

20
DRS
24

4

BOSTON

PROCEEDINGS OF

DRS2024

BOSTON

RESISTANCE • REFLECTION
RECOVERY • REIMAGINATION
DESIGN RESEARCH SOCIETY
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, USA
23 – 28 JUNE 2024

EDITORS

COLIN M. GRAY ESTEFANIA CILIOTTA CHEHADE PAUL HEKKERT
LAURA FORLANO PAOLO CIUCCARELLI PETER LLOYD

ISSN 2398-3132

Proceedings of DRS2024 Boston

RESISTANCE, RECOVERY, REFLECTION, REIMAGINATION

Design Research Society International Conference

Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts, USA,
23–28 June 2024

Editors:

Colin M. Gray
Estefania Ciliotta Chehade
Paul Hekkert
Laura Forlano
Paolo Ciuccarelli
Peter Lloyd

Proceedings of DRS2024 Boston

Design Research Society International Conference

23–28 June 2024

Boston, Massachusetts, USA

www.drs2024.org

Cover and conference identity design by Viviane Kim

Proceedings copy edited and compiled by Lenny Martinez Dominguez

Editors: Colin M. Gray, Estefania Ciliotta Chehade, Paul Hekkert, Laura Forlano,
Paolo Ciuccarelli, Peter Lloyd



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial
4.0 International License. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Proceedings of DRS 2024 International Conference

ISSN 2398-3132

ISBN 978-1-912294-62-6

doi.org/10.21606/drs.2022.cv001

Published by the Design Research Society

85 Great Portland Street

London, W1W 7LT

United Kingdom

Design Research Society

email: admin@designresearchsociety.org

website: www.designresearchsociety.org

digital library: dl.designresearchsociety.org

Founded in 1966 the Design Research Society (DRS) is a learned society committed to promoting and developing design research. It is the longest established, multi-disciplinary worldwide society for the design research community and aims to promote the study of, and research into, the process of designing in all its many fields.

DRS International Biennial Conference Series

DRS2002 London; DRS2004 Melbourne; DRS2006 Lisbon; DRS2008 Sheffield; DRS2010 Montreal; DRS2012 Bangkok; DRS2014 Umeå, DRS2016 Brighton, DRS2018 Limerick, DRS2020 Brisbane, DRS2022 Bilbao.

DRS Special Interest Groups

Design Education (EdSIG)

Design for Health, Wellbeing and Happiness (SIGWELL)

Design for the Pluriverse (PluriSIG)

Design for Policy and Governance (PoGoSIG)

DRS Special Interest Groups (continued)

Inclusive Design (Inclusive SIG)

Global Health SIG (Global Health SIG)

Designing Change (SIG DfC)

Design for Tangible, Embedded and Networked Technologies (TENT SIG)

Objects, Practices, Experiences, Networks (OPENSIG)

Sustainability SIG (SuSSIG)

Experiential Knowledge (EKSIG)

Design Retail & Services Futures (DRSF SIG)

Design Ethics (DE SIG)

Sound-Driven Design (SDD SIG)

Interdisciplinary Textiles (IT SIG)

DRS2024 Committees

Conference Chairs

Paolo Ciuccarelli, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Paul Hekkert, TU Delft, NL

Program Chair

Colin M. Gray, Indiana University Bloomington

Content Committee Leads

Paolo Ciuccarelli, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston (*Committee Chair*)

Estefania Ciliotta Chegade, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Colin M. Gray, Indiana University Bloomington

Strategy Committee Leads

Paolo Ciuccarelli, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Paul Hekkert, TU Delft, NL

Estefania Ciliotta Chegade, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Annabelle Tocco, Northeastern University, Boston

Strategy Committee

Julie Farkas, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Laura Forlano, Northeastern University, Boston

Aashita Jain, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Brittani LeBel Rousseau, Northeastern University, Boston

Sara Lenzi, University of Deusto, ES

Peter Lloyd, TU Delft, NL

Nikita Saner, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Keynote Event Committee

Laura Forlano, Northeastern University, Boston (*Committee Chair*)

Paolo Ciuccarelli, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Viviane K. Kim, Northeastern University, Boston

Kristian Kloeckl, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Michael Arnold Mages, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Papers Committee

Colin M. Gray, Indiana University Bloomington (*Committee Chair*)

Miso Kim, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Michael Arnold Mages, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Conversations Committee

Sofía Bosch Gómez, Northeastern University, Boston

Kees Dorst, University of Technology Sydney, AU

Miso Kim, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Frederick Van Amstel, University of Florida

Federico Vaz, Royal College of Art, UK

Workshops Committee

Estefania Ciliotta Chehade, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston (*Co-Chair*)

Catalina Cortes Loyola, Universidad del Desarrollo (UDD), Chile (*Co-Chair*)

Liz Allen, Northeastern University, Boston

Sara Carr, Associate Professor, School of Architecture, Northeastern University, Boston

Paulina Contreras, Universidad del Desarrollo (UDD), Chile

Miso Kim, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Alejandra Poblete Perez, Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana, Chile

Mariluz Soto, Universidad del Desarrollo (UDD), Chile

Ignacio Galvarino Toledo Roman, Universidad del Desarrollo (UDD), Chile

Labs Committee

Estefania Ciliotta Chehade, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston (*Co-Chair*)

Sara Lenzi, University of Deusto, ES (*Co-Chair*)

Mark Araujo, The Mayor's Office of New Urban Mechanics (MONUM), Boston

Arlene Oak, University of Alberta, Canada

PhD Event Committee

Ryan Bruggeman, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Laura Forlano, Northeastern University, Boston

Luis Garcia, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh

Sofía Bosch Gómez, Northeastern University, Boston

Alayt Issak, Northeastern University, Boston

Michael Arnold Mages, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Jules Rochielle Sievert, Northeastern University Boston

Performance & Exhibition Committee

Kristian Kloeckl, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Laura Forlano, Northeastern University, Boston

Fringe Committee

Sofie Hodara, Northeastern University, Boston

Kristian Kloeckl, Center for Design, Northeastern University, Boston

Ann McDonald, Northeastern University, Boston

Anna Nasi, Northeastern University, Boston

Bonnie Parrott, Northeastern University, Boston

Annabelle Tocco, Northeastern University, Boston

Partners

Mark Araujo, The Mayor's Office of New Urban Mechanics (MONUM), Boston

Roi Salgueiro Barrio, Morningside Academy for Design, MIT, Cambridge

Indigo Casais, Museum of Fine Art, Boston

Elizabeth Christoforetti, Graduate School of Design, Harvard, Cambridge

Marion Cunningham, Morningside Academy for Design, MIT, Cambridge

Michelle Fisher, Museum of Fine Art, Boston

Liana Mestas, Design Museum Foundation, Boston

Janessa Mulepati, Master in Design Engineering, Harvard, Cambridge

John A. Ochsendorf, Morningside Academy for Design, MIT, Cambridge

Jennifer Spungin, Morningside Academy for Design, MIT, Cambridge

Maria Villafranca, Design Museum Foundation, Boston

Andrew Witt, Graduate School of Design, Harvard, Cambridge
Adélaïde Zollinger, Morningside Academy for Design, MIT, Cambridge

DRS President

Rachel Cooper

DRS Executive Board

Laura Forlano (*Chair*)

Peter Lloyd

Colin M. Gray

Dan Lockton

Paul Hekkert

DRS International Advisory Council

Anna Vallgård (*Chair*)

Kristina Andersen

Stella Boess

Rebecca Cain

Lin-Lin Chen

Paulina Contreras Correa

Catalina Cortés Loyola

Hua Dong

Kees Dorst

Martyn Evans

Jodi Forlizzi

Tincuta Heinzl

Sampsa Hyysalo

Sabine Junginger

Cecilia Landa-Avila

Sara Lenzi

Juan Giuseppe Montalván

Tek-Jin Nam

Arlene Oak

Alejandra Poblete Pérez

Johan Redström

Heather Wiltse

Toshimasa Yamanaka

Theme Track Chairs and Editorial Authors

1. Resisting, Recovering, Reflecting, and Reimagining Design Education

James Corazzo, Sheffield Hallam University, UK
Violeta Clemente, University of Aveiro, Portugal
Derek Jones, The Open University, UK
Nicole Lotz, The Open University, UK
Lesley-Ann Noel, North Carolina State University, US
Naureen Mumtaz, Mount Royal University, Canada

2. Design for Longevity (D4L): Project Your Future Self Through Service and Technology

Sheng-Hung Lee, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA
Joseph F. Coughlin, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA
Sofie Hodara, Northeastern University, USA
Anna Meroni, Politecnico di Milano School of Design, Italy
Carla Sadini, Politecnico di Milano School of Design, Italy

3. Design For Wellbeing and Happiness

Leandro Miletto Tonetto, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA
Ann Petermans, Hasselt University, Belgium
Rebecca Cain, Loughborough University, UK

4. Reimagining Care through Evidence

Diana S. Nicholas, Drexel University, USA
Minou Afzali, Swiss Center of Design and Health
Ajla Aksamija, The University of Utah, USA
Liz Sanders, The Ohio State University, USA
Nora Coleman, Emory University School of Medicine, USA
Angela Mazzi, GBBN Architects
Isil Oygur Ilhan, University of Cincinnati, USA

5. Liveable Cities: Reimagining Design for Healthy Cities and Communities

Emmanuel Tsekles, Professor in Global Health design, Lancaster University, UK
Jen Ballie, V&A Dundee, UK
Cláudia de Souza Libânio, Associate Professor in Accessibility, Inclusion and Design for Health, Federal University of Health Sciences of Porto Alegre, Brazil
Blaise Nguendo-Yongsi, Associate Professor of health geography and spatial epidemiology, University of Yaoundé II, Cameroon
Mariluz Soto Hormazábal, Researcher and Professor at Universidad del Desarrollo, Chile
Juan Motalvan, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP), Peru
Leigh-Ann Hepburn, University of Sydney, Australia

6. Design for Balance: Reimagining Processes and Competences for Sustainable Futures

Paola Bertola, Department of Design, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Erminia D'Itria, Department of Design, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Silvia Maria Gramegna, Department of Design, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Carmen Bruno, Department of Design, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Ruta Valusyte, Design Centre, KTU Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania
Luca Simeone, Aalborg University, Denmark
Rike Neuhoﬀ, Aalborg University, Denmark

7. Co-Design Towards Behaviour Change

Gubing Wang, Tilburg University, Netherlands

Haïou Zhu, Loughborough University, UK

8. Past, Present, and Future: Understanding the Expanse of Design for Policy and Governance

Scott Schmidt, Georgetown University, USA

Marzia Mortati – Politecnico Milano, Italy

9. Designing Policies in The Space Between Institutions and Experimental Government Practices

Francesco Leoni, Department of Design, Politecnico di Milano

Diana Pamela Villa Alvarez, Fundación Saldarriaga Concha

Sofía Bosch Gómez, Northeastern University

Federico Vaz, MIT GOV/LAB

Luis Garcia, Carnegie Mellon University

Natalia Villaman, University of Helsinki / Aalto University Silvia Pau, UAL

Beatriz Belmonte, Better Public Services

10. Systemic Citizens: Equity, Power, and Relational Autonomy

Cecilia Landa-Avila, Loughborough University, UK

Shichao Zhao, Loughborough University, UK

Sine Celik, TU Delft, Netherlands

Pushpi Bagchi, The University of Edinburgh, UK

Nicolai Brodersen Hansen, Aalborg University, Denmark

11. Joyful Complexity: Queering, Intersecting, and Navigating Alternate Futures

Jess Parris Westbrook (they/them), DePaul University (DPU), Chicago, IL, USA

Coraline Ada Ehmke (she/her), Organization for Ethical Source (OES), Chicago, IL, USA

12. Design for Empowerment

Laura Santamaria, Royal College of Art, UK

Ksenija Kuzmina, Loughborough University London, UK

13. Pluriversal Design as a Paradigm

Renata M. Leitão, Cornell University, USA

Lesley-Ann Noel, North Carolina State University, USA

14. Polyphonic Speculations

David Philip Green, Lancaster University, UK

Spyros Bofylatos, Royal College of Art, London, UK

Mayane Dore Rey Juan Carlos University, Madrid, Spain

Veronica Ranner, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

15. Spatial Justice in Design Research: A Transdisciplinary Discourse

Miriam Tedeschi, University of Turku

Amalia Verdu Sanmartin, Turku Institute for Advanced Studies (TIAS)

Sarah Kanouse, Northeastern University

Jules Rochielle Sievert, Northeastern University

16. Language in Design

Peter Lloyd, TU Delft, The Netherlands

Senthil Chandrasegaran, TU Delft, The Netherlands

Arlene Oak, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

Colin Gray, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

Ben Matthews, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

Tania Allen, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA

Sara Queen, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA

17. More-Than-Human Design in Practice

Joseph Lindley, Lancaster University, UK

Iohanna Nicenboim, TU Delft, Netherlands

Laura Forlano, Northeastern University, USA

Elisa Giaccardi, TU Delft, Netherlands

Arne Berger, Hochschule Anhalt, Germany

Cristina Zaga, University of Twente, The Netherlands

18. Data as Design Research: Mediating Processes, Protocols, and Precedent in Practice

Elizabeth Bowie Christoforetti, Harvard Graduate School of Design, USA

Andrew Witt, Harvard Graduate School of Design, USA

19. Translational Design: Enabling Impact in Complex, Multi-Stakeholder Research Projects through Design

Rowan Page, Monash University, Australia

Rosie Hornbuckle, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom

André Nogueira, Harvard University, United States of America

Leah Heiss, Monash University, Australia

20. Designing Resilient Food Futures: Food Commons, Transitions, and Sovereignty

Chun Zheng, Riverlife Pittsburgh

Francis Carter, Pittsburgh East End Food Coop

21. Designing (for) Transitions and Transformations: Imagination, Climate Futures, and Everyday Lives

Femke Coops, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands

Dan Lockton, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands

Idil Gaziulusoy, Aalto University, Finland

Cameron Tonkinwise, University of Technology Sydney, Australia

Joanna Boehnert, Bath Spa University, United Kingdom

Marysol Ortega Pallanez, Arizona State University, United States

Anja Overdiek, Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands

Ida Nilstad Pettersen, Norwegian University of Science & Technology, Norway

Alma Leora Culén, University of Oslo, Norway

Silvana Juri, SARAS Institute, Uruguay / Stockholm Resilience Center, Sweden

22. Design for Manufacturing: Rehumanising Digital Manufacturing

Mersha Aftab, Senior Lecturer in Design Management, Birmingham City University

Rebecca Grant, Lecturer in Biometeorology & Design, Loughborough University

Mey Goh, Reader in Transdisciplinary Digital Manufacturing, Loughborough University
Iryna Yevseyeva, Associate Professor in Computer Science, DeMontfort University

23. Making in The Digital Era

Nithikul Nimkulrat, OCAD University, Canada
Camilla Groth, University of South-Eastern Norway, Norway

24. Ethics in/of/for Design

Deger Ozkaramanli, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Laura F. Ferrarello, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne - EPFL, Switzerland
Linda N. Laursen, Aalborg University, Denmark

25. Design Sketching and Visualization, Futures & Research

Bryan Howell, Brigham Young University, United States
Jan Willem Hoftijzer, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Mauricio Novoa Munoz, University of Western Sydney, Australia
Amos Scully, Rochester Institute of Technology, United States
Mark Sypesteyn, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Jason Germany, University of Washington, United States
Wouter Eggink, University of Twente, Netherlands
Wendy Zhang, University of Canterbury, New Zealand
Verena Paepcke-Hjeltness, Auburn University, United States
Alexander (Freddie) Holliman, University of Strathclyde, Scotland

26. How do you Sound Design? Articulating Experiences and Cultures via Listening

Stefano Delle Monache, Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Industrial Design Engineering
Nicolas Misdariis, IRCAM STMS Lab, Sound Perception and Design group, Paris
Elif Özcan, Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Industrial Design Engineering
Davide Rocchesso, University of Palermo, Dept. of Mathematics and Computer Science
Sara Lenzi, Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Industrial Design Engineering
Simone Spagnol, IUAV University of Venice
Sandra Pauletto, KTH Royal Institute of Technology. Division of Media Technology and Interaction Design
Daniel Hug, Zurich University of the Arts, Institute for Computer Music and Sound Technology

27. Play Design: Initiating Transformation through Imagination

Helle Marie Skovbjerg, Design School Kolding, Denmark
Sofie Kinch, Design School Kolding, Denmark
Sune Klok Gudiksen, Design School Kolding, Denmark
Shanti Sumartojo, Monash University, Australia
Lisa Grocott, Monash University, Australia
Colleen Macklin, Parsons School of Design, USA

28. Retail, Hospitality and Service Design Futures

Katelijan Quartier, Hasselt University, Belgium
Mia Münster, PolyU School of Design, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong
Rebekah Matheny, The Ohio State University, USA
Bethan Alexander, London College of Fashion, United Kingdom

International Board of Reviewers

The following people provided one or more peer reviews for the 791 research papers that went out for review as part of DRS2024. Our thanks for your effort and commitment to ensuring the quality of the 386 final papers that were accepted.

Canan Akoglu, Design School Kolding, Denmark
Ajla Aksamija, University of Utah, USA
Bilge Merve Aktas, Independent Researcher, USA
Nóra Al Haider, Stanford Law School, USA
Amani Alaali, Ahlia University, Bahrain
Bethan Alexander, London College of Fashion, UAL, United Kingdom
Katerina Alexiou, The Open University, United Kingdom
Hena Ali, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Liz Allen, Northeastern University, USA
Matthew Allen, Washington University in St Louis, Canada
Ece Altinsbasak, Turkiye
Catalina Alzate Mora, The University of Texas at Austin, USA
Carla Amaral, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Mariana Victoria Amatullo, Parsons The New School, USA
Ahmed Ansari, NYU, USA
Alissa Antle, Simon Fraser University, Canada
Amy Archambault, North Carolina State University, USA
Helen Armstrong, North Carolina State University, USA
Michael Arnold Mages, Northeastern University, USA
Weslynnne Ashton, Illinois Institute of Technology, USA
Lindsay Asquith, UTS, Australia
Jan Auernhammer, USA
Andrea Augsten, TU Dresden, Germany
Nyein Aung, Monash University, Australia
Stephen Awoniyi, Texas State University, USA
Camilo Ayala Garcia, Universidad de los Andes, Colombia
Joon Sang Baek, Yonsei University, South Korea
Saúl Baeza, ELISAVA, Spain
Ehsan Baha, University of Montreal, Canada
Corelia Baibarac-Duignan, University of Twente, Netherlands
Jocelyn Bailey, UAL, United Kingdom
Fernando Bajo, Spain
Yekta Bakırloğlu, Middle East Technical University, Turkiye
Madeline Balaam, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden
Carol Bales, The Weather Company, USA
Paris Balla, Monash University, Australia
Anne Louise Bang, VIA University College, Denmark
Bahareh Barati, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Silvia Barbero, Politecnico di Torino, Italy
Alison Barnes, Western Sydney University, Australia
Nicholas Baroncelli Torretta, Lisbon University, Sweden
Mario Barros, Aalborg University, Denmark
Belen Barros Pena, Northumbria University, United Kingdom
Anne-Marie Bartlett, The Open University, United Kingdom
Kristin Alicia Bartlett, University of Kentucky, USA
Gemma Barton, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Zenab Bastawala, Rochester Institute of Technology, USA
Deaa Bataineh, USA
Weston Baxter, Imperial College London, United Kingdom
Elif Baykal, Turkiye
Katie Beavan, New York University, USA
Jon Begiristain, University of the Basque Country, Spain
Taslina Begum, Cardiff Metropolitan University, United Kingdom
Sana Behnam Asl, North Carolina State University, USA

M. M. Bekker, tue, Netherlands
Fiona Bell, University of New Mexico, USA
Somaya Ben Allouch, Amsterdam University of Applied Science, Netherlands
Roy Bendor, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Pete Bennett, University of Bristol, United Kingdom
SJ Bennett, University of Durham, USA
Isabella Bergamini, Ministero dell'Istruzione, Italy
Francesco Bergamo, Iuav University of Venice, Italy
Katinka Bergema, Zwaluw | Innovatie & Samenwerking, Netherlands
Jan Peter Bergen, University of Twente, Netherlands
Estelle Berger, Strate School of Design, France
Constant Berkhout, Hasselt University, Netherlands
Roberta Bernabei, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Enrico Bertini, USA
Paola Bertola, Politecnico Di Milano, Italy
Frederic Bevilacqua, IRCAM, France
Sankalp Bhatnagar, Northeastern University, USA
Maharshi Bhattacharya, cultureNOW, USA
Massimo Bianchini, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Noemi Bitterman, Technion, Israel
Thea Blackler, QUT, Australia
Joanna Boehnert, Bath Spa University, United Kingdom
Stella Boess, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Spyros Bofylatos, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Erik Bohemia, Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, Norway
Elizabeth Boling, Indiana University Bloomington, USA
Patrizia Bolzan, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Emanuela Bonini Lessing, Università Iuav di Venezia, Italy
Elizabeth Bonsignore, USA
Naz A G Z Börekçi, Middle East Technical University, Türkiye
Sofia Bosch Gomez, Northeastern University, USA
Idil Bostan, TU Delft, Netherlands
Andrea Botero, Aalto University, Finland
Herman Botes, Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa
Wilhelmina Maria Botes, University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg
Roberto Bottazzi, The Bartlett School of Architecture, United Kingdom
Remy Bourganel, IEP Paris, France
Jacky Bourgeois, TU Delft, Netherlands
Stephen Boyd Davis, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Bryan Boyer, University of Michigan, USA
Mikkel Snorre Wilms Boysen, University College Absalon, Denmark
Bodil Bøjer, The Royal Danish Academy, Denmark
Eva Brandt, Denmark
Úrsula Bravo, Universidad del Desarrollo, Chile
Philip Breedon, Nottingham Trent University, United Kingdom
Charlie Breindahl, University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Gerard Briscoe, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Loove Broma, Sweden
James BROWN, Umeå University, Sweden
Jacob T. Browne, Philips, Netherlands
Sophia Brueckner, University of Michigan, USA
Yolandi Burger, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Alison Burrows, Universidade do Minho, Portugal
Yousef Bushehri, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA
Deepa Butoliya, University of Michigan, USA
Jacob Buur, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
Jonathan Cagan, USA
Roland Cahen, ENSCI Les Ateliers, France
Rebecca Cain, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Valentina Caiola, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
Jorge Camacho, Centro de Diseño, Cine y Televisión, Mexico

Filipe Campelo Xavier da Costa, Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Brazil
Elena Caratti, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Sara Carr, Northeastern University, USA
Martina Carraro, Italy
Sidse Carroll, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Fernando Carvalho, San Francisco State University, USA
Philip Cash, Technical University of Denmark, Denmark
Krystina Castella, Art Center College of Design, USA
Cabirio Cautela, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Michelle Cedeno, Imperial College London, United Kingdom
Sine Celik, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Pinar Ceyhan, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Senthil Chandrasegaran, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Fangyuan Chang, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China
Juyoung Chang, Dongseo University, South Korea
Jonathan Chapman, Carnegie Mellon University, USA
Abhinav Chaturvedi, Bennett University, India
Maria Chatzichristodoulou, United Kingdom
Meira Chefitz, IBM, USA
Tatiana Chemi, aalborg university, Denmark
Chien-Hsiung Chen, National Taiwan University of Science & Technology, Taiwan
Dominique Chen, Waseda University, Japan
Fan CHEN, Tongji University, China
Lin-Lin Chen, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Yuning Chen, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Zeya Chen, Illinois Institute of Technology, USA
Ichen Chiang, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taiwan
Laureline Chiapello, Université de Québec à Chicoutimi, Canada
Peter Childs, Imperial College London, United Kingdom
Marcos Chilet, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile
Tseng-Ping Chiu, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan
Chanee Choi, USA
Brooke Chornyak, Northeastern University, USA
Bo Christensen, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark
Line Gad Christiansen, Designschool Kolding, Denmark
Wayne Chung, Carnegie Mellon University, USA
Abdüsselam Selami Çifter, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Türkiye
Nazli Cila, TU Delft, Netherlands
Estefania Ciliotta Chehade, Northeastern University, Center for Design, USA
Paolo Ciuccarelli, Northeastern University, USA
Violeta Clemente, University of Aveiro, Portugal
Gary Clough, RCA, United Kingdom
M.A. Cobussen, Leiden University, Netherlands
Ezequiel Collantes, University of the Basque Country, Spain
Alison Colwell-Matsuura, Monash University, Australia
Paulina Contreras, Universidad del Desarrollo, Chile
Sharon Cook, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Ginger Coons, Hogeschool Rotterdam, Netherlands
Rachel Cooper, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Jillian Coorey, Kent State University, USA
James Corazzo, Sheffield Hallam University, United Kingdom
Ana Correia de Barros, Fraunhofer Portugal AICOS, Portugal
Catalina Cortés, Universidad del Desarrollo, Chile
ANGELINA LEÃO COSTA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DA PARAÍBA, France
Paul Coulton, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Adam Cowart, Carnegie Mellon University, USA
Claire Craig, Sheffield Hallam University, United Kingdom
Nathan Crilly, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
Leon Cruickshank, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Beatriz Itzel Cruz Megchun, University of Portland, USA
Janka Csernák, Moholy-Nagy University of Art and Design, Hungary

Alma Leora Culén, University of Oslo, Norway
Bronwyn Cumbo, Monash University, Australia
Lisa D'Ambrosio, MIT, USA
Jaap Daalhuizen, DTU, Denmark
Doriana Dal Palù, Politecnico di Torino, Italy
Vici Daphne Handel, Denmark
Naga Nandini Dasgupta, Srishti Manipal Institute of Art, Design and Technology, India
Marie Davidová, IntCDC University of Stuttgart, Germany
Michel de Blois, Université Laval, Canada
Santiago De Francisco Vela, Universidad de los Andes, Colombia
Amalia De Götzen, Allborg University, Denmark
Bjorn de Koeijer, University of Twente, Netherlands
Sasha de Koninck, University of Colorado Boulder, USA
Jotte De Koning, TUDELFT, Netherlands
Christine De Lille, Northumbria University, Netherlands
Mirella de Menezes Migliari, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Annalinda De Rosa, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
João de Souza Leite, School of Design / Rio de Janeiro State University, Brazil
Cláudia de Souza Libânio, Federal University of Health Sciences of Porto Alegre, Brazil
Thomas Deacon, University of Surrey, United Kingdom
Colin Andrew Deevy, Institute of Technology Carlow, Ireland
Tessa Dekkers, University of Twente, Netherlands
Fernando Del Caro Secomandi, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Federico Del Giorgio Solfa, National University of La Plata, Argentina
Carine Delanoe, Université de Nîmes, France
Claudio Dell'Era, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Stefano Delle Monache, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Halime Demirkan, Bilkent University, Türkiye
Robert-Jan den Haan, University of Twente, Netherlands
Shital Desai, York University, Canada
Pieter Desmet, Delft University, Netherlands
Emma Dewberry, The Open University, United Kingdom
Kanan Dhru, The Hague University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands
Di Di Xiao, TUE, Netherlands
Myriam D. Diatta, Independent Scholar, Denmark
Ingvild Digranes, Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, Norway
Orsalia Dimitriou, University of Westminster, United Kingdom
Carl DiSalvo, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA
Brian Dixon, Ulster University, United Kingdom
Judith Marlen Dobler, Anhalt University of Applied Sciences, Germany
Sean Dockray, Australian National University, Australia
Michael Doherty, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Markéta Dolejšová, Aalto University, Finland
Hua Dong, Brunel University London, United Kingdom
Erica Dorn, Carnegie Mellon University, USA
Steven Dorrestijn, Saxion, Netherlands
Kees Dorst, UTS, Australia
Myf Doughty, Monash University, Australia
Craig Douglas, Harvard University, USA
Simon Downs, United Kingdom
Emília Duarte, IADE, Universidade Europeia, Portugal
Sofia Soledad Duarte Poblete, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Jennifer DuBose, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA
Palak Dudani, Independent, Norway
Delia Dumitrescu, University of Borås, Sweden
David Durling, DurlingDesign, United Kingdom
Catherine Durose, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom
Abigail Durrant, Newcastle University, United Kingdom
Ricardo Dutra, Australia
Rebecca Earley, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Håkan Edeholt, Oslo School of Architecture and Design, Norway

Judy Edworthy, Psychology, United Kingdom
Pelin Efiltili, Istanbul Technical University, Türkiye
Berry Eggen, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Wouter Eggink, University of Twente, Netherlands
Coraline Ehmke, Organization for Ethical Source, USA
Jeannette Eicks, Vermont Law School, USA
Dina El Zanfaly, Carnegie Mellon University, USA
Hannah Ellis, Sheffield Hallam University, United Kingdom
Chris Elsdon, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Catherine Elsen, University of Liège, Belgium
Philip Ely, Manchester Metropolitan University, United Kingdom
Nick Emerson, University of Canterbury, New Zealand
Stuart English, Northumbria University, United Kingdom
Alpay Er, Ozyegin University, Türkiye
Ozlem Er, Istanbul Bilgi University, Türkiye
Elina Eriksson, KTH, Sweden
Eva Eriksson, Aarhus University (DNK), Denmark
Carolina Escobar-Tello, Loughborough University / Doughnut Economics Action Lab, Portugal
Temidayo Eseonu, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Motahhare Eslami, Carnegie Mellon University, USA
Shabnam FakhrHosseini, MIT, USA
Priska Falin, Aalto University, Finland
Kjetil Falkenberg, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden
Wenhao Fang, Birmingham city university, United Kingdom
Delfina Fantini van Ditmar, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Luke Feast, Aalborg University, Denmark
Karen Feder, Design School Kolding, Denmark
Nathan Felde, Northeastern University, USA
Jonathan Joseph Felix, RMIT University Vietnam, Vietnam
Deborah Fels, Canada
Beth Ferguson, University of California, USA
Clara Fernandes, Lasalle, Singapore
Aline Fernandes Barata, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Maria Fernandez de Osso, Ireland
Laura Ferrarello, EPFL, Switzerland
Joao Batalheiro Ferreira, IADE, Portugal
Gabriele Ferri, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Andre Fiebig, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany
Thomas Fischer, Southern University of Science and Technology, China
Tom Fisher, Nottingham Trent University, United Kingdom
Karen Fleming, Ulster University, United Kingdom
Aidan Flynn, MIT & the Queer Educators in Architecture Network, Canada
Mariana Fonseca Braga, University of Salford, United Kingdom
Francesca Fontana, University of Camerino, Italy
Jodi Forlizzi, Carnegie Mellon University, USA
James Forren, Canada
Tessa Forshaw, Harvard University, USA
Laetitia Forst, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Maria Foverskov, malmö university, Denmark
Karmen Franinovic, ZHdK, Switzerland
Joep Frens, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Johnny Friberg, University of Gothenburg, Sweden
Emma Frid, IRCAM, France
Ilya Fridman, Monash University, Australia
Ken Friedman, Tongji University, Sweden
Kyla Fullenwider, USA
Malika Gabbas, South Korea
Rachel Gadsden, United Kingdom
Anikó Gal, University of Ferrara, Italy
Fernando Galdon, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Lorraine Gamman, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom

Tomás García Ferrari, University of Waikato, New Zealand
Adrià Garcia i Mateu, holon, Spain
Claudia Garduño García, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico
Greg Garner, NC State University, USA
Ignacio Garnham, Aarhus University, Denmark
Gionata Gatto, Dubai Institute of Design and Innovation, United Arab Emirates
Katie Gaudion, Helen Hamlyn Centre for Design / Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Philippe Gauthier, Université de Montréal, Canada
Ilona Gaynor, Independant, USA
Anouk Geenen, University of Twente, Netherlands
Koray Gelmez, Istanbul Technical University, Turkiye
Georgi V. Georgiev, University of Oulu, Finland
Krity Gera, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Alix Gerber, Smith College, USA
Nolen Gertz, University of Twente, Netherlands
Elisa Giaccardi, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Mathieu Gielen, Netherlands
Carolina Gill, North Carolina State University, USA
Nabeel Gillani, Northeastern University, USA
Nandhini Giri, Purdue University, USA
Inte Gloerich, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands
Beatrice Gobbo, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Kate Goldsworthy, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Gonçalo Gomes, Universidade de Aveiro, Portugal
Gloria Gomez, Oceanbrowser & University of Sydney, New Zealand
Rafael Gomez, Queensland University of Technology, Australia
Milene Gonçalves, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Jon Goodbun, United Kingdom
Eric Gordon, Emerson College, USA
Kosa Goucher-Lambert, University of California, Berkeley, USA
Visda Goudarzi, USA
Phillip Joel Gough, The University of Sydney, Australia
Colin M. Gray, Indiana University Bloomington, USA
Rose Gridneff, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Silvia Grimaldi, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Jobnathan Grinham, Harvard University Graduate School of Design, USA
Lisa Grocott, Monash University, Australia
Nonkululeko Grootboom, Hasselt University, South Africa
Katharina Gross-Vogt, University of Music and Performing Arts Graz, Austria
Camilla Groth, University of South-Eastern Norway, Norway
Eduard Groutars, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Heng Gu, TU Delft, Netherlands
Sune Gudiksen, Design School Kolding, Denmark
NADIA GUEROUAOU, IRCAM, CNRS, France
Abby Guido Guido, Tyler School of Art and Architecture, Temple University, USA
Natalia Gulbransen-Diaz, University of Sydney, Australia
Hazel Gumus Ciftci, Arizona State University, USA
Xi Guo, Birmingham City University, United Kingdom
Alisdair Gurling, Monash University, Australia
Ian Gwilt, University of South Australia, Australia
Helena Haapio, University of Vaasa / University of Lapland / Lexpert Ltd, Finland
Tim Haats, University of Carleton, Canada
Margaret Hagan, Stanford University, USA
Young-ae Hahn, Yonsei University, USA
Vera Hale, the Open University, United Kingdom
Ashley Hall, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Kevin Hamilton, USA
Olivia Hamilton, RMIT, Australia
Tarryn Handcock, RMIT University, Australia
David Hands, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
David Hands, United Kingdom

Flemming Tvede Hansen, The Royal Danish Academy, Denmark
Jakob Thestrup Hansen, Denmark
Preben Hansen, Stockholm University, Sweden
Cécile Hardebolle, EPFL, Switzerland
Alexandros Haridis, Harvard University, USA
Rachel Harkness, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Robert Harland, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Monica Louise Hartvigsen, Design School Kolding, Denmark
Juha Hartvik, Åbo Akademi University, Finland
Gillian Harvey, University of Alberta, Canada
Astrid Sri Haryati, North Carolina State University, USA
Paul Hatch, University of Illinois Chicago, USA
Vilde Haugrønning, OsloMet, Norway
Laura Hay, University of Strathclyde, United Kingdom
Naomi Hay, Australian National University, Australia
Sarah Hayes, Munster Technological University, Ireland
Juanjuan "June" He, Drexel University, USA
Liam Healy, Goldsmiths University, United Kingdom
Tero Heikkinen, University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland
Tincuta Heinzl, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Leah Heiss, Monash University, Australia
Paul Hekkert, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Karey Helms, Stockholm University, Sweden
Bart Hengeveld, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Kevin Henry, Columbia College Chicago, USA
Leigh-Anne Hepburn, University of Sydney, Australia
Pablo Hermansen, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile
Sander Hermesen, OnePlanet Research Centre, Netherlands
Lucie Hernandez, Falmouth University, United Kingdom
Jock Herron, Harvard Graduate School of Design, USA
Ann Heylighen, KU Leuven, Belgium
Clive Hilton, The Open University, United Kingdom
Xavier Ho, Monash University, Australia
Elise Hodson, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Michael Hohl, Anhalt University of Applied Sciences, Germany
Kim Holflod, Aarhus University, Denmark
Samuel Holleran, University of Melbourne, USA
Edward Hollis, United Kingdom
Rosie Hornbuckle, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Kei Hoshi, Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand
Olivier Houix, IRCAM, France
Michael Howlett, klrfr, Canada
Pete Howson, United Kingdom
Magnus Høholt Kaspersen, Aarhus University, Denmark
Chung-Ching Huang, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan
Xinyi Huang, University of Edinburgh, China
Yujia Huang, University of Dundee, United Kingdom
Ella-Mae Hubbard, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Oscar Huerta, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile
Daniel Hug, Zürcher Hochschule der Künste, Switzerland
Kristin Hughes, Carnegie Mellon University, USA
Caroline Hummels, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
I Chun Hung, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan
Daniel Huppertz, Swinburne University of Technology, Australia
Karl Hurn, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Samuel Huron, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, France
Amanda Huynh, Pratt Institute, USA
Sampsa Hyysalo, Aalto University, Finland
Alayt Issak, Northeastern University, USA
Ninela Ivanova, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Ricardo J Hernandez, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile

Irina Jackiva (Yatskiv), Transport and Telecommunication Institute, Latvia
Anna Jackson, AUT, New Zealand
Dan Jackson, NuLawLab - Northeastern University School of Law, USA
Naomi Jacobs, University of Twente, Netherlands
Mikko Jalas, Finland
Alison James, independent, United Kingdom
Bob Jerrard, Birmingham City University, United Kingdom
Emilie Bech Jespersen, Design School Kolding, Denmark
Keesa Johnson, USA
Michael Pierre Johnson, Glasgow School of Art, United Kingdom
Sarah Johnstone, Australia
Wolfgang Jonas, Braunschweig University of Art, Germany
Derek Jones, The Open University, United Kingdom
Peter Hayward Jones, Tec de Monterrey, Canada
Li Jönsson, Malmö University, Sweden
Jomy Joseph, University of Oslo, Norway
Hanne Hede Jørgensen, Denmark
Helle Jovgaard Jørgensen, University College Lillebælt, Denmark
Guy Julier, Aalto University, Finland
Gyuchan Thomas Jun, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Jiwon Jung, TU Delft, Netherlands
Silvana Juri, SARAS Institute, Uruguay
Lorraine Justice, Rochester Institute of Technology, USA
Melanie Kahl, USA
Anubha Kakroo, India
Eleni Kalantidou, Griffith University, Australia
Faith Kane, Massey University, New Zealand
Berrak Karaca Salgamcioglu, Istanbul University, Türkiye
Armağan Karahanoğlu, University of Twente, Netherlands
Elvin Karana, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Patrycja Kaszynska, University of the Arts London, Poland
Anastasia Katharine Ostrowski, MIT Media Lab, USA
Maria Antony Katticaran, HDR Inc, USA
Veronika Kelly, University of South Australia, Australia
Tobie Kerridge, Goldsmiths, University of London, United Kingdom
Hatice Server Kesdi, Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Türkiye
Sarah Kettley, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Sumbul Khan, Singapore University of Technology and Design, Singapore
Zakkiya Khan, University of Lincoln, United Kingdom
Surabhi Khanna, National Institute of Design Haryana, India
Chuan Khoo, Monash University, Australia
Byungsoo Kim, Kansas State University, USA
Chajoong Kim, UNIST, South Korea
Euiyoung Kim, TU Delft, Netherlands
Jinsook Kim, Georgian Court University, USA
KwanMyung Kim, South Korea
Kyulee Kim, Northeastern University, USA
MiHyun Kim, Texas State University, USA
Miso Kim, Northeastern University, USA
Nayeon Kim, The Catholic University of Korea, South Korea
Lucy Kimbell, UAL, United Kingdom
Sofie Kinch, Designschool Kolding, Denmark
Arja Kjällbom, Sweden
Kasey Klimes, Rhizome R&D, USA
Laura Knight, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Eva Knutz, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
Anthony Kong, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong
Teksin Kopanoglu, Cardiff Metropolitan University, United Kingdom
Mikko Koria, Loughborough University London, United Kingdom
Hannah Korsmeyer, Monash University, Australia
Ilpo Koskinen, UNSW, Australia

Anna Kouhia, University of Helsinki, Finland
Nantia Koulidou, Sheffield Hallam University, United Kingdom
Katie Krcmarik, Illinois State University, USA
Vinayak Krishnamurthy, Texas A&M University, USA
Tore Kristensen, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark
Peter Gall Krogh, Aarhus University, Denmark
Lenneke Kuijer, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Peter Kun, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark
yesim kunter, yesimkunter ltd., United Kingdom
Jo-Yu Kuo, National Taipei University of Technology, Taiwan
Ana Kuštrak Korper, Linköping University, Sweden
Blair Kuys, Swinburne University of Technology, Australia
Ksenija Kuzmina, Loughborough University London, United Kingdom
Karolina La Fors, University of Twente, Netherlands
Tarja-Kaarina Laamanen, Aalto Univeristy, Finland
Thierry Lagrange, KU Leuven, Belgium
Henna Lahti, University of Helsinki, Finland
Riitta Lahtinen, Finland
Danielle Lake, Elon University, USA
Sotiris Lalaounis, University of Exeter Business School, United Kingdom
Carine Lallemand, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Busayawan Lam, Brunel University, United Kingdom
Cecilia Landa-Avila, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Matthias Laschke, University of Siegen, Germany
Thomas Laurien, University of Gothenburg, Sweden
Lea Holst Laursen, Denmark
Jakob Clemen Lavrsen, Technical University of Denmark - DTU, Denmark
Minh-Nguyet Le, Lucerne School of Art & Design, Switzerland
Marion Lean, Newcastle University, United Kingdom
Boyeun Lee, University of Exeter Business School, United Kingdom
Chaiwoo Lee, MIT, USA
Chang Hee Lee, KAIST, South Korea
Hyun-Kyung Lee, South Korea
Jen Yoohyun Lee, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong
Minha Lee, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Yanki Lee, Linnaeus University, United Kingdom
Youngsil Lee, Youngsil Lee, Netherlands
Jesper Falck Legaard, Designschool Kolding, Denmark
Sanna Lehtinen, Aalto University, Finland
Renata Leitaó, Cornell University, USA
Catarina Lelis, University of Aveiro, Portugal
Sara Lenzi, Universidad de Deusto, Spain
Elena Carolina Li, University of Taipei, Taiwan
Matthew Lickiss, University of Leeds, United Kingdom
Ann Light, University of Sussex, United Kingdom
Petra Lilja, Konstfack, Sweden
Yihyun Lim, University of Southern California, USA
Joseph Lindley, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Kristina Lindström, Malmö University, Sweden
Stephen Little, Tshwane University of Technology, United Kingdom
Houjiang Liu, The University of Texas at Austin, USA
Sylvia Liu, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong
Peter Lloyd, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Alex Lobos, Rochester Institute of Technology, USA
Dan Lockton, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Leon Loh, Kyushu University, Japan
Julia Lohmann, Finland
James Lomas, Delft university of Technology, Netherlands
Ricardo Lopez, Universidad Autonoma de Aguascalientes, Mexico
Franca Lopez Barbera, Braunschweig University, Germany
Nicole Lotz, The Open University, United Kingdom

Gijs Louwers, Technical University of Delft, Netherlands
Jasmine Lu, University of Chicago, USA
Yuan Lu, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Geke Ludden, University of Twente, Netherlands
Ding-Bang Luh, China
Emma Luke, RMIT, Australia
Rohan Lulham, University Of Technology Sydney, Australia
Eva Lutnæs, Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway
Harini M, National Institute of Design, India
Min-Yuan Ma, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan
Xiao Ma, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taiwan
Mairi-Claire MacDonald, Denmark
Mairi-Claire MacDonald, Designskolen Kolding, Denmark
Herminia Machry, University of Kansas, USA
Angella Mackey, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands
Jeremy Madden, Atlantic Technological University,, Ireland
Ravi Mahamuni, TCS, India
Anja Maier, University of Strathclyde, United Kingdom
Donna Maione, Linnaeus University, Sweden
Maarit Mäkelä, Aalto University, Finland
Elena Malakhutka, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden
Carmen Malvar, ELISAVA ESCUELA DE DISEÑO, Spain
Ruchita Arvind Mandhre, Arizona State University, USA
William Mangold, Drexel University, USA
Arthi Manohar, Brunel University London, United Kingdom
Bilgen Manzakoglu, Bahcesehir University, Turkiye
Ezio Manzini, Italy
Anastasios Maragiannis, University of Westminster, United Kingdom
Georgios Marentakis, Østfold University College, Norway
Thomas Markussen, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
Valentina Marques da Rosa, UFRGS, Spain
Jamie Marsden, United Kingdom
Lorraine Marshalsey, University of South Australia, Australia
Patrizia Marti, University of Siena, Italy
William Martin, Carnegie Mellon University, USA
João Martins, School of Technology and Management/ Polytechnic Institute of Viana do Castelo, Portugal
Tiago Martins, University of Coimbra, Portugal
Sara Patrícia Martins Gancho, IADE, Portugal
Sanna-Maria Marttila, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Zach Mason, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Sonia Massari, Pisa University, Italy
Gloria Mast, IUP, USA
M. Marie Mastrobattista, Drexel University, USA
Rebekah Matheny, The Ohio State University, USA
Goran Matic, University of Brighton, Canada
Julieta Matos Castano, University of Twente, Netherlands
Ben Matthews, The University of Queensland, Australia
Alexandra Matz, SAP SE, Germany
Michele Mauri, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Artur Mausbach, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Ramia Mazé, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Francesco Mazzarella, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Marco Mazzarotto, UTFPR, Brazil
Arianna Mazzeo, Didi Dubai Institute of Design and Innovation, United Arab Emirates
Erin Claire McAuliffe, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Sean McCusker, Northumbria University, United Kingdom
Kate McEntee, Victoria Legal Aid, Australia
Cameron McEwan, Northumbria University, United Kingdom
Troy McGee, Monash University, Australia
Chris McGinley, Helen Hamlyn Centre for Design / Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Anita McKeown, SMARTlab Skelligs, Ireland

Heather McKinnon, Queensland University of Technology, Australia
Muireann McMahon, University of Limerick, Ireland
Roisin Mcnane, Monash University, Australia
Holly McQuillan, TU Delft, Netherlands
Jessica Meharry, IIT Institute of Design, USA
G. Mauricio Mejía, Arizona State University, USA
Abby Mellick Lopes, University of Technology Sydney, Australia
Paula Melo Signerez, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Daphne Menheere, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Tieni Meninato, wake to, Canada
Anna Meroni, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Paul Mickethwaite, Manchester Metropolitan University, United Kingdom
Satu Miettinen, University of Lapland, Finland
Constanza Miranda, Johns Hopkins University, USA
Nicolas Misdariis, Ircam, France
Kimberly Mitchell, University of Tennessee Knoxville, USA
Robb Mitchell, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
Richie Moalosi, University of Botswana, Botswana
Laia Mogas Soldevila, University of Pennsylvania, USA
Stefano Delle Monache, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Charu Monga, India
Charu Monga, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, India
Vanessa Monna, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Juan Giuseppe Montalván Lume, Pontifical Catholic University of Peru, Peru
Rui Costa Monteiro, ID+ Research Institute for Design, Media and Culture, Portugal
Stine Moons, University of Antwerp, Belgium
Joe Moore, Town of Zebulon, USA
Michael Moore, Ulster University, United Kingdom
Nicola Morelli, Aalborg University, Denmark
Jolanda Morkel, South Africa
Piera Morlacchi, University of Sussex, United Kingdom
Fabio Morreale, New Zealand
Andrew Morris, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Andrew Morrison, AHO, Norway
Elham Morshedzadeh, University of Houston, USA
Marzia Mortati, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Alireza Mortezaapour, University of Salerno, Italy
Najla Mouchrek, Northeastern University, USA
Jeanne-Louise Moys, University of Reading, United Kingdom
hanne Mølbak, VIA University College, Denmark
Signe Mørk Madsen, Via University College, Denmark
Dan Mu, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Ruth Mugge, TUDelft, Netherlands
Ingrid Mulder, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Maaïke Mulder-Nijkamp, University of Twente, Netherlands
Louise Mullagh, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Naureen Mumtaz, Mount Royal University, Canada
Mia Münster, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong
Francesca Murialdo, Middlesex University, United Kingdom
Ryan Murphy, Memorial University, Canada
Dave Murray-Rust, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Troy Nachtigall, Eindhoven University of Technology / Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands
JAIST Nagai, Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Japan
Michael Nagenborg, University of Twente, Netherlands
Lexi Namer, USA
Ulises Navarro Aguiar, University of Gothenburg, Sweden
Anja Neidhardt-Mokoena, Umeå University, Sweden
Marco Neves, Lisbon School of Architecture, University of Lisbon, Portugal
Amelyn Ng, RISD, USA
Blaise Nguendo-Yongsi, IFORD-University of Yaounde II, Cameroon
Iohanna Nicenboim, tu delft, Netherlands

Claire Nicholas, University of Oklahoma, USA
Farnaz Nickpour, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom
Oliver Niebuhr, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
Kristina Niedderer, Manchester Metropolitan University, United Kingdom
Liv Merete Nielsen, Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway
Evangelos Niforatos, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Kirsi Niinimäki, Finland
Nithikul Nimkulrat, OCAD University, Canada
Bettina Nissen, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Ijeoma Njaka, North Carolina State University and Georgetown University, USA
Ijeoma Njaka, North Carolina State University and Georgetown University, USA
Lesley-Ann Noel, North Carolina State University, USA
Esther Noëth, University of Antwerp, Belgium
André Nogueira, Leap, USA
Kieran Nolan, Dundalk Institute of Technology, Ireland
Christian Nold, The Open University, United Kingdom
Renee Noortman, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Anitra Nottingham, RMIT Online, Australia
Katri Nousiainen, HLS, USA
Conall O Cathain, (Independent Scholar), United Kingdom
Michelle Marie O'Keeffe, Munster Technological University, Ireland
Arlene Oak, University of Alberta, Canada
Peter Oakley, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Maya Ober, University of Bern, Switzerland
Netta Ofer, USA
Dietmar Offenhuber, Northeastern University, USA
HyunJoo Oh, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA
Folasayo Olalere, The Open University, United Kingdom
Sissel Olander, Denmark
Catalina Olivas, Tecnologico de Monterrey, Mexico
Dimeji Onafuwa, Microsoft, USA
Doenja Oogjes, Netherlands
Lenard Opeskin, TU Dresden, Germany
Bruno Oro de Abreu, Iowa State University, USA
Iyare Oronsaye, North Carolina State University, USA
Susan Orr, York St John University, United Kingdom
Natalia Orrego, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile
Isaac Arturo Ortega Alvarado, Utrecht University, Netherlands
Frederick Peter Ortner, Singapore University of Technology and Design, Singapore
Sam Osys, Open University, United Kingdom
Erik Ottar Jensen, Denmark
Anja Overdiek, Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands
Elif Özcan, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Ayşegül Özçelik, Aalborg University, Denmark
Deger Ozkaramanli, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Helen Paine, United Kingdom
Maria Catalina Pajarito Caicedo, Georgetown University, USA
Paul Pangaro, Carnegie Mellon University, USA
Fabio Parasecoli, New York University, USA
Jorge Paricio Garcia, University of Connecticut, USA
Stefano Parisi, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Chorong Park, Purdue University, USA
Hyunyim (Shera) Park, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU), Hong Kong
Jaehyun Park, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong
Sun Young Park, USA
Seungho Park-Lee, Ulsan National Institute of Science and Technology, South Korea
Sandra Pauletti, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden
Belinda Jane Paulovich, Swinburne University of Technology, Australia
Owain Pedgley, Middle East Technical University, Türkiye
Zhuochao Peng, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands

Jorge Brandão Pereira, IPCA Polytechnic University of Cavado and Ave / ID+ Research Institute for Design Media and Culture, Portugal
Vinícius J. Pereira, University of East Anglia, United Kingdom
Amina Pereno, Italy
Dulmini Perera, Bauhaus University Weimar, Germany
Laura J Perovich, Northeastern University, USA
Amanda Perry-Kessaris, University of Kent, United Kingdom
Eliza Pertigkiozoglou, McGill University, Canada
Ann Petermans, Hasselt University, Belgium
Bruna Petreca, United Kingdom
Iseline Peyre, Sorbonne Universite, France
Hien Phan, University of Florida, USA
Robert Phillips, Robert Phillips, United Kingdom
Silvia Pizzocarò, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Austeja Platukyte, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania
Alise Plavina, Norwegian University of Science and Technology/ Pir II AS, Norway
Philip Plowright, Lawrence Technological University, USA
ALEJANDRA VIRGINIA POBLETE PÉREZ, UNIVERSIDAD TECNOLÓGICA METROPOLITANA, Chile
Anna Pohlmeier, TU Delft, Netherlands
Rafael Poiate, ESDI - UERJ, Brazil
Anton Poikolainen Rosen, Finland
Fátima Pombo, University of Aveiro, Portugal
Vesna Popovic, QUT, Australia
Keith Porcaro, Duke Law School, USA
Monica Porteanu, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, USA
Kruakae Pothong, LSE, United Kingdom
Mathias Poulsen, Designschool Kolding, Denmark
Emmi Pouta, Aalto University, Finland
Sharon Prendeville, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Alison Prendiville, LCC, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Rebecca Price, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Ilse Prinsloo, University of Johannesburg, South Africa
Sebastien Proulx, The Ohio State University, USA
Larissa Pschetz, The University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Emma Puerari, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Irma Puskarevic, Wichita State University, USA
Ambika Putri, Georgetown University, USA
Manuela Quaresma, Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Katelijn Quartier, Hasselt University, Belgium
Cristobal Quezada, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile
Jess Rahbek, Denmark
Jeroen Raijmakers, Philips, Netherlands
Prineeth Ramachandra, National Institute of Design, India
Carolina Ramirez-Figueroa, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Lucia Rampino, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Gail Ramster, RCA, United Kingdom
Charlie Ranscombe, Swinburne University of Technology, Australia
Vivek Rao, UC Berkeley, USA
Yaone Rapitsenyane, University of Botswana, Botswana
Idrees Rasouli, Anglia Ruskin University, United Kingdom
Sonja Rebecca Rattay, University of Copenhagen, Sweden
Marion REAL, IAAC, Spain
Annamaria Recupero, Italy
Muralidhar Reddy, CMR University, India
Johan Redström, Umeå University, Sweden
Pedro Reissig, UBA, Argentina
Lizette Reitsma, Malmö University, Sweden
Kenzo Repole, Onozo, USA
Denisa Reshef Kera, Bar Ilan University, Israel
Juliana Restrepo, Sweden
Karen Reuther, Harvard University, USA

Emma Rhule, United Nations University International Insititute for Global Health, Malaysia
Marina Ricci, Polytechnic University of Bari, Italy
Dina Riccò, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Liz Richardson, University of Manchester, United Kingdom
Jekaterina Rindt, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
C. C. Risseeuw, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Holly Robbins, Netherlands
David Robertson, Australia
Davide Rocchesso, University of Palermo, Italy
Jules Rochielle Sievert, Northeastern University School of Law, USA
Stephen Roddy, Univeristy College Cork, Ireland
Paul Rodgers, University of Strathclyde, United Kingdom
Vanessa Rodrigues, Linköping University, Sweden
Valentina Rognoli, POLitecnico di Milano, Italy
Maximiliano Romero, Università IUAV di Venezia, Italy
Niklas Rönnerberg, Linköping University, Sweden
Arianna Rossi, SnT, University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg
Emilio Rossi, Università di Chieti-Pescara, Italy
Adolfo Ruiz, MacEwan University, Canada
Anna Rylander Eklund, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden
shobhan s, slowstudio, India
Juan Sádaba, University of the Basque Country, Spain
Noemi Sadowska, London College of Communication, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Jasmijn Sagel, University of Twente, Netherlands
Mahmoud Reza Saghafi, Art University of Isfahan, Iran
Betul Sahin, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Fatima Saikaly, Co-Creando, Italy
Almila Akdag Salah, Utrecht University, Netherlands
Juan Salamanca, University of Illinois, USA
Petra Salaric, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Muhammad Saleem, Shaheed Allah Buksh Soomro University of Art, Design and Heritages Jamshoro, Pakistan
Lara Salinas, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Florian Sametinger, University of Arts Linz, Austria
Anne-Lene Sand, Design School Kolding, Denmark
Erik Sandelin, Konstfack University of Arts, Crafts and Design, Sweden
Carlos Sandoval Olascoaga, Northeastern University, USA
Flavio Sanson Fogliatto, Universidade Federal Do Rio Grande Do Sul, Brazil
Laura Santamaria, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Aguinaldo Santos, Paraná Federal University, Brazil
Joaquin Santuber, Hasso-Plattner-Institute, University of Potsdam, Germany
Rosana Sanz Segura, Zaragoza University, Spain
Tarcisio Saurin, Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil, Brazil
Nitin Sawhney, Aalto University, Finland
Joni Elaine Saylor, Ibm, USA
Marie-Monique Anastasia Schaper, Aarhus University, Denmark
Laura Scherling, Columbia University, USA
Tania Schlatter, Wheaton College, USA
Ruth Schmidt, Institute of Design, Illinois Tech, USA
Scott Schmidt, Georgetown University, USA
Nadine Schutz, IRCAM, France
Christine Schwobel-Patel, University of Warwick, United Kingdom
James Self, UNIST, South Korea
Daniela Selloni, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Avery Sen, Sen Sound, Germany
Prateek Shankar, USA
Agnivesh Sharma, Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay, India
Cara Shaw, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom
Archana Shekara, Illinois State University, USA
Avinash Shende, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, India
Peining Sheng, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Mardelle M Shepley, Cornell University, USA

Irina Shklovski, Denmark
Mortaza Shoaie Bargh, Netherlands
Carolina Short, University of Waikato, New Zealand
Miguel Sicart, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Madeline Sides, Carnegie Mellon University, USA
Perline, Hwee Ling Siek, Sunway University, Malaysia
Luca Simeone, Aalborg University, Denmark
Nidhi Singh Rathore, Independent Researcher, USA
Frances Singleton, Amsterdam Law Hub, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands
Andrea Siodmok, RMIT, Australia
Muriel Sippel, Open University, United Kingdom
Jennifer Ann Skriver, Denmark
Froukje Sleeswijk Visser, TU Delft, Netherlands
Geertje Slingerland, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
wina smeenk, Inholland, Applied University, Netherlands
Catherine Smith, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Rachel Charlotte Smith, Aarhus University, Denmark
Dirk Snelders, TU Delft, Netherlands
Kim Snooks, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Robert Soden, University of Toronto, Canada
Mar De Dios Solana, Spain
Camilo Soler-Caicedo, United Kingdom
Bjorn Sommer, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Binyang Song, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA
Jihyun Song, Drexel University, USA
Natalie Sontopski, University of Applied Sciences Anhalt, Germany
Ricardo Sosa, University of Sydney, Australia
Mariluz Soto, Universidad del Desarrollo, Chile
Nicos Souleles, Cyprus
Marie Louise Juul Søndergaard, The Oslo School of Architecture and Design, Denmark
Simone Spagnol, Luav University of Venice, Italy
Chris Speed, RMIT University, Australia
Eamon Spelman, Limerick School of Art & Design / TUS, Ireland
Nicholas Spencer, Northumbria University, United Kingdom
Katta Spiel, Belgium
Gabriella Spinelli, Brunel University London, United Kingdom
Åsa Ståhl, Linnaeus University, Sweden
Liesbeth Stam, KU Leuven, Belgium
Abigale Stangl, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA
Pieter Jan Stappers, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Justyna Starostka, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Modestos Stavrakis, University of the Aegean, Greece
Michael Stead, School of Design, Imagination, LICA, Lancaster University, United Kingdom, United Kingdom
Frederick Steier, Fielding Graduate University, USA
Ruth Stevens, Hasselt University, Belgium
Eve Stirling, sheffield hallam university, United Kingdom
Jodi Lynn Sturge, University of Twente, Netherlands
Laura Succini, università di Bologna, Italy
Shanti Sumartojo, Monash University, Australia
Kärt Summatavet, University of Tartu, Estonia
Qian Sun, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Azra Sungu, Illinois Institute of Technology, USA
Mari Suoheimo, The Oslo School of Architecture and Design, Norway
Aditi Surana, Design Informatics, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Patrick Susini, IRCAM, France
Sally Sutherland, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Bruno Sutil, FGV EAESP, Brazil
Ben Sweeting, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Oliver Szasz, Macromedia University of Applied Sciences, Germany
Raditya Ardianto Taepoer, Chiba University, Japan
Elise Talgorn, Royal Philips / Delft University of Technology, Netherlands

Anna Talley, University of Edinburgh / DRS, United Kingdom
Linus Tan, Swinburne University of Technology, Australia
Hsien-Hui Tang, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taiwan
Francisco Tapia, University of Leeds, United Kingdom
Virginia Tassinari, Politecnico di Milano, Belgium
Sarah Teasley, RMIT University, Australia
Andris Teikmanis, Art Academy of Latvia, Latvia
Carlos Teixeira, Institute of Design, Illinois Tech, USA
Irem Tekogul, Illinois Institute of Technology, USA
Ida Telalbasic, Loughborough University London, United Kingdom
Koldo Telleria-andueza, EHU UPV, Spain
Andres Tellez, Appalachian State University, USA
Jan Tepe, University of Borås - Swedish School of Textiles, Sweden
Mellina Terres, UFCSPA, Brazil
Nazlı Terzioğlu, United Kingdom
Test Test, Test, USA
Myra Thiessen, Monash University, Australia
Joyce K Thomas, Auburn University, USA
Jana Thompson, North Carolina State University, USA
Tassy Thompson, University of South Eastern Norway, Norway
Alison Thomson, Queen Mary, University of London, United Kingdom
Katja Thoring, Technical University of Munich, Germany
T. Shea Tillman, Auburn University, USA
Sebnem Timur, Ozyegin University, Turkiye
Martín Tironi, Pontificie Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile
Noopur Tiwari, UID, India
Nate Tkacz, The University of Warwick, United Kingdom
Rikke Toft, Denmark
Reto Togni, ETH Zurich, Switzerland
Christine Toh, University of Nebraska at Oklahoma, USA
Ignacio Toledo, Universidad del Desarrollo, Chile
Christian Tollestrup, Aalborg University, Denmark
Leandro Miletto Tonetto, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA
Damla Tonuk, METU, Turkiye
James Tooze, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Simone Torresin, University of Trento, Italy
Guilherme Tortorella, University of Melbourne, Australia
Hande Işık Tosun, Tobb Etu, Turkiye
Rojda Tosun, Public Legal Design, Germany
Robert Tovey, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Test Track Chair, test, Afghanistan
Joshua Trees, Pratt Institute, USA
Nynke Tromp, TU Delft, Netherlands
Katja Tschimmel, University of Porto, Portugal
Emmanuel Tsekleves, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Dion Tuckwell, Monash University, Australia
Amy Twigger Holroyd, Nottingham Trent University, United Kingdom
Tau Ulv Lenskjold, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
Kelly Umstead, North Carolina State University, USA
Isabelle Şöhret Uner, Birmingham City University, United Kingdom
Megan Urban, Carnegie Mellon University / State University of New York at Fredonia, USA
German Valenzuela, University of Talca, USA
Julia Valle Noronha, Estonian Academy of Arts, Estonia
Anna Vallgård, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Francesca Valsecchi, Tongji University, China
Frederick M. C. van Amstel, University of Florida, USA
Margot van den Brink, Netherlands
Antonius Van den Broek, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Mieke van der Bijl-Brouwer, TU Delft, Netherlands
Vera van der Burg, TU Delft, Netherlands
Remko van der Lugt, Utrecht University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands

Willem van der Maden, ITU Copenhagen, Netherlands
Mascha van der Voort, University of Twente, Netherlands
Karel van der Waarde, Graphic Design - Research, Belgium
Jelle van Dijk, University of Twente, Netherlands
Niels van Huizen, University of Twente, Netherlands
Saskia van Kampen, San Francisco State University, USA
Lieselotte van Leeuwen, University of Gothenburg, HDK-Valand, Sweden
Maarten Van Mechelen, Denmark
Mateus van Stralen, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brazil
Koen van Turnhout, Hogeschool van Utrecht, Netherlands
Nicholas Vanderschantz, University of Waikato, New Zealand
Theodora Vardouli, McGill University, Canada
Xanat Vargas Meza, University of Tsukuba, Japan
Rosana Vasques, USP, Brazil
Federico Vaz, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Silvia Veiga-Seijo, Queen Margaret University, United Kingdom
Rodrigo Vera, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile
Amalia Verdu-Sanmartin, University of Turku, Finland
Roberto Verganti, USA
G. Arno Verhoeven, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Jouke Verlinden, University of Antwerp, Belgium
Emilija Veselova, Aalto University, Finland
Helle Vesti, Aalborg University, Denmark
Arianna Vignati, UNSW, Australia
Susann Vihma, Aalto uni, Finland
Diana Pamela Villa Alvarez, Fundación Saldarriaga Concha, Colombia
John Vines, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Josina Vink, Oslo School of Architecture & Design (AHO), Norway
Joanne Vinke-de Kruijf, University of Twente, Netherlands
Klaasjan Visscher, University of Twente, Netherlands
Daniel Charles Vlahos, Merrimack College, USA
Valentina Volpi, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Bettina von Stamm, Innovation Leadership Forum, Germany
Thomas Georg Vrachliotis, TU Delft, Netherlands
Son Vu Dang, Carleton University, Canada
Shantanu Vyas, Texas A&M University, USA
Thijs Waardenburg, University of Twente, Netherlands
Bruce Walker, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA
Jayne Wallace, United Kingdom
Niki Wallace, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Greg Walsh, University of Baltimore, USA
Yixiao Wang, Georgia Tech, USA
Patrick Waterson, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Kathleen Waterston, USA
Penelope Webb, Philips North America, USA
Frithjof Wegener, Warwick Business School, Netherlands
Markus Wernli, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong
Michelle Westerlaken, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
Renee Wever, Linköping University, Sweden
Judy Whipps, GVSU, USA
Andrew James Whitcomb, Arizona State University, USA
Roger Whitham, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Mikael Wiberg, Umea University, Sweden
Catherine Wieczorek, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA
Catherine Wieczorek, USA
Danielle Wilde, SDU, Denmark
Sabine Wildevuur, University of Twente, Netherlands
Alex Wilkie, Goldsmiths University of London, United Kingdom
Rua M. Williams, Purdue University, USA
Sarah Williams, MIT, USA
Anne-Marie Willis, University of Tasmania, Australia

Paul Wilson, University of Leeds, United Kingdom
Heather Wiltse, Umeå University, Sweden
Jerrod Bradley Windham, Auburn University, USA
Suzanne Wint, independent scholar, USA
Jordan Wirfs-Brock, Whitman College, USA
Andrew Witt, Harvard University, USA
Ryan Wittingslow, University of Groningen, Netherlands
Rachel A. Wood, Open University, United Kingdom
Xueting Wu, Arizona State University, USA
Jieling Xiao, Birmingham City University, United Kingdom
Zijie Xie, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Yaohan Xing, Birmingham City University, United Kingdom
Jie Xu, China Academy of Art, China
Aria Chien-hui Yang, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong
Eunhwa Yang, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA
Maria Yang, MIT, USA
Ya-Chun Yang, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan
Dvora Yanow, Netherlands
Joyce Yee, Northumbria University, United Kingdom
Yuanyuan Yin, University of Southampton, United Kingdom
Ahu Yolac, Lawrence Technological University, USA
Daisy Yoo, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
So-Yeon Yoon, Cornell University, USA
Jinlong Yuan, Arizona State University, USA
PAULINA YURMAN, Central St Martin's College of Art and Design, United Kingdom
Cristina Zaga, University of Twente, Netherlands
Bieke Zaman, Belgium
Theo Zamenopoulos, The Open University, United Kingdom
Keila Zari, Denmark
Cecilia Zecca, Helen Hamlyn Centre for Design / Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Xiaorui Zhang, United Kingdom
Wenqi Zheng, Arizona State University, USA
Jing Zhou, Monmouth University, USA
Haiou Zhu, University of Oxford, United Kingdom
Siqi Zhu, Sasaki, USA
Emilene Zitkus, United Kingdom
Ilya Zitter, Netherlands
Yushan Zou, Southwest University, China
Wang Zunfu, Hunan University, China
Neena Singh Zutshi, World University of Design, India

Contents

Contents	1
Editorial: Welcome to DRS 2024	5
Open Call for Papers	7
<i>Integrating Design Perspectives</i>	7
<i>Design Cognition and Ideation</i>	9
<i>Literacies, Inclusivity, and Empowerment</i>	11
<i>Change and Impact</i>	14
<i>Health and Healthcare</i>	16
<i>Empathy, Care, and Bodily Perspectives</i>	18
<i>Augmenting Diverse Contexts through Design</i>	21
<i>Materials and Materiality</i>	23
1 Resisting, Recovering, Reflecting, and Reimagining Design Education	26
<i>Resisting Education / The Education of Resistance</i>	26
<i>Technology & Reimagining Education</i>	28
<i>Recovering Education / The Education of Recovery</i>	31
2 Design for Longevity (D4L): Project Your Future Self through Service and Technology	34
<i>D4L and Technologies</i>	34
<i>D4L and Aging</i>	36
<i>D4L and Services</i>	38
3 Design for Wellbeing and Happiness	40
<i>Spatial Wellbeing</i>	40
<i>Health and Wellbeing</i>	42
<i>Experiential Wellbeing</i>	44
<i>Subjective Wellbeing</i>	46
4 Reimagining Care through Evidence: Design Research, Patient Centered Solutions, and a Culture of Care for Healthy Societies	50
<i>Reimagining Care through Evidence: Environment</i>	50
<i>Reimagining Care through Evidence: Technology</i>	53



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International Licence.

<i>Reimagining Care through Evidence: Culture and Strategy</i>	56
5 Liveable Cities: Reimagining Design for Healthy Cities and Communities	59
<i>Digital Tools for Healthy Cities</i>	59
<i>Healthy Cities & Communities</i>	61
6 Design for Balance: Reimagining Processes and Competences for Sustainable Futures	64
<i>Re-imagining Design Approaches for Balance</i>	64
<i>Re-imagining Design Practices for Balance</i>	67
7 Co-design towards Positive Change	70
<i>Co-design for Behavior Change I: Communities & Public Space</i>	70
<i>Co-design for Behavior Change II: Theories, Reflections, & Frameworks</i>	73
8 Past, Present, and Future: Understanding the Expanse of Design for Policy And Governance	76
<i>Design for Policy and Governance Futures</i>	76
<i>Design for Policy and Governance Theory</i>	78
<i>Design for Policy and Governance Practice</i>	80
9 Designing for Just and Sustainable Policies in the Space between Institutions and Experimental Government Practices	82
<i>Designing Policies across Institutional Boundaries</i>	82
10 Systemic Citizens: Equity, Power, and Relational Autonomy	85
<i>Systemic Citizens I</i>	85
<i>Systemic Citizens II</i>	87
11 Joyful Complexity: Queering, intersecting, and navigating alternate futures	90
<i>Joyful Complexity: People, Power, Positionalities</i>	90
<i>Joyful Complexity: Methodological (Dis/Re)Orientations</i>	92
12 Design For Empowerment	95
<i>Design for Empowerment I: Approaches and Understandings</i>	95
<i>Design for Empowerment II: Methods & communities</i>	96
13 Pluriversal Design as a Paradigm	99
<i>Pluriversal Design as a Paradigm I</i>	99
<i>Pluriversal Design as a Paradigm II</i>	101
14 Polyphonic Speculations	104
<i>Potentials for Polyphonic Speculations</i>	104
<i>Polyphonic Speculation in Practice</i>	106
15 Spatial Justice in Design Research: A Transdisciplinary Discourse	109

<i>Spatial Justice in Design Research: A Transdisciplinary Discourse</i>	109
16 Turn by Turn: Language and Design	112
<i>Language in Design Process</i>	112
<i>Language in Design Practice</i>	115
17 More-Than-Human Design in Practice	117
<i>More-Than-Human: Becoming With the More-Than-Human</i>	117
<i>More-Than-Human: Designing With and Through Technologies</i>	119
<i>More-Than-Human: Thinking with Care</i>	121
18 Data as Design Research: Mediating Processes, Protocols, and Precedent in Practice	124
<i>Generative AI in Practice</i>	124
<i>Data as Design Method</i>	126
<i>Social Dimensions of Data and Research</i>	128
19 Translational Design: Enabling Impact in Complex, Multi-Stakeholder Research Projects Through Design	131
<i>Translational Design I</i>	131
<i>Translational Design II</i>	133
20 Designing Resilient Food Futures: Food Commons, Transitions, and Sovereignty	137
<i>Food Cultures and Transitions</i>	137
<i>Innovative Food Systems: Networks and Partnerships</i>	139
21 Designing (for) Transitions and Transformations: Imagination, Climate Futures, and Everyday Lives	141
<i>Futuring in Transitions</i>	141
<i>Ecologies and Regeneration in Transitions</i>	143
<i>Perspectives and Pedagogies in Transitions</i>	146
<i>Systems and Services in Transitions</i>	148
22 Design for Manufacturing: Rehumanising Digital Manufacturing	151
<i>Design for Manufacturing: Rehumanising Digital Manufacturing</i>	151
<i>Design for Manufacturing: Rehumanising Digital Manufacturing</i>	153
23 Making in the Digital Era	157
<i>Making in the Digital Era</i>	157
24 Ethics in/of/for Design	161
<i>Ethics in Design: Practices</i>	161
<i>Ethics of Design: Theories and Methods</i>	163
<i>Ethics for Design: Positions & Relations</i>	165
25 Design Sketching and Visualization, Futures & Research	168

<i>AI's Impact on Sketching & Workflow</i>	168
<i>Analogue Sketching Research</i>	171
<i>Sketching Futures with XR and AI</i>	173
26 How Do You Sound Design? Articulating Experiences and Cultures via Listening	176
<i>Sound-Driven Design: Foundations</i>	176
<i>Sound-Driven Design in Action</i>	178
27 Play Design: Initiating Transformation through Imagination	181
<i>Play Design I</i>	181
<i>Play Design II</i>	183
28 Retail, Hospitality, and Service Design Futures	185
<i>Sustainability in Retail, Hospitality and Service Design</i>	185
<i>User Experiences in Retail, Hospitality and Service Design</i>	187
<i>Technology in Retail, Hospitality and Service Design</i>	189

Editorial: Welcome to DRS 2024

A very warm welcome to DRS2024, a historic moment as we gather for the first DRS conference in the United States. Design research in the US is rich but distributed and we hope with this conference to not only bring together design researchers across the US, but to provide an opportunity to connect with design researchers across the globe. This milestone is a testament to the expanding reach and inclusivity of the design research community. Our journey to this conference has been one of dedication and collaboration, highlighting the resilience, adaptability, and increased reach of our field.

Boston, a city renowned for its academic traditions and historical significance, is our setting for the conference this year. And Northeastern University's College of Arts, Media, and Design is our host institution, in partnership with the Harvard University Graduate School of Design and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Morningside Academy for Design. We are also welcomed by the City of Boston Mayor's Office of New Urban Mechanics, the Design Museum Foundation, and the Museum of Fine Arts Boston. This setting provides an inspiring backdrop for a conference that values the impact of design in a multitude of contexts and that reflects the diverse and dynamic nature of design research.

The call for papers for DRS2024 resulted in a huge response, with 1184 abstracts and 869 full paper submissions—over a 47% increase from DRS2022. Of these submissions, 78 were desk rejected and 791 papers underwent rigorous peer review. Based on this review process, we are pleased to include 386 accepted papers in our program, reflecting a 44.4% acceptance rate. This rigorous selection process ensures that we continue to uphold the highest standards of academic excellence in design research.

Our program is rich and varied, featuring 29 conversations and 38 workshops designed to foster deep engagement and lively debate. We are very pleased to welcome over 770 delegates, including more than 180 online participants and 590 participants on-site in Boston. This hybrid blend of in-person and online participation, a key feature of DRS2022 in Bilbao, enriches our conference through making it accessible.

Research papers remain at the center of the conference, and we are proud to present 28 invited theme tracks, comprising 342 of the accepted papers. These tracks cover a wide array of topics, from more-than-human design and sound design to design for policy, ethics, and pluriversal design. Themes that reflect both established and emerging areas of interest within the design research community. While many of these tracks are sponsored by



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International Licence.

DRS Special Interest Groups (SIGs), others represent new and exciting areas of exploration.

The diversity of our theme tracks underscores the expansive nature of design research. Our field continues to progress and evolve, integrating new perspectives from disciplines such as anthropology, politics, economics, law, and healthcare. This cross-disciplinary approach enriches our knowledge creation and pushes the boundaries of design research.

PhD and early-career researchers play a crucial role in this conference, representing the next generation of design scholars. Their fresh perspectives and innovative approaches are helping to shape the future of our field. We welcome those for whom DRS2024 is their first opportunity to participate in a conference, we hope you will have a rewarding and transformative experience.

Supporting and enabling the design research community is the DRS Digital Library, a central hub for disseminating design research with almost 1 million downloads. Since its inception in 2020, the Library has become a vital resource, facilitating connections, promoting collaboration, and communicating the scope and value of design research.

As we gather in Boston, we celebrate not only the achievements of our discipline but also the potential for future contributions. DRS2024 is a platform for new ideas, new connections, and new opportunities. We look forward to the powerful discussions and collaborations that will emerge from this conference, driving design research forward in innovative and impactful ways.

Acknowledgements

We extend our deepest gratitude to everyone who made DRS2024 possible. Special thanks to our local hosts in Boston for their support and hospitality. We also thank the 133 Theme Track Chairs and 1067 Reviewers for their incredible dedication and hard work, ensuring the high quality of this conference.

We are grateful to all the authors who submitted their work for review. Your contributions are the heart of this conference, and we hope that you will continue to engage with and grow within the design research community.

Finally, we acknowledge the invaluable efforts of our support team and volunteers. Your commitment and countless hours of work have made this conference a reality.

DRS2024 Proceedings Editors:

Colin M. Gray, Estefania Ciliotta Chegade,
Paul Hekkert, Laura Forlano, and Paolo Ciuccarelli

Paradigm shifts in research assessment for scientific publishing in design: Emerging models in a pluriverse perspective

Elena Maria Formia^a, Eleonora Lupo^b, Lorela Mehmeti^{a,*}

^aAlma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna, Italy

^bPolitecnico di Milano, Italy

*Corresponding e-mail: lorela.mehmeti2@unibo.it

doi.org/10.21606/drs.2024.849

Abstract: In the realm of design, research publication undergoes a transformative shift in evaluation and emerging forms that prompt investigation into the distortive impact of the current assessment framework on publication diversity. The complexity of assessing research quality within institutional frameworks and career metrics hinders innovation, and globally, debates on impact factors drive a shift to qualitative, responsible evaluation. Therefore, peer-review models advance toward transparency and continuous assessment. Regarding these concerns, a solid review culture in the design domain is crucial, emphasizing the link between assessment and impact. The article explores how collaborative methodologies enable new assessment practices for design communities in the Global South, challenging Western-centric peer-review norms to adopt a more pluriversal perspective. It includes an introduction problematising the status of publication assessment in the general scientific domain. It continues focusing on some features and good practices in the assessment that could be inspirational and suitable for design (that in Italy – the context of this paper - is a non-bibliometrics sector). The paradigm of pluriversality is then introduced as a background framework to discuss and nurture new opportunities in the assessment of scientific research and publication in the design field and adopted as a reference in two proposals, shown in the case studies. The paper concludes with some statements and propositions integrating the concept of distributed knowledge leadership in assessment processes and thus refining the discourse on research plurality.

Keywords: design, scientific production, responsible evaluation, pluriversality, research equity



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International Licence.

1. Introduction

Research in the realm of design assumes a significant role within the discipline, serving as a fundamental pillar for comprehending its diverse influences and safeguarding the integrity of the research community. The preservation of high standards of quality in design research discourse, coupled with a commitment to embracing diversity, stands as an imperative. Within the design domain, the principles of inclusivity and transparency are upheld as foundational values, transcending geographical boundaries to encompass aspects such as gender, career progression, and ethnic diversity.

In the scientific publication of design there are concerns about global diversity in design research publications (Trinidad & Pereira, 2023). At the same time, there is a discernible trend towards the adoption of non-traditional paper formats, which incorporate elements of innovation, affording researchers greater latitude to explore design practices with enhanced creative liberty. This evolutionary trajectory underscores a dynamic landscape within which scholarly inquiry is encouraged to thrive, fostering a scholarly environment enriched by experimentation and exploration.

The paper discusses new academic publishing and assessment in design that try to adopt a more pluriversal approach. In the following two paragraphs, the authors problematise academic publishing evaluation and assessment and good practices in general, emphasizing criticalities and challenges that are also relevant to design.

2. The impact of assessment on research and scientific publishing: different (local and global) stories

Evaluation constitutes an important step in disseminating research and its results, as well as a mandatory and unavoidable requirement for a scientifically accredited publication.

The evaluation of research involves very different objects: institutions, research projects, journals, publications and individual researchers. These relationships form a complex network of mutual influences, such as those between projects and institutions. For instance, universities often gauge their performance based on the number of projects they secure funding for, such as from competitive sources like European or national research grants. Similarly, projects themselves are frequently evaluated—and subsequently funded—based on the reputation and ranking of the institution proposing them. Moreover, there exists a symbiotic connection between the quality of journals and articles, which significantly impacts individual researchers. Specifically, in bibliometric realms where metrics such as article citations and journal Impact Factors hold sway, these factors interplay to reinforce each other. As citations bolster a journal's Impact Factor, authors, motivated by this dynamic, tend to gravitate towards high-impact journals. Consequently, this interdependence perpetuates certain biases within the system, which in turn sustains the status quo and reinforces existing power structures.

In this context, discussions are on the agenda around:

Article Processing Charges (APC) which remain the sole responsibility of the authors, with phenomena such as double dipping (duplication of fees for both publication and access to content);

Controversial use of the Impact factor (Curry, 2018; Waltman & Traag, 2021);

Opacity of the journal system, in which the essential functions (archiving, registration, dissemination and certification) are controlled in such a way as to make it difficult to change any aspect (Priem & Hemminger, 2012);

Necessary innovation of open and transparent peer review processes, increasingly recognized as a quality criterion characterizing scientific journals (WOS, SCOPUS).

These conditions significantly impact the possibility of innovating methods and formats of scientific production and its evaluation.

Until now, two models have prevailed (Hicks, 2012): a first model based on peer review, such as the British Research Excellence Framework (REF), and a second model based on bibliometric indicators, such as Australian Excellence in Research (ERA).

Regarding the evaluation approach based on metrics, two main issues have been raised: for some scientific fields, namely social sciences and humanities, bibliometrics is not easily applicable, and some research outputs are not covered in bibliographic databases, such as books or articles in national languages. In addition, the consensus is that a merely quantitative approach reduces the diversity and variety of leading institutions capable of attracting funding (Nature Editorial, 2022), but also that it is not reliable as an exclusive criterion for ranking institutions (Gringas, 2016) or the evaluation of the quality of individual articles and researchers (Waltman, Traag, 2021).

Consequently, a third model of research assessment has emerged, where bibliometrics and peer review are jointly adopted. The evaluation of design publications typically relies on peer review and non-bibliometric metrics to assess their quality and impact.

In Italy particularly, the Governmental Agency for Research Evaluation (ANVUR) applied this model in its research assessment exercises (VQR) for many disciplines among which design. The Italian regulatory system for the evaluation of scientific production is complex, due to often conflicting procedures at different institutional levels (University criteria, VQR - Evaluation of Research Quality, ASN - National Scientific Qualification), in an equally varied framework of actors and classifications (ANVUR - National Agency for Evaluation of the University and Research System, SSD - scientific disciplinary sectors and related scientific societies). The evaluation is therefore performed using a mixed model, by two distinct processes: 1. assessment (of publications, scholars...), mainly quantitative, i.e. based on metrics and typical of bibliometric SSDs, and 2. review, which is, instead, a qualitative process (not bibliometric, but used both by bibliometric and non-bibliometric SSDs) for peer evaluation of a single article, generally made anonymously by experts (peers) to verify the quality of the text and allow publication in a journal (or a conference, albeit with often less restrictive rigor criteria) or participate in the three-yearly VQR exercises of the Universities

and Research Institutions, established by ANVUR and used for the allocation of the reward share of the Ordinary Financing Fund. About this dual model, studies realized both in Italy and the UK, discussing the agreement between bibliometrics and informed peer review, prove that results do not converge and therefore do not validate the use of the dual system of evaluation (Baccini, Barabesi, De Nicolao, 2020). In the UK too, “individual metrics give significantly different outcomes from the Research Excellence Framework peer review process, showing that metrics cannot provide a like-for-like replacement for REF peer review” (Wildson et al., 2015). Traag and Waltman claimed that the appropriate level of the REF is the institutional one and not to assess the quality of individual publications (Traag, Waltman, 2019).

Therefore, the assessment of researchers begins to oscillate between institutional evaluation (Colarusso & Giancola, 2020) and new ways to build reputation (Gandini, 2016; Fecher et al., 2017).

In the Italian academic design sector, which is a non-bibliometric sector, evaluation and assessment are based entirely on peer review.

Traditional peer review, according to the Open Research Glossary, is “a process by which a research article is reviewed by community experts before publication” to be admitted to the community. The evaluation must be “constructive” even in the event of rejection of the article - that is, clear, impartial, appropriate (to the context, the discipline, the author's career level) and useful for improving the publication (Martin, 2016); it must be based on objective and shared qualitative criteria such as originality, relevance and rigour. An international pilot study carried out in 2021 in 740 international academic journals of the publisher Elsevier, measured the effectiveness of the review processes, showing the relationship between the publication of evaluation reports and improvement of publications, in a logic not only of selection but of effective support for the development of the scientific product (Garcia-Costa et al., 2019).

In this context, it should be noted that the review processes are being completely reshaped, moving towards a scenario of democratic, open and continuous review (Ietto-Gillies, 2012; Shanahan & Olsen, 2014). The process is evolving towards greater collaboration and transparency, with initiatives such as disclosing the identities of reviewers and authors, and publishing review reports alongside articles. This facilitates direct interaction between authors and reviewers, as well as public engagement (Ross-Hellauer, 2017). An analysis carried out in 2019 on five Elsevier journals, made it possible to evaluate that the publication of evaluation reports does not change the objective behaviour of the evaluators (even if only 8% agreed to publish the evaluation report in non-anonymous form) (Bravo et al., 2019). An excellent example of transparent processes is the Open Research Europe platform, in which research publications resulting from funding from Horizon 2020, Horizon Europe and Euratom are published without fees through an open review process whose reports and related discussions are published next to the articles.

However, in Italy, the evaluation process for Class A journals (the list of journals with the highest level of reputation within the Italian research system according to ANVUR which encompasses a significant portion of the national scientific journals in the field of design) or VQR exercises remains opaque, as the reports are not disclosed to the public, except for individual authors under review. Moreover, this disclosure typically occurs in a fully anonymous manner, and the evaluation process lacks provisions for a dialogic exchange with the evaluator. An in-depth analysis of this type at a national and specific SSD level would serve to develop a solid basic knowledge and therefore consolidate a shared culture around the review processes, that could be relevant for the design discipline too. On the other hand, the practice towards a constructive review is not always obvious and sometimes the evaluation is perceived in a distorted way (Colarusso & Giancola, 2020) differently from abroad where it is considered very effective, even if the dimension of anonymity (Mulligan, Hall & Raphael, 2012).

In addition, even peer review is not free from implications and critical issues.

Some studies have begun to analyze the biases to which peer review can be subject, thus compromising its reliability and safety (Mulligan et al., 2012), also starting from cases of fallacious or fraudulent evaluation (Abambres et al., 2019). According to the Science Europe Position Statement and Recommendations on Research Assessment Processes (2019), the most often scrutinized potential biases were gender (82%) and discipline (77%). Other biases related to specific types of assessment, such as affiliation (62%) or seniority (49%) were also widely listed. Even the clause of anonymity and confidentiality of data between authors and reviewers (often requested by publishers and journals) does not guarantee constructive and quality reviews, nor does it allow us to compare and, therefore, improve the methods with which publishers manage the process. Birukou et al. (2011), discussing some controversies relating to peer review and some experimental practices, go so far as to propose alternative models such as community-based evaluation based on reputation and incentives.

The increasingly frequent possibility of updating and modifying or contributing to articles granted by journals and platforms through "updates" or "public response articles" is leading to the redistribution of review processes along the entire life cycle of a publication: from pre-publication review to post-publication, until continuous revision.

Hybrid formats such as visual essays, video articles, enhanced articles and in general contributions with interactive contents and reading paths that are not necessarily linear, require structural changes both in the review processes and in the skills of the reviewers, as well as a certain awareness of how the most recent developments in AI (Artificial Intelligence) can contribute to the processes of scientific writing and production in an automated way (Marconi, 2022), also causing the possibility of publishing scientifically altered or unverified information (De Kerckhove, 2022).

These conditions make the review ethically complex, to the extent that it underscores a tangible necessity for enhanced education in review culture, particularly within the domain of design. One approach could involve providing training for young researchers on the

evaluation of research published in academic journals (Pyrzczak & Tcherni-Buzzeo, 2019). Alternatively, initiatives such as The Design Journal's establishment of a College of Reviewers offer promising avenues. Within this framework, each member is paired with a mentor to foster a more coherent, high-quality, reliable, and excellent review process (Atkinson, Valentine & Christer, 2021).

At the same time, it is however possible to promote a more transparent review through incentives and rewards. Some publishing platforms publicly recognize and reward the work of reviewers, e.g., Orvium. Others, like Publons, showcase the impact of scholars based on their reviews and editorial activities for academic journals, offering recognition to often hidden peer review work.

Finally, review and assessment have a relevant impact on publishing patterns. In Italy there is a noticeable increase in the quantity of scientific production in 2016-2021 (due to the establishment of the ASN procedures and the scholars' effort to reach the threshold), and an increase in citations per article. But at the same time recent studies report an increase in "inwardness" (an indicator defined as the proportion of citations coming from the country over the total number of citations gathered by the country) due to the generalized strategic use of citations in the Italian scientific community, both in the form of strategic author self-citations and of citation clubs or "gaming" (Baccini, De Nicolao, Petrovich, 2019). According to those studies, the anomalous trends in the country self-citation rates of some countries, such as Italy, have been induced by the distorting effect of citation metrics-centred science policies, and suggest managing bibliometric indicators in research policy contexts with extreme caution (Baccini, Petrovich, 2023).

3. How assessment is changing: Existing good practices and recommendations

Following the controversy over the use of impact factor (Curry, 2018; Waltman & Traag, 2021) new open and collaborative ways to recognize the value of academic content have been promoted, regardless of where it is published, and the concept of assessment is increasingly moving from an initial quantitative logic to a qualitative one of responsible evaluation. The review of new practices discussed in this section encompasses various scientific domains, yet certain practices hold relevance and suitability for the field of design.

Signs in this sense are initiatives such as the 2013 San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA - Declaration on Research Assessment), the 2015 Leiden Manifesto for Research Metrics (Hicks et al. 2105), the Principles of Hong Kong for the 2020 researcher assessment (Moher et al., 2020), and recently the establishment of COARA - Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment of 2022. The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment has developed recommendations which, underlining the results of scientific research, denounce the impact factor as a tool focused only on peer-reviewed journals and suggest mitigating its use, evaluating the research products also based on merit through qualitative indicators of the impact, even outside the academic world - such as influence in

society, at the level of policies and practices in the socio-cultural, environmental, economic, institutional and community fields.

The Leiden Manifesto proposes, among its ten principles, to recognize the systemic effects of evaluation and indicators, for example by protecting excellence in locally relevant research.

Finally, COARA was promoted by the European Commission Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, launched in 2022, as a co-creation exercise, the drafting of an agreement in which more than 350 organizations participated (public and private research financiers, universities, research centres, accreditation and evaluation agencies, academic societies and associations of researchers representing a wide variety of views and perspectives) from fifty countries. As of July 2023, 596 organizations have already signed the agreement, including ANVUR. The coalition's perspective is that in the evaluation of research, researchers and research organizations must recognize outcomes, practices and activities that maximize the quality and impact of the research. This requires basing the evaluation primarily on qualitative judgment, for which peer review is central, supported by the responsible use of quantitative indicators. The number of institutions and publishers who claim to adopt responsible evaluation processes and show their criteria publicly is starting to increase, e.g., Imperial College is committed to using “fair, robust and transparent” procedures and has signed the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA). Interesting case studies are available on the same DORA website. Elsevier supports a combined qualitative and quantitative approach as well as the careful use of metrics and indicators in research evaluation and has given its endorsement of both DORA and the Leiden Manifesto.

In this framework, peer evaluation is recognized as one of the most “robust methods for quality assessment” (COARA, 2022).

ANVUR, in addition to having signed the Agreement on Research Assessment of the COARA coalition, has recently published a report drawn up by international experts about the 2015-2019 VQR exercise. In this report, out of the 21 recommendations provided, some specifically address the Human and Social Sciences (SSH), which are pertinent for non-bibliometric sectors, including design. These recommendations underscore the significance of adopting a more qualitative and pluralistic approach to evaluation, one that aligns closely with the interests and specificities of the design discipline. This entails embracing a holistic and integrated evaluation methodology, emphasizing the selection and training of reviewers and evaluation experts. Additionally, there is a call to discourage the reliance on metrics at the journal level and to establish compensation parameters tailored to disciplinary fields characterized by slower publication cycles. The recommendations also advocate for the recognition of monographs and works in their original language, promoting multilingualism, and acknowledging various research outcomes beyond traditional publications. Finally, the quality of research and publications increasingly calls into question not only the evaluation

of relevance and rigour but also impact. The impact of a scientific publication is based on searchability and reusability, i.e., it goes beyond mere citation.

The reuse of a publication today is therefore measured, in addition to traditional citation metrics, through qualitative metrics that measure awareness and interest.

Scite is an interesting example: it is an intelligent citation index that scans articles and categorizes, using machine learning, the intent of the citation by indicating whether, instead of a simple mention, the statement provides supporting or conflicting evidence for a referenced work (thus reusing existing knowledge to broaden reflection) (Nicholson et al., 2021).

However, in promoting a real alternative perspective on impact (Dinsmore, Allen & Dolby, 2014), it is crucial to go beyond measurement, albeit qualitative. According to the Research Quality Plus (RQ+) Assessment framework, although the use, influence and impact of research are not under the full control of researchers, it is reasonable to hold researchers accountable for the extent to which research is well positioned for use, based on the context in which it is designed and conducted (McLean et al., 2022). The criterion of "positioning for use" of research is based on the involvement of stakeholders and "actionability", i.e., the possibility of applying the results in the real world (McLean et al., 2022).

These emerging opportunities are yet to be fully integrated and systematically embraced within the realm of design.

4. Proposed “statement of practices” for a pluriverse perspective in the assessment of design research

Studies show that there is a mainstream methodological structure in ways of thinking, producing, and organising knowledge in design, mainly belonging to the Western and Anglo-Saxon centres (Trinidad & Pereira 2023).

Introducing a pluriversal approach can be therefore essential to develop opportunities that increase accessibility and visibility in design publications based on the values that the pluriversal concept proposes. In this context, we lack the space to comprehensively delve into the concept of pluriverse and pluriversal design, as elucidated by Escobar (2017, 2018, 2021). For the scope of this paper, we find it pertinent to highlight the concepts of alternative world-building and interdependence, as previously examined in a prior work by the authors (Formia et al., 2023). In the context of design publishing practices, these ideas suggest a transition from knowledge power dynamics to distributed knowledge and leadership processes. The challenges posed by this pluriversal perspective include a) facilitating the meaningful contributions of researchers from non-Western educational backgrounds without resorting to tokenism (Leitão & Noel, 2022); b) emphasizing indigenous/endogenous creativity (Cardini, 2022); c) fostering global permeability to multicultural influences and empirical multiperspective (Alvelos & Barreto, 2022).

Ruth Schmidt, of the Institute of Design (IIT), claims that research evaluation is essentially a question to be approached as a "human-centred design problem", since it is a complex system characterized by the interpretability of measurements and subject to behaviour: to redesign the evaluation of the research, thus, she suggests framing the issue from three different perspectives (institutional, individual and behavioural) and mapping the flows (Schmidt, 2019).

In this context of interpretability and behavioural complexity, as possible viable alternatives for the Design sector, we propose a real cultural change in the systems and processes of scientific evaluation, based on theoretical propositions but simultaneously grounded on exemplary "statements of practice", to detail them in specific interpretations of practical use.

We articulate our propositions according to two possible perspectives:

- a more pluriverse approach, which means a shift from the current and unequal models of power and knowledge control towards new knowledge leadership models (Mabey, Kulich & Lorenzi-Cioldi, 2012) distributing agency among all the stakeholders of the assessment system (institutions and individuals);
- a more situated and endogenous approach (Cardini, 2022) means shifting from a standardized system of assessment of the research products to a diversified system strongly anchored to the intrinsic nature of the products themselves.

These perspectives present our views on how the effort to address assessment practices in Italy embraces new forms of agency and power. We argue that the proliferation and complexification of the assessment framework of scientific production is pushing towards standardization, while the wider design research community ought to identify possible ways to innovate, by introducing responsible approaches and collaborative methodologies.

Thus, to detail our propositions, we first introduce the contemporary design debate on the two perspectives, by later exemplifying them through concrete experimental actions. These actions are a prototype that serves to bring up issues in a collective discussion concerning the assessment processes: a systematized research group has been established at a National level (*PRO.DES Research Group* within the *Società Italiana di Design -SID*).

4.1 Pluriversity and distributed stakeholders

The first perspective is strongly anchored to the concept of "pluriversality" which is receiving great attention in the Design debate, where concepts of inclusivity and intersectionality are becoming foundational. The global knowledge ecosystem is affected by ethnocentrism and witnesses Western monopolies of knowledge that built hegemonic structures and narratives (Fiormonte, 2017). Graham et al. (2011) presented a series of maps showing the cultural and geographical biases of global knowledge in terms of both infrastructure and cultural discourse; some authors speak about "peripheries countries", and Western domination seems to be untouched (Kieńć, 2017).

Academic scholarship and publication also reflect these unequal geographies of knowledge: the Western dictat “Publish or Perish” hinders the scientific advancement of the Global South and largely impacts the dissemination of local knowledge.

Considering the necessity to address pluriversality and multipolarity for new geopolitics of knowledge (Mignolo, 2018; Reiter, 2018; Escobar, 2018), is it possible to adopt a more equal system of research and publication assessment in which to valorize the pluriverse ecosystem of stakeholders?

In this sense, we propose a model in which leadership (i.e., guidance, direction) in assessment is not centralized, but distributed (and therefore more negotiated) among the plurality of actors living in the system, valuing more their interdependencies.

A first applicative case was materialized during the 8th International Forum of Design as a Process themed “Disrupting Geographies in the Design World” held in Bologna in June 2022. This endeavor was achieved through a collaborative effort involving three partner universities: the University of Bologna, Tecnológico de Monterrey, and Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. The international conference was organized by the Latin Network for the Development of Design as a Process (founded in 2008), whose aim is to promote the culture of systems and processes from a pluriversal perspective compared to the mainstream culture of industrial production. The original vocation of the Latin cultures was, over the years, extended to researchers and designers of the Mediterranean Area, Middle East, IOR (Indian Ocean Region), and Global South regions, intending to share new perspectives on how design futures can be imagined in a responsible and just perspective, at the forefront of change, building strategic partnerships, creating accessible knowledge. The theme of the 2022 edition was Disrupting Geographies in the Design World, with a call for investigations around the research question of how design principles and practices might adapt their approaches to attend to the diversity that characterizes the contemporary world. The concept of “disruptive geographies” was also used as the basis for the setting of background principles to be respected in the organization: the selection of keynote speakers followed a pluralistic vision; the promotion of the call in Global South regions; the accessibility of the registration fees; the blended system of presentation; the opportunity to publish in a well-established scientific journal.

Within this vision, the process also experimented with a new evaluation framework of the peer-review process of the long abstracts submitted to the 8th International Forum (for the sake of transparency, the research must point out that the Call for long abstracts was developed on a traditional submission system based in Europe and therefore intrinsically biased). This experimental process adopted an empirical methodology of evaluation based on not-Western-centric values that prioritised the valorisation of local knowledge, endemic design, community-led projects, design participation and co-creation, responsible innovation, social justice and ecocentrism. The Editorial Board of the conference was thoughtfully composed on a pluriversal principle, embracing diverse perspectives and voices to ensure a rich and inclusive scholarly discourse, including scholars from Brazil, United Arab

Emirates, Chile, Mexico, and Turkey. The Editorial Board, operating on a pluriversal principle, recognized the Forum as a dedicated publishing space for non-English native speakers. In a conscious effort to foster inclusivity, the reviewers were encouraged to evaluate submissions not only through traditional methodological approaches of scientific review but also by considering the research content relevance and the social significance and purpose of each project in the implemented area. This approach, influenced by the concept of excellence (Formia et al., 2023), deliberately steered away from penalizing authors for grammar mistakes or poor traditional methodological articles. Instead, emphasis was placed on the importance of well-structured and clear writing.

Furthermore, the Editorial Board concentrated on two essential aspects, drawing inspiration from works such as Gandini (2016) and Fecher et al. (2017): reputation and merit, rather than relying solely on metrics. This nuanced approach aimed to create a scholarly environment that values the quality and impact of the research over rigid linguistic or methodological standards. To ensure transparency and fairness, all proponents were duly informed of the specific criteria adopted for evaluation.

The peer-review process resulted in a 90% acceptance rate of abstracts submitted (of which 40% of submissions from the Global South) and total acceptance of full papers submitted for publication based on the above evaluation criteria. The increasing accessibility to international research venues represented an answer to the hierarchy of scientific values from high-income countries over low-middle-income countries (Kieńć, 2017; Nicholas et al., 2017).

4.2 Endogenesis and tailored assessment

The second perspective is anchored to the concept of biocultural diversity of knowledge, research and publication in Design (Lupo & et al., in press). This is a crucial aspect to avoid losing knowledge capital (Hayama & Zurlo, 2020).

In this context, recognising and implementing diverse cultural practices contribute to the epistemological pluralisation of processes. Paolo Cardini (2022) argues that empirical and vernacular knowledge is a kind of design that belongs to people, not vice versa. According to the author, global design practices have often played the role of exogenous entities: experts and saviours who, through careful analysis of any context, are supposedly capable of creating universal solutions wherever there is a problem to be solved. Global design practices belong to the hemisphere of the Global North, often disregarding the intertwining and plurality of cultural identities in favour of a hegemonic scientific truth. However, design is now reconnecting with endogenous and endemic practices to recognise and raise awareness of the inevitable epistemological impact of dominant narratives and canons on the global design community.

According to Valentine (2022), while maintaining the integrity of the design community and the quality and rigour of the research dialogue proposed by scientific journals, it is fundamental to respect diversity and remove unintended bias, through alternative formats

of scientific products that valorize disciplinary specificities and support people, cultures, and universities to participate in the transition processes of the publishing system. This can also be translated into the field of knowledge assessment. Considering the necessity to experiment with new forms of knowledge production and diffusion, how is it possible to create an adequate system of assessment? Is it possible to adopt principles of transparency, situatedness, and inclusion?

In this sense, we propose a model for the experimentation of new peer review processes and formats.

A second applicative case was developed within *diid - Disegno Industriale Industrial Design scientific journal* based in Italy. *diid* Journal is published three times a year, as an open-access and peer-reviewed journal. It was founded in 2022 to fill a gap concerning scientific journals related to industrial design and design studies. The one inaugurated in 2021, with issue 73, was a new phase when the journal became digital and open access. This was the occasion to review the editorial policies, the committees, the indexing system, and the structure of contents, by adopting a pluriversal approach to face the scientific design community. This ongoing path towards forms of decolonizing knowledge production in the design field also implied the experimentation of new models for quality and impact assessment. The aim was to expand the realm of the Journal by welcoming innovative forms of publication, conferring to them an identarian assessment process. Beyond the traditional Research and Experimentation Papers, the Journal introduced a) Conversation Pieces, b) Reportages and c) Case Studies Papers. These formats are expressively oriented towards the enrichment of editorial solutions. They have elements of provocation that allow researchers to explore design practices more freely.

In the first case (a), the format is strongly anchored to the need to face the front end of the contemporary and future-oriented debate by hosting representatives who are more used to working with the discipline's applicative and less theoretical side. In the second case (b), it is anchored to a typical design research methodology based on the quali/quantitative analysis of contemporary case studies and best practices to be modeled to orient future development of the design project. The third case (c) is crucial for illustrating practical applications of theories and methodologies through real-world examples. The traditional form of peer review was then tailored to respond to new qualitative and quantitative indicators depending on the specific and identity nature of these formats.

Quantitative and qualitative indicators for traditional research articles typically include criteria such as originality, methodological validity, and impact. For Conversation Pieces and Case Studies Papers, new indicators emphasize non-anonymous participation, contribution originality, experimental dimensions, and the inclusion of representative images. The proposed editorial format aims to assess participant richness, originality levels, experimentation, and the use of visual elements.

In the experimental process, questions arise about evaluating originality in unconventional contexts and balancing participation with authorship. Challenges include defining standards

for participant richness and managing ethical issues related to non-anonymity in the case of Conversation Pieces. Addressing these issues will require a collaborative approach within the research group and the design academic community as a whole.

5. Conclusions

Knowledge leadership can be defined as an attitude or action that drives people to create, share and use new and important knowledge to bring change in collective thinking and outcomes (Mabey, Kulich & Lorenzi-Cioldi, 2012). Knowledge leadership is, by definition, complex and beyond the reach of a single actor, involving a range of agencies (Haynes 2003; Koppenjan and Klijn 2004).

In this respect, the concept of enabling distributed knowledge leadership is in the mission of the Research Group *PRO.DES* from which this research and investigation initiated. The group is active at a national level and together with plurality on research assessment is addressing other issues e.g., plurality in the forms of publications (new publication typologies), in publishing processes (investigation on the diversity of design journals in terms of geographic variety and gender composition of editorship and journal boards) and in content and issues.

For what concern the assessment ecosystem the research group is experimenting and supporting distributed forms of sharing evaluation knowledge among the stakeholders:

- Institutional bodies, like the Governmental Agency for Research Evaluation and Scientific Societies, should proactively address challenges in evaluation procedures. They should also contribute to defining and formalizing scientific products for accreditation in non-bibliometric disciplines.
- Academic institutions, in addition to formal declarations, must promote real processes of responsible and plural evaluation, recognizing the value and nature of local research, the specificities of the career phase and profiles of researchers and the specific objective of the evaluation (publication, career advancement, funding), avoiding biases.
- Researchers must avoid unconscious bias resulting in fallacious or fraudulent evaluation to avoid all the distorting effects of evaluation, i.e., the adaptation and continuous change of their publication models to the evaluation criteria based on convenience and excessive self-referentiality.
- strengthen international collaboration to address imbalances in research cooperation with high-income countries, as it is a frequent criticism that research partners from high-income countries frequently maintain control over research projects.

In conclusion, the assessment of design research is undergoing a transformative journey. Two emergent assessment models are proposed by this study: 1) a pluriversal approach, redistributing agency among all stakeholders, exemplified through the "Disrupting Geographies" conference; and 2) a situated, endogenous approach, recognizing and

valorizing diverse cultural practices in design, illustrated by the diid Journal's tailored assessment process for Conversation Pieces and Case Studies Papers. These innovations aim to address challenges of standardization, promoting responsible approaches and collaborative methodologies. The examples presented show how to bring theoretical positions like propositions and recommendations into viable and practical interpretations applicable to different contexts. Both experiments are currently ongoing and hold potential for further expansion and analysis, to integrate them into regular practice. The arguments presented herein will be fortified through forthcoming studies and papers. Critical questions persist regarding the evaluation of originality within unconventional contexts, the management of non-anonymous participation, and the optimization of indicators for these innovative formats. These challenges underscore the continuous dedication to nurturing inclusive, diverse, and impactful design research, while also delineating avenues for future exploration in the field.

6. References

- Abambres, M., Salloom, T., Beganovic, N., Dojka, R., Roncallo-Dow, S., Verna, T., & Takhar, S. (2019). Bye Bye Peer-Reviewed Publishing. HAL Id: hal-02114531. <https://hal.science/hal-02114531v3>
- Alvelos H. & Barreto S. (2022). Contributions towards a plurality in design narratives: Addressing dynamics between global and local discourses, *The Design Journal*, 25:6, 934-954, DOI: 10.1080/14606925.2022.2125731
- Baccini, A., Barabesi, L., De Nicolao, G. (2020) On the agreement between bibliometrics and peer review: Evidence from the Italian research assessment exercises. *PLoS ONE* 15(11): e0242520. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242520>
- Baccini A, De Nicolao G, Petrovich E (2019) Citation gaming induced by bibliometric evaluation: A country-level comparative analysis. *PLoS ONE* 14(9): e0221212. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0221212>
- Baccini, A., Petrovich, E. (2023). A global exploratory comparison of country self-citations 1996-2019 [10.48550/arXiv.2303.08090].
- Birukou, A., Wakeling, J. R., Bartolini, C., Casati, F., Marchese, M., Mirylenka, K., Osman, N., Ragone, A., Sierra, C., & Wassef, A. (2011). Alternatives to peer review: novel approaches for research evaluation. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, 5, 56.
- Bravo, G., Grimaldo, F., López-Iñesta, E., Mehmani, B., & Squazzoni, F. (2019). The effect of publishing peer review reports on referee behavior in five scholarly journals. *Nature Communication*, 10, 322. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-08250-2>
- Cardini, P. (2002). Endogenesis. *diid - Disegno Industriale Industrial Design*, 76, 16-21.
- Curry S. (2018). Let's move beyond the rhetoric: it's time to change how we judge research. *Nature*, 554, 147. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-01642-w>
- Escobar, A. (2017). Sustaining the Pluriverse: The Political Ontology of Territorial Struggles in Latin America." In *The Anthropology of Sustainability: Beyond Development and Progress*, edited by Marc Brightman and Jerome Lewis, 237–256. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Escobar, A. (2018). *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Escobar, A. (2020). *Pluriversal Politics: The Real and the Possible*. Durham: Duke University Press.

- Fecher, B., Friesike, S., Hebing, M., & Linek, S. (2017). A reputation economy: how individual reward considerations trump systemic arguments for open access to data. *Palgrave Communications*, 3, 17051.
- Fiormonte, D. (2017). Digital Humanities and the Geopolitics of Knowledge. *Digital Studies/le Champ Numérique*, 7(1), 5.
- Formia E.M., Lupo, E., Mehmeti, L. (2023) Designing Pluriverse Knowledge in Design Research: The Case of the 8th International Forum of Design as a Process, in: 15th International Conference of the European Academy of Design, São Paulo, Blucher Design Proceedings, 2023, pp. 280 – 293.
- Gandini A. (2016). *The Reputation Economy. Understanding Knowledge Work in Digital Society*. Palgrave.
- Garcia-Costa, D., Squazzoni, F., Mehmani, B., Grimaldo, F. (2022). Measuring the developmental function of peer review: a multi-dimensional, cross-disciplinary analysis of peer review reports from 740 academic journals. *PeerJ*. 10:e13539. <http://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.13539>
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 101(2), 366-385. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021847>
- Hayama, Y., & Zurlo, F. (2020). Narrazioni del cambiamento attraverso il design: Una prospettiva di design strategico verso futuri alternativi per la sostenibilità. *AND Rivista Di Architetture, Città E Architetti*, 38(2), 22-29. <https://www.and-architettura.it/index.php/and/article/view/402>
- Heesen, R., & Bright, L. K. (2021). Is Peer Review a Good Idea? *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 72(3), 635–663. <https://doi.org/10.1093/BJPS/AXZ029>
- Hicks D. Performance-based university research funding systems. *Research Policy*. 2012; 41(2):251–261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2011.09.007>
- Leitão R. M., Noel L.A. (2022) Special Forum: Designing a World of Many Centers, *Design and Culture*, 14:3, 247-253, DOI: 10.1080/17547075.2022.2110796
- letto-Gillies, G. (2012). The evaluation of research papers in the XXI century. The Open Peer Discussion system of the World Economics Association. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, 6, 54. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2012.00054>
- Lupo, E., Formia, E.M, Mehmeti, L. (in press). Supporting cultural biodiversity of knowledge, research and publication in design. *Proceedings of the Conference SID Società Italiana del Design*, Pescara, Italy, 2023.
- Kieńć, W. (2017). Authors from the periphery countries choose open access more often (preprint). *figshare. Dataset*. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.3635808.v2>
- Mignolo, W. (2018). Foreword: On Pluriversality and Multipolarity.” In B. Reiter (Ed.), *Constructing the Pluriverse: The Geopolitics of Knowledge* (pp. ix–xv). Duke University Press.
- Mulligan, A., Hall, L., & Raphael, E. (2012). Peer review in a changing world: An international study measuring the attitudes of researchers. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 64(1), 132-161 <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22798>
- Nicholas, D., Rodríguez-Bravo, B., Watkinson, A., Boukacem-Zeghmouri, C., Herman, E., Xu, J., Abrizah, A. & Świgoń, M. (2017). Early career researchers and their publishing and authorship practices. *Learned Publishing*, 30, 205-217. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1102>
- Reiter, B. (Ed.). (2018) *Constructing the Pluriverse: The Geopolitics of knowledge*. Duke University Press. <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9781478002017/html#contents>
- Shanahan, D.R., & Olsen, B. R. (2014). Opening peer-review: the democracy of science (editorial), *Journal of Negative Results in BioMedicine*, 13, 2 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-5751-13-2>
- Traag VA, Waltman L. Systematic analysis of agreement between metrics and peer review in the UK

- REF. Palgrave Communications. 2019; 5(1):29. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0233-x>
- Trindade Perry G., Leônidas Soares Pereira, L., (2023). Global diversity in design research: A bibliometric investigation of design journals, *Design Studies*, Volume 88, Sept. 2023, 101217
- Waltman L., Traag V.A. (2021). Use of the journal impact factor for assessing individual articles: Statistically flawed or not?. *F1000 Research*, 9, 366
- Wilsdon, J., Allen, L., Belfiore, E., Campbell, P., Curry, S., Hill, S., Jones, R., Kain, R., Kerridge, S., Thelwall, M., Tinkler, J., Viney, I., Wouters, P., Hill, J. and Johnson, B. (2015). *The Metric Tide: Report of the Independent Review of the Role of Metrics in Research Assessment and Management*. London: Sage.

About the Authors:

Elena Maria Formia, is Full Professor in Design at the Department of Architecture of the Alma Mater Studiorum - Università di Bologna, where she is Director of First Cycle Degree in Industrial Design and the Second Cycle Degree in Advanced Design.

Eleonora Lupo, PhD in Industrial design and multimedia communication is Associate Professor in Design at Politecnico di Milano. Her research interests are mainly Humanities and Culture Driven Innovation, Design for Cultural Heritage and Product and process design cultures.

Lorela Mehmeti is a PhD Student in Architecture and Design Cultures. Her current work focuses on the analysis of scientific production and critical analyses of design cultures. She is currently Associate Editor of the Italian scientific journal *diid.disegno industrial industrial design*.

**PROCEEDINGS OF
DRS 2024 BOSTON**

Design Research
Society International
Conference
23 – 28 June 2024
Boston, MA, USA

**COVER AND CONFERENCE
IDENTITY DESIGNED**

by Viviane Kim

PROCEEDINGS COMPILED

by Colin M. Gray

EDITORS

Colin M. Gray
Estefania Ciliotta Chehade
Paul Hekkert
Laura Forlano
Paolo Ciuccarelli
Peter Lloyd

ISBN 978-1-912294-62-6



9 781912 294626

WWW.DRS 2024.ORG