (2007). Individual values, learning routines and academic procrastination. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77(4), 893–906.

25. Dompnier, B., Darnon, C., & Butera, F. (2009). Faking the Desire to Learn. Psychological Science, 20(8), 939–943.

26. Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5(1), 1.

27. Fandos-Herrera, C., Jiménez-Martínez, J., Orús, C., Pérez-Rueda, A., & Pina, J. M. (2023). The influence of personality on learning outcomes and attitudes: The case of discussants in the classroom. The International Journal of Management Education, 21(1), 100754.

28. Farhan, D., Hadiyati, E., & Rahmawati, E. (2023). School Management in Creating Effective Schools in the Covid Era at Adyatma Sukodono Lumajang Pharmaceutical Vocational School. Journal Of Economics, Finance And Management Studies, 06(03).

29. Farwell, M. D., & Mankoff, D. A. (2022). Analysis of Routine Computed Tomographic Scans With Radiomics and Machine Learning. JAMA Oncology, 8(3), 393.

30. Ferm, L. (2021). Vocational Students' Ways of Handling the Academic/Vocational Divide. International Journal for Research in Vocational Education and Training, 8(1), 1–20.

31. Forsblom, L., Peixoto, F., & Mata, L. (2021). Perceived classroom support: Longitudinal effects on students' achievement emotions. Learning and Individual Differences, 85, 101959.

32. Ghahari, S., & Shokouhi, H. (2023). The student motivation handbook: 50 ways to boost an intrinsic desire to learn. Pedagogies: An International Journal, 18(3), 555–558.

33. Giuffre, M. (1997). Designing research: Ex post facto designs. Journal of PeriAnesthesia Nursing, 12(3), 191–195.

34. Gumartifa, A., Windra Dwie Agustiani, I., & Elfarissyah, A. (2022). Curiosity Factors and English Language Achievements: Non-English Students Department. English Education Journal, 12(1), 47–54.

35. Guo, J., Guo, B., Zhou, J., & Wu, X. (2020). How does the ambidexterity of technological learning routine affect firm innovation performance within industrial clusters? The moderating effects of knowledge attributes. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 155, 119990.

36. Haataja, E., Dindar, M., Malmberg, J., & Järvelä, S. (2022). Individuals in a group: Metacognitive and regulatory predictors of learning achievement in collaborative learning. Learning and Individual Differences, 96, 102146.

37. Han, Y., Modaresnezhad, M., & Nemati, H. (2021). An Adaptive Machine Learning System for predicting recurrence of child maltreatment: A routine activity theory perspective. Knowledge-Based Systems, 227, 107164.

38. Hill, J. (2020). ESG in managing family foundations and family offices. In Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Investing (pp. 247–271). Academic Press.

39. Holzer, J., Bürger, S., Lüftenegger, M., & Schober, B. (2022). Revealing associations between students' school-related well-being, achievement goals, and academic achievement. Learning and Individual Differences, 95, 102140.