

PROCEEDINGS OF DRS

DRS 2016

27-30 JUNE 2016

VOLUME 3

50th Anniversary Conference Brighton, UK

Design + Research + Society Future-Focused Thinking

EDITED BY:
PETER LLOYD
ERIK BOHEMIA

This page is intentionally left blank.

Proceedings of DRS 2016

Design + Research + Society
Future–Focused Thinking

50th Anniversary International Conference
Brighton, UK, 27–30 June 2016

Volume 3

Editors
Peter Lloyd and Erik Bohemia

This page is intentionally left blank.

Proceedings of DRS

2016 International Conference
28–30 June 2016, Brighton, UK
www.drs2016.org
Volumes 3 of 10

Cover and conference identity design by Gavin Ambrose, Nikki Brewster and Seamus White
Proceedings compiled by Kaajal Modi

Editors: Peter Lloyd and Erik Bohemia

Section-Editors: Harriet Atkinson; Leonard Bachman; Giovanni Baule; Michaël Berghman; Noemi Bitterman; Alison Black; Rebecca Cain; Elena Caratti; Rachel Cooper; Anne Cranny-Francis; Tejas Dhadphale; Hua Dong; Bianca Elzenbaumer; Carolina Escobar-Tello; Luke Feast; Tom Fisher; Aija Freimanee; Lorraine Gamman; Valeria Graziano; Camilla Groth; Marte Gulliksen; Paul Hekkert; Derek Jones; Sarah Kettley; Tore Kristensen; Sylvia Liu; Geke Ludden; Jamie Mackrill; Maarit Mäkelä; Betti Marenko; Andrew Morris; Kristina Niedderer; Nithikul Nimkulrat; Maya Oppenheimer; Elif Ozcan; Verena Paepcke-Hjeltness; Ann Petermans; Philip Plowright; Tiiu Poldma; Hendrik Schifferstein; Pirita Seitamaa-Hakkarainen; Qian Sun; Michael Tovey; Rhoda Trimmingham; Kim Trogal; Nynke Tromp; Mieke van der Bijl-Brouwer; Sue Walker; Alex Wilkie; Alex Williams; Seda Yilmaz



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 2016 International Conference: Future–Focused Thinking

ISSN 2398-3132

Published by the Design Research Society
Loughborough University, London
3 Lesney Avenue, The Broadcast Centre, Here East
London, E15 2GZ
United Kingdom

Design Research Society Secretariat
email: admin@designresearchsociety.org
website: www.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 Special Interest Groups

Design for Behaviour Change
Design for Health, Wellbeing and Happiness
Design Innovation Management
Design Pedagogy
Design for Sustainability
Design for Tangible, Embedded and Networked Technologies
Experiential Knowledge
Inclusive Design
Objects, Practices, Experiences, Networks

DRS International Conference Series

DRS 2002 London; DRS 2004 Melbourne; DRS 2006 Lisbon; DRS 2008 Sheffield; DRS 2010 Montreal; DRS 2012 Bangkok; DRS 2014 Umeå

DRS 2016 Programme Committee

Conference Chair

Peter Lloyd, University of Brighton, UK

Conference Co-Chairs

Tracy Bhamra, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Stephen Boyd-Davis, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Jonathan Chapman, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Peter Childs, Imperial College, United Kingdom

International Scientific Review Committee

Tracy Bhamra, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Erik Bohemia, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Lin Lin Chen, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taiwan
Nathan Crilly, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
Paul Hekkert, TU Delft, The Netherlands
Peter Lloyd, University of Brighton, UK

Debates, Conversations and Workshops Chairs

Stella Boess, TU Delft, The Netherlands
Carlos Peralta, University of Brighton, UK
Cameron Tonkinwise, Carnegie Mellon University, US

Conference Experience Chairs

Dan Lockton, Royal College of Art, UK
Veronica Ranner, Royal College of Art, UK

PhD by Design

Bianca Elzenbaumer, Leeds College of Art, UK
Maria Portugal, Goldsmiths University, UK
Alison Thomson, Goldsmiths University, UK

DRS Special Interest Group Chairs

Erik Bohemia, Loughborough University, UK
Rebecca Cain, Warwick University, UK
Hua Dong, Tongji University, China
Tom Fisher, Nottingham Trent University, UK
Sarah Kettle, Nottingham Trent University, UK
Kristina Niedderer, University of Wolverhampton, UK
Nithikul Nimkulrat, Estonian Academy of Arts, Tallinn
Michael Tovey, Coventry University, UK
Rhoda Trimmingham, Loughborough University, UK

Executive Advisors

Carl DiSalvo, Georgia Institute of Technology, US
Kees Dorst, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia
Janet McDonnell, University of the Arts London, UK
Johan Redström, Umeå Institute of Design, Sweden
Erik Stolterman, Indiana University, US
Anna Valtonen, Aalto School of Arts, Design and Architecture, Finland

International Board of Reviewers

Tom Ainsworth, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Katerina Alexiou, The Open University, United Kingdom
Manola Antonioli, Ecole Nationale Supérieure d'Architecture Paris La Villette, France
Rina Arya, Wolverhampton, United Kingdom
Harriet Atkinson, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Stephen Awoniyi, Texas State University, United States
Jeremy Aynsley, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Leonard Bachman, University of Houston College of Architecture, United States
Betsy Barnhart, Iowa State University, United States
Giovanni Baule, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Nigan Bayazit, Istanbul Technical University, Turkey
Michaël Berghman, TU Delft, Netherlands
Tracy Bhamra, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Richard Bibb, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Noemi Bitterman, Technion, Israel
Alison Black, Reading University, United Kingdom
Janneke Blijlevens, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology University, Australia
Anne Boddington, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Stella Boess, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Erik Bohemia, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Casper Boks, NTNU, Norway
Elizabeth Boling, Indiana University, United States
Andy Boucher, Goldsmiths, University of London, United Kingdom
Simon Bowen, Newcastle University, United Kingdom
Stephen Boyd Davis, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Jamie Brassett, Central Saint Martins, United Kingdom
Philip Breedon, Nottingham Trent University, United Kingdom
Charlie Breindahl, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Denmark
Patrick Bresnihan, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland
Cheryl Buckley, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Jacob Buur, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
Rebecca Cain, University of Warwick, United Kingdom
Elena Caratti, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Philip Cash, DTU, Denmark
Tom Cassidy, University of Leeds, United Kingdom
Julia Cassim, Kyoto Institute of Technology, Japan
Jonathan Chapman, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Chien-Hsiung Chen, Taiwan Tech, Taiwan, R.O.C.
Chun-Chih Chen, National Kaohsiung Normal University, Taiwan, R.O.C.
Chun-Di Chen, National Taipei University of Education, Taiwan, R.O.C.
Kuohsiang Chen, I-Shou University, Taiwan, R.O.C.
Lin-Lin Chen, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taiwan, R.O.C.
Peter Childs, Imperial College London, United Kingdom
Wen-Ko Chiou, Chang Gung University, Taiwan, R.O.C.
Bo Christensen, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark
Henri Christiaans, UNIST, School of Design & Human Engineering, South Korea
Abdusselam Selami Cifter, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Turkey
Nazli Cila, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands
Mollie Claypool, University College London, United Kingdom
Stephen Clune, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Tim Cooper, Nottingham Trent University, United Kingdom
Anne Cranny-Francis, University of Technology Sydney, Australia
Nathan Crilly, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
Odette da Silva, TU Delft, Netherlands
Massimo De Angelis, University of East London, United Kingdom
Michel de Blois, Université Laval, Canada
Cees de Bont, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong
Christine de Lille, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Jakki Dehn, Jakki Dehn Materials, United Kingdom

Federico Del Giorgio Solfa, National University of La Plata, Argentina
Claudio Dell'Era, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Samuel DeMarie, Iowa State University, United States
Halime Demirkan, Bilkent University, Turkey
Gaurang Desai, American University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates
Pieter Desmet, TU Delft, Netherlands
Emma Dewberry, The Open University, United Kingdom
Sarah Diefenbach, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Germany
Ingvild Digranes, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway
Orsalia Dimitriou, Central Saint Martins, United Kingdom
Hua Dong, Tongji University, China
Dennis Doordan, University of Notre Dame, United States
Kees Dorst, University of Technology Sydney, Australia
Shelby Doyle, Iowa State University, United States
Alex Duffy, University of Strathclyde, United Kingdom
Delia Dumitrescu, University of Borås, United Kingdom
Abigail Durrant, Newcastle University, United Kingdom
Thomas Dykes, Northumbria University, United Kingdom
Wouter Eggink, University of Twente, Netherlands
Bianca Elzenbaumer, Leeds College of Art, United Kingdom
Magnus Eneberg, Konstfack - University College of Arts, Crafts and Design, Sweden
Alpay Er, Ozyegin University / Istanbul Institute of Design, Turkey
Ozlem Er, Istanbul Technical University, Turkey
Pia Geisby Erichsen, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
Carolina Escobar-Tello, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Juhyun Eune, Seoul National University, South Korea
Mark Evans, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Luke Feast, Aalto University, Finland
Thomas Fischer, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, China
Tom Fisher, Nottingham Trent University, United Kingdom
Kate Tanya Fletcher, London College of Fashion, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Jodi Forlizzi, Carnegie Mellon University, United States
Lois Frankel, Carleton University, Canada
Jill Franz, Queensland University of Technology, Australia
Biljana Fredriksen, University College of Southeast Norway, Norway
Ken Friedman, Tongji University, China
Jennifer Gabrys, Goldsmiths, University of London, United Kingdom
Loraine Gamman, Central Saint Martins, University of the Arts, United Kingdom
Nick Gant, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Philippe Gauthier, Université de Montréal, Canada
Aysar Ghassan, Coventry University, United Kingdom
Katherine Gibson, University of Western Sydney, Australia
Carolina Gill, The Ohio State University, United States
Steve Gill, Cardiff Met University, United Kingdom
Maria Goransdotter, Umeå University, Sweden
Colin Gray, Purdue University, United States
Camilla Groth, Aalto University, School of Arts, Design and Architecture, Finland
Marte Sørebo Gulliksen, Telemark University College, Norway
Ian Gwilt, Sheffield Hallam University, United Kingdom
Robert Harland, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Dew Harrison, University of Wolverhampton, United Kingdom
Steve Harrison, Virginia Tech, United States
Marc Hassenzahl, Folkwang University of the Arts, Germany
Anders Haug, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
Tero Heikkinen, independent / University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland
Tincuta Heinzl, Nottingham Trent University, United Kingdom
Paul Hekkert, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Bart Hengeveld, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, Netherlands
Ricardo Hernandez, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Ann Heylighen, KU Leuven, Belgium
Clive Hilton, Coventry University, United Kingdom

Michael Hohl, Anhalt University of Applied Sciences, Germany
Chung-Ching Huang, National Taiwan University, Taiwan, R.O.C.
Karl Hurn, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Praima Israsena Na Ayudhya, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand
Robert Jerrard, Manchester Metropolitan Univ/Birmingham City Univ, United Kingdom
Wolfgang Jonas, Braunschweig University of Art, Germany
Derek Jones, The Open University, United Kingdom
Peter Jones, OCAD University, Canada
Rachel Jones, Instrata, United Kingdom
Guy Julier, University of Brighton/Victoria and Albert Museum, United Kingdom
Sabine Junginger, Hertie School of Governance, Germany
Lorraine Justice, Rochester Institute of Technology, United States
Faith Kane, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Helen Kennedy, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Tobie Kerridge, Goldsmiths, University of London, United Kingdom
Richard Arthur Kettley, Nottingham Trent University, United Kingdom
Sarah Kettley, Nottingham Trent University, United Kingdom
Jinsook Kim, Trinity Christian College, United States
Lucy Kimbell, UAL, United Kingdom
Holger Klapperich, Folkwang University of Arts, Germany
Maaïke Kleinsmann, TU Delft, Netherlands
Ben Kraal, Queensland University of Technology, Australia
Ksenija Kuzmina, Loughborough University London, United Kingdom
John Langrish, Salford University, United Kingdom
Keelin Leahy, University of Limerick, Ireland
Helmut Leder, University of Vienna, Austria
Ji-Hyun Lee, KAIST, South Korea
Yanki Lee, Hong Kong Design Institute, Hong Kong
Eva Lenz, Folkwang University of Arts, Germany
Pierre Levy, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands
Debra Lilley, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Rungtai Lin, National Taiwan University of Arts, Taiwan, R.O.C.
Stephen Little, Asia Pacific Technology Network, United Kingdom
Sylvia Liu, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong
Peter Lloyd, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Kathy Pui Ying, Lo, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Dan Lockton, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Vicky Lofthouse, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Lian Loke, University of Sydney, Australia
Nicole Lotz, The Open University, United Kingdom
Rachael Luck, The Open University, United Kingdom
Geke Ludden, University of Twente, Netherlands
Rohan Lulham, University of Technology Sydney, Australia
Ole Lund, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway
Alastair Macdonald, Glasgow School of Art, United Kingdom
Fiona Maciver, Norwich University of the Arts, United Kingdom
Jamie Mackrill, Imperial College London, United Kingdom
Anja Maier, Technical University of Denmark, Denmark
Maarit Mäkelä, Aalto University, Finland
Betti Marenko, Central Saint Martins, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Ben Mathews, The University of Queensland, Australia
Tuuli Mattelmäki, Aalto University, Finland
Ramia Mazé, Aalto University, Finland
Sanjoy Mazumdar, University of California, Irvine, United States
Janet McDonnell, Central Saint Martins, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Chris McGinley, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Tomislav Medak, Multimedia Institute, Croatia
Wellington Gomes de Medeiros, Federal University of Campina Grande, Brazil
Brian Mennecke, Iowa State University, United States
Paul Micklethwaite, Kingston University, United Kingdom
Karen Miller, University of Brighton, United Kingdom

Val Mitchell, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Kathryn Moore, Birmingham City University, United Kingdom
Michael Moore, Ulster University, United Kingdom
Sarah Morehead, Northumbria University, United Kingdom
Nicola Morelli, Aalborg University, Denmark
Mariale Moreno, Cranfield University, United Kingdom
Andrew Morris, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Andrew Morrison, AHO, Norway
Jeanne-Louise Moys, Reading University, United Kingdom
Tara Mullaney, Umeå Institute of Design, Sweden
Yukari Nagai, Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Japan
Ki Young Nam, KAIST, South Korea
Kristina Niedderer, Wolverhampton University, United Kingdom
Liv Merete Nielsen, Oslo and Akershus university college, Norway
Nithikul Nimkulrat, Estonian Academy of Arts, Estonia
Conall Ó Catháin, Past Chairman DRS, Ireland
Arlene Oak, University of Alberta, Canada
Maya Oppenheimer, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Elif Ozcan, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Kursat Ozenc, Stanford, United States
Verena Paepcke-Hjeltness, Iowa State University, United States
Eujin Pei, Brunel University London, United Kingdom
Carlos Peralta, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
José Pérez de Lama, University of Sevilla, Spain
Oscar Person, Aalto University, Finland
Ann Petermans, Hasselt University, Belgium
Daniela Petrelli, Sheffield Hallam University, United Kingdom
Doina Petrescu, The University of Sheffield, United Kingdom
Ida Nilstad Pettersen, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Norway
Sarah Pink, RMIT University, Australia
Silvia Pizzocaro, Politecnico di Milano, Italy
Philip Plowright, Lawrence Technological University, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, United States
Anna Pohlmeier, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Tiiu Poldma, University of Montreal, Canada
Lubomir Popov, Bowling Green State University, United States
Vesna Popovic, Queensland University of Technology, Australia
Thomas Porathe, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway
Ruben Post, TU Delft, Netherlands
William Prindle, Iowa State University, United States
Charlie Ranscombe, Swinburne, Australia
Yaone Rapitsenyane, University of Botswana, Botswana
Ingo Rauth, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden
Kirstine Riis, University College Telemark, Norway
Paul Rodgers, Northumbria University, United Kingdom
Zoe Romano, WeMake, Makerspace, Italy
Jose Antonio Rosa, Iowa State University, United States
Seymour Roworth-Stokes, Coventry University, United Kingdom
Robin Roy, The Open University, United Kingdom
Keith Russell, University of Newcastle, Australia, Australia
Daniel Saakes, KAIST, South Korea
Noemi Maria Sadowska, Regent's University London, United Kingdom
Miguel Said Vieira, Independent, Brazil
Fatina Saikaly, Co-Creando, Italy
Filippo Salustri, Ryerson University, Canada
Liz Sanders, The Ohio State University, United States
Rick Schifferstein, TU Delft, Netherlands
James Self, UNIST, South Korea
Nick Senske, Iowa State University, United States
Matt Sinclair, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Kin Wai Michael Siu, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong
Dirk Snelders, TU Delft, Netherlands

Ricardo Sosa, Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand
Chris Speed, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom
Jak Spencer, The Sound HQ, United Kingdom
Kay Stables, Goldsmiths, University of London, United Kingdom
Pieter Jan Stappers, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
Shanti Sumartojo, RMIT University, Australia
Kärt Summatavet, Aalto University, Estonia
Qian Sun, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Helena Sustar, Aalto University, Finland
Gunnar Swanson, East Carolina University, United States
Ben Sweeting, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Keith Tam, University of Reading, United Kingdom
Hsien-Hui Tang, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taiwan, R.O.C.
Toshiharu Taura, Kobe University, Japan
Damon Taylor, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
Sarah Teasley, Royal College of Art, United Kingdom
Adam Thorpe, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Clementine Thurgood, University of Technology Sydney, Australia
Jeremy Till, Central Saint Martins, University of the Arts London, United Kingdom
Oscar Tomico, Eindhoven University of Technology, United Kingdom
Cameron Tonkinwise, Carnegie Mellon University, United States
Mike Tovey, Coventry University, United Kingdom
Rhoda Trimmingham, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Nynke Tromp, TU Delft, Netherlands
Darren Umney, Open University, United Kingdom
Louise Valentine, University of Dundee, United Kingdom
Anna Valtonen, Aalto University, Finland
Mieke van der Bijl-Brouwer, University of Technology Sydney, Australia
Johann van der Merwe, Independent Researcher, South Africa
Mascha van der Voort, University of Twente, Netherlands
Karel van der Waarde, Graphic Design - Research, Belgium
Susann Vihma, Aalto University, Finland
Andre Viljoen, University of Brighton, United Kingdom
John Vines, Newcastle University, United Kingdom
Bettina von Stamm, Innovation Leadership Forum, United Kingdom
Sue Walker, Reading University, United Kingdom
Renee Wever, Linköping University, Sweden
Alex Wilkie, Goldsmiths, University of London, United Kingdom
Alex Williams, Kingston University, United Kingdom
Garrath Wilson, Loughborough University, United Kingdom
Heather Wiltse, Umeå University, Sweden
Christian Woelfel, TU Dresden, Germany
Martin Woolley, Coventry University, United Kingdom
Paul Wormald, National University of Singapore, Singapore
Artemis Yagou, Macromedia University for Media and Communication, Germany
Joyce Yee, Northumbria University, United Kingdom
Susan Yelavich, The New School, United States
Seda Yilmaz, Iowa State University, United States
Robert Young, Northumbria University, United Kingdom

This page is intentionally left blank

Table of Content

Editorial..... i

– Volume 1 –

SECTION 1 50 YEARS OF DESIGN RESEARCH

Design Research: What is it? What is it for?.....	5
Victor Margolin	
Schön's Legacy: Examining Contemporary Citation Practices in DRS Publications.....	17
Jordan Beck, Laureline Chiapello	
The Idea of Architecture, The User As Inhabitant: Design through a Christopher Alexander Lens.....	31
Molly Wright Steenson	
Design Research for Sustainability: Historic Origin and Development.....	43
Astrid Skjerven	
The Design Methods Movement: From Optimism to Darwinism.....	51
John Z. Langrish	
User Design: Constructions of the "user" in the history of design research.....	65
Theodora Vardouli	
60 years of creativity in business organizations.....	83
Ricardo Sosa, Pete Rive and Andy M. Connor	
20th Century Boys: Pioneering British Design Thinkers.....	97
Emma Murphy and Martyn Evans	
Design Research and Design Participation.....	111
Robert Aish	
The Design Research Society in the 1980s and 1990s: a memoir.....	125
Conall Ó Catháin	

SECTION 2 AESTHETIC PLEASURE IN DESIGN

Introduction: Aesthetic Pleasure in Design.....	139
Michaël Berghman and Paul Hekkert	
Measuring design typicality – a comparison of objective and subjective approaches.....	145
Stefan Mayer and Jan R. Landwehr	
Most Advanced yet Acceptable: A case of referential form-driven meaning innovation.....	157
Seong geun Lee, James Self and Ekaterina Andrietc	
Extracting Design Aesthetic Heuristics from Scientific Literature.....	179
Ana Cadavid, Stefany Ruiz-Córdoba and Jorge Maya	
Putting product design in context: Consumer responses to design fluency as a function of presentation context.....	203
Laura K. M. Graf and Jan R. Landwehr	
The Value of Transparency for Designing Product Innovations.....	215
Peiyao Cheng and Ruth Mugge	
A comparison between colour preference and colour harmony – taking athletic shoe design as an example.....	233
Li-Chen Ou	
Creating Novel Encounters with Nature: Approaches and Design Explorations.....	245
Thomas J. L. Van Rompay and Geke D. S. Ludden	
Introducing Experience Goals into Packaging Design.....	259
Markus Joutsela and Virpi Roto	
The beauty of balance – An empirical integration of the Unified Model of Aesthetics for product design.....	277
Michaël Berghman and Paul Hekkert	

SECTION 3 DESIGN EPISTEMOLOGY

Introduction: Design Epistemology.....	295
Derek Jones, Philip Plowright, Leonard Bachman and Tiiu Poldma	
Mapping design knowledge: 36 years of <i>Design Studies</i>	303
Kathryn Burns, Jack Ingram and Louise Annable	
I know this one, but the answer is complex... ..	321
Simon Downs	
Source domains of Architectural Knowledge: Mappings, Categories, Validity and Relevance.....	339
Philip D Plowright	
Using Rhetoric in Persuasive Design: What Rhetoric?.....	355
Danny Godin	
Design Fiction: Does the search for plausibility lead to deception?.....	369
Paul Coulton, Joseph Lindley and Haider Ali Akmal	

Graphicality: why is there not such a word?	385
Robert Harland and David Craib	
Design as Anticipation and Innovation: Co-creating a future by learning from the future as it emerges	401
Markus F. Peschl and Thomas Fundneider	

– Volume 2 –

SECTION 4
Design EDUCATION AND LEARNING

Introduction: Design Education and Learning	419
Michael Tovey	
“Dis-course is Killer!” Educating the critically reflective designer	425
Veronika Kelly	
Design Culture and Contemporary Education	441
Therese Uri	
Promoting an emancipatory research paradigm in Design Education and Practice	455
Lesley-Ann Noel	
Design Thinking: A Rod For Design’s Own Back?	471
Aysar Ghassan	
Designing the unknown: supervising design students who manage mental health issues	483
Welby Ings	
Using Design Thinking to create a new education paradigm for elementary level children for higher student engagement and success 501	
Lesley-Ann Noel and Tsai Lu Liu	
Design Research in Interior Design Education: A Living Framework for Teaching the Undergraduate Capstone Studio in the 21st Century	513
Charles Boggs, Helena Moussatche, Catherine Pizzichemi and Meghan Woodcock	
Designing Universities of the Future	525
Anna Valtonen	
Design Futures: A Pedagogy for Long-Horizon Design Scenarios	539
Peter Scupelli, Arnold Wasserman, and Judy Brooks	
Design and Interdisciplinarity: the improbable introduction of “fundamental physics” in a design school	555
Annie Gentes, Anne-Lyse Renon and Julien Bobroff	
Card Games Creation as a Learning Method	569
Birgit S. Bauer	
“Spend another day in our class talking about this research please”: Student insights from a research-based design thinking exercise 593	
Cynthia J. Atman, Arif Ahmer, Jennifer A. Turns and Jim Borgford-Parnell	
Communication is not collaboration: observations from a case study in collaborative learning	609
Iestyn Jowers, Mark Gaved, Gary Elliott-Cirigottis, Delphine Dallison, Alan Rochead and Mark Craig	
The use of argumentation in design research	625
Stella Boess	
Digital Sketch Modelling: Integrating digital sketching as a transition between sketching and CAD in Industrial Design Education	637
Charlie Ranscombe and Katherine Bissett-Johnson	
Prototyping in the in-between. A Method for Spatial Design education	653
Jennie Andersson Schaeffer and Marianne Palmgren	
Global Flows of Materials: Design Research and Practice in Architecture	669
Janet McGaw	
Evaluating Living and Learning on Campus: A Community Engaged Research Model	685
Rebekah Radtke	
What is sought from graphic designers? A first thematic analysis of job offers for graphic design positions in the United Kingdom	705
Paulo Roberto Nicoletti Dziobczenskiand Oscar Person	
LIVD: An Avant-Garde Publication with Pedagogical and Epistemological Aims	719
Meredith James	
Design Studio Desk and Shared Place Attachments: A Study on Ownership, Personalization, and Agency.	729
Peter Scupelli and Bruce Hanington	
Online Reflective Interactions on Social Network Sites in Design Studio Course	751
Simge Hough	
Junior designers’ awareness of personal values and their employment choices	767
Anna Jonkmans, Julia Wurl, Dirk Snelders and Lenny van Onselen	
Knowledgeability culture: Co-creation in practice	781
Alicen Coddington, Colin Giang, Alexander Graham, Anne Prince, Pauliina Mattila, Christine Thong and Anita Kocsis	
Visual Thinking Styles and Idea Generation Strategies Employed in Visual Brainstorming Sessions	795
Naz A.G.Z. Börekçi	
The Future of Product Design Utilising Printed Electronics	813
Nicola York, Darren Southee and Mark Evans	

Project Contribution of Junior Designers: Exploring the What and the How of Values in Collaborative Practice	835
Lennart Kaland, Annelijn Vernooij and Lenny van Onselen	
Exploring framing within a team of industrial design students	853
Mithra Zahedi, Lorna Heaton, Manon Guité, Giovanni De Paoli and Marie Reumont	

– Volume 3 –

SECTION 5

AESTHETICS, COSMOPOLITICS AND DESIGN

Introduction: Aesthetics, Cosmopolitics and Design	873
Alex Wilkie	
Framing Values in Design	881
Marta Gasparin and William Green	
The Prototype as a Cosmopolitical Place: Ethnographic design practice and research at the National Zoo	895
Martín Tironi, Pablo Hermansen and José Neira	
The Role of Participation in Designing for IoT	913
Anuradha Reddy and Per Linde	
Aesthetics, Cosmopolitics and Design Futures in Computational Fashion	927
Laura Forlano	
Designing diagrams for social issues	941
Michele Mauri and Paolo Ciuccarelli	
iPhoneography and New Aesthetics: The Emergence of a Social Visual Communication Through Image-based Social Media	959
Eman Alshawaf	
A Creative Ontological Analysis of Collective Imagery during Co-Design for Service Innovation	969
Priscilla Chueng-Nainby, John Lee, BingXin Zi and Astury Gardin	
Post-critical potentials in experimental co-design	985
Sissel Olander	
Collaborative Imaging. The communicative practice of hand sketching in experimental physics	997
Judith Marlen Dobler	
The Aesthetics of Action in New Social Design	1013
Ilpo Koskinen	
Designing Debate: The Entanglement of Speculative Design and Upstream Engagement	1025
Tobie Kerridge	

SECTION 6

DESIGN AND TRANSLATION

Introduction: Design and Translation	1039
Giovanni Baule and Elena Caratti	
Towards Translation Design A New Paradigm for Design Research	1047
Giovanni Baule and Elena Caratti	
Design as translation activity: a semiotic overview	1061
Salvatore Zingale	
Word to Image – Image to Word The Contribution of Visual Communication to Understanding and Dialog	1073
Michael Renner	
Perception, Meaning and Transmodal Design	1089
Mathias Nordvall and Mattias Arvola	
The Ways of Synesthetic Translation: Design models for media accessibility	1101
Dina Riccò	
The narratives and the supports. Remediating Design Culture in the translation of transmedia artefacts	1111
Matteo Ciastellardi and Derrick de Kerckhove	
Rules of Thumb: An Experiment in Contextual Transposition	1123
Damon Taylor, Monika Büscher, Lesley Murray, Chris Speed and Theodore Zamenopoulos	
Juxtaposing Chinese and Western Representational Principles: New Design Methods for Information Graphics in the Field of Intercultural Communication	1139
Ruedi Baur and Ulrike Felsing	
Elucidating perceptions of Australian and Chinese industrial design from the next generation of industrial designers	1163
Blair Kuys and Wenwen Zhang	
Translating picturebooks: Re-examining interlingual and intersemiotic translation	1179
Anne Ketola	
Long Kesh: Site - Sign - Body	1191
Ola Ståhl	

SECTION 7

DESIGN FOR DESIGN – THE INFLUENCE AND LEGACY OF JOHN HESKETT

Introduction: Design for Design The Influence and Legacy of John Heskett	1205
Tore Kristensen and Sylvia Liu	
Doing qualitative studies, using statistical reasoning	1211
Gorm Gabrielse and Tore Kristensen	
Design as Driver for Understanding Sustainability and Creating Value in the Fur Industry	1223
Irene Alma Lønne, Else Skjold	
Design Awareness: Developing Design Capacity in Chinese Manufacturing Industry	1237
Sylvia Liu	
Design Expanding into Strategy: Evidence from Design Consulting Firms	1253
Suzan Boztepe	

– Volume 4 –

SECTION 8

Design for Behaviour Change

Introduction: Design for Behaviour Change	1271
Kristina Niedderer, Geke Ludden, Rebecca Cain, Andrew Morris and Aija Freimane	
An alternative approach to influencing behaviour: Adapting Darnton’s Nine Principles framework for scaling up individual upcycling	1277
Kyungeun Sung, Tim Cooper and Sarah Kettley	
Assessment of the Co-creative Design Process	1291
Pratik Vyas, Robert Young, Petia Sice and Nicholas Spencer	
The potential of Design for Behaviour Change to foster the transition to a circular economy	1305
Laura Piscicelli and Geke Dina Simone Ludden	
Developing a theory-driven method to design for behaviour change: two case studies	1323
Anita Van Essen, Sander Hermsen and Reint Jan Renes	
What a designer can change: a proposal for a categorisation of artefact-related aspects	1339
Anneli Selvfors, Helena Strömberg and Sara Renström	
Exploring and communicating user diversity for behavioural change	1357
Aykut Coskun and Cigdem Erbug	
How I learned to appreciate our tame social scientist: experiences in integrating design research and the behavioural sciences	1375
Sander Hermsen, Remko van der Lugt, Sander Mulder and Reint Jan Renes	
A Design Approach for Risk Communication, the Case of Type 2 Diabetes	1390
Farzaneh Eftekhari and Tsai Lu Liu	
Metadesigning Design Research – How can designers collaboratively grow a research platform?	1412
Mathilda Tham, Anna-Karin Arvidsson, Mikael Blomqvist, Susanne Bonja, Sara Hyltén-Cavallius, Lena Håkansson, Miguel Salinas, Marie Sterte, Ola Ståhl, Tobias Svensén and Ole Victor	

SECTION 9

Design for Health, Wellbeing and Happiness

Introduction: Design for Health, Wellbeing and Happiness	1434
Rebecca Cain, Noemi Bitterman, Geke Ludden, Jamie Mackrill, Elif Ozcan, Ann Petermans and Carolina Escobar-Tello	
In the moment: designing for late stage dementia	1442
Cathy Treadaway, David Prytherch, Gail Kenning and Jac Fennell	
Design for Ageing-in-place: Evidence from Australia	1458
Naseem Ahmadpour and Alen Keirnan	
Supporting healthy behaviour: A stages of change perspective on changing snacking habits of children	1473
Geke D.S. Ludden and Laura H.J. de Ruijter	
Co-creating narratives: an approach to the design of interactive medical devices, informed by phenomenology	1487
Rowan Page and Mark Richardson	
A Design Primer for the Domestication of Health Technologies	1499
Paul Chamberlain and Claire Craig	
Disentangling complexity: a visualisation-led tool for healthcare associated infection training	1515
Alastair S. Macdonald, David Loudon, Susan Wan and Colin Macduff	
Exploring Design for Happiness in the Home and Implications for Future Domestic Living	1529
Emily Corrigan-Doyle, Carolina Escobar-Tello and Kathy Pui Ying Lo	
Using symbolic meaning as a means to design for happiness: The development of a card set for designers	1553
Mafalda Casais, Ruth Mugge and Pieter M. A. Desmet	
Designs with benefits: hearth fire nights and bittersweet chores	1573
Stella U. Boess and Anna E. Pohlmeier	
Happy moments: A well-being driven design of a Car2Go	1589
Tessa Duste, Pieter Desmet and Elmer van Grondelle	

**SECTION 10
DESIGN FUTURES**

Games as Speculative Design: Allowing Players to Consider Alternate Presents and Plausible Futures	1609
Paul Coulton, Dan Burnett and Adrian Gradinar	
An approach to future-oriented technology design – with a reflection on the role of the artefact	1627
Tiina Kymäläinen	
Future Product Ecosystems: discovering the value of connections	1643
Tim Williams and Marianella Chamorro-Koc	
Vision Concepts within the landscape of design research	1659
Ricardo Mejia Sarmiento, Gert Pasma and Pieter Jan Stappers	
Visual conversations on urban futures. Participatory methods to design scenarios of liveable cities	1677
Serena Pollastri, Rachel Cooper, Nick Dunn and Chris Boyko	

– Volume 5 –

**SECTION 11
Design Innovation Management**

Introduction: Design Innovation Management	1701
Rachel Cooper, Alex Williams, Qian Sun and Erik Bohemia	
Emerging Trends of Design Policy in the UK	1709
Qian Sun	
Resourcing in Co-Design	1725
Salu Ylirisku, Jacob Buur and Line Revsbæk	
From Participation to Collaboration: Reflections on the co-creation of innovative business ideas	1739
Cara Broadley, Katherine Champion, Michael Pierre Johnson and Lynn-Sayers McHattie	
Bridging service design with integrated co-design decision maker interventions	1759
Sune Gudiksen, Anders Christensen and Pernille Henriksen	
Exploring framing and meaning making over the design innovation process	1779
Clementine Thurgood and Rohan Lulham	
The making of sustainable cultural and creative cluster in Hong Kong	1795
Kaman Ka Man Tsang and Kin Wai Michael Siu	
An exploration of Service Design Jam and its ability to foster Social Enterprise	1811
Ksenija Kuzmina, Chris Parker, Gyuchan Thomas Jun, Martin Maguire, Val Mitchell, Mariale Moreno and Samantha Porter	
Fiction as a resource in participatory design	1829
Eva Knutz, Tau U. Lenskjold and Thomas Markussen	
Space as organisational strategy	1845
Pia Storvang	
The value of design: an issue of vision, creativity and interpretation	1865
Mariana Fonseca Braga	
A Multilevel Approach to Research ‘Obscure’ Innovation Processes and Practices	1883
Emmanouil Chatzakis, Neil Smith and Erik Bohemia	
Coordinating product design with production and consumption processes	1905
Anders Haug	
How Companies adopt different Design approaches	1921
KwanMyung Kim	
Challenges in co-designing a building	1937
Min Hi Chun	

**SECTION 12
DESIGN PROCESS**

Form as an abstraction of mechanism	1953
Lewis Urquhart and Andrew Wodehouse	
Integrating Nanotechnology in the Design Process: An Ethnographic Study in Architectural Practice in Egypt	1971
Ramy Bakir and Sherif Abdelmohsen	
Of Open bodies: Challenges and Perspectives of an Open Design Paradigm	1987
Émeline Brulé and Frédéric Valentin	
Provocative design for unprovocative designers: Strategies for triggering personal dilemmas	2001
Deger Ozkaramanli and Pieter M. A. Desmet	
A case based discussion on the role of Design Competences in Social Innovation	2017
Tamami Komatsu, Manuela Celi, Francesca Rizzo and Alessandro Deserti	
Riding Shotgun in the Fight Against Human Trafficking	2031
Lisa Mercer	
Could LEGO® Serious Play® be a useful technique for product co-design?	2045
Julia Anne Garde and Mascha Cecile van der Voort	

Intuitive Interaction research – new directions and possible responses	2065
Alethea Blackler and Vesna Popovic	
Skilling and learning through digital Do-It-Yourself: the role of (Co-)Design	2077
Giuseppe Salvia, Carmen Bruno and Marita Canina	
Design Research, Storytelling, and Entrepreneur Women in Rural Costa Rica: a case study	2091
Maria Gabriela Hernandez	
Temporal design: looking at time as social coordination	2109
Larissa Pschetz, Michelle Bastian and Chris Speed	
A Physical Modeling Tool to Support Collaborative Interpretation of Conversations	2123
Piotr Michura, Stan Ruecker, Celso Scaletsky, Guilherme Meyer, Chiara Del Gaudio, Gerry Derksen, Julia Dias, Elizabeth Jernegan, Juan de la Rosa, Xinyue Zhou and Priscilla Ferronato	

– Volume 6 –

SECTION 13 DESIGN INNOVATION FOR SOCIETY

Introduction: Design Innovation for Society	2143
Nynke Tromp and Mieke van der Bijl-Brouwer	
The Challenges of Human-Centred Design in a Public Sector Innovation Context	2149
Mieke van der Bijl-Brouwer	
Activating the core economy by design	2165
Rebeca Torres Castanedo and Paul Micklethwaite	
On presenting a rich picture for stakeholder dialogue	2183
Abigail C. Durrant, Wendy Moncur, David S. Kirk, Diego Trujillo Pisanty and Kathryn Orzech	
Design and the Creation of Representational Artefacts for Interactive Social Problem Solving	2203
Richard Cooney, Nifeli Stewart, Tania Ivanka and Neal Haslem	
Appreciative Co-design: From Problem Solving to Strength-Based Re-authoring in Social Design	2221
Tasman Munro	
Design Tools for Enhanced New Product Development in Low Income Economies	2241
Timothy Whitehead, Mark Evans and Guy Bingham	
Redesigning governance – a call for design across three orders of governance	2257
Tanja Rosenqvist and Cynthia Mitchell	
Involving stakeholders in cross-border regional design	2273
Annet Kempenaar	
From the specificity of the project in design to social innovation by design: a contribution	2287
Marie-Julie Catoir-Brisson, Stéphane Vial, Michela Deni and Thomas Watkin	

SECTION 14 EFFECTIVE INFORMATION DESIGN

Introduction: Effective Information Design	2303
Alison Black and Sue Walker	
Informing the design of mobile device-based patient instructions leaflets: the case of Fentanyl patches	2309
Myrto Koumoundourou, Panayiotis Koutsabasis and Jenny S. Darzentas	
Design methods for meaning discovery: a patient-oriented health research case study	2327
David Craib and Lorenzo Imbesi	
Expectations and prejudices usurp judgements of schematic map effectiveness	2343
Maxwell J. Roberts and Ida C.N. Vaeng	
Data Visualisation Does Political Things	2361
Joanna Boehnert	
The information designer through the lens of design for learning	2381
Eden Potter	
A user centred approach to developing an actionable visualisation for ‘balance health’	2393
Shruti Grover, Simon Johnson, Ross Atkin and Chris Mcginley	

SECTION 15 Design Thinking

Introduction: Design Thinking	2417
Seda Yilmaz, Verena Paepcke-Hjeltness and Tejas Dhadphale	
From Technology-Driven to Experience-Driven Innovation: A Case from the Aviation Industry using VIP	2425
Wan-Jen Jenny Tsay and Christine de Lille	
Critically Exploring the Development of a Conceptual Framework for Building Innovative Brands	2447
Xinya You and David Hands	
United We Stand: A Critique of the Design Thinking Approach in Interdisciplinary Innovation	2465
Fiona Maciver, Julian Malins, Julia Kantorovitch and Aggelos Liapis	

Designing Creative Destruction	2483
Ashley Hall	
Blending Hard and Soft Design via Thematic Analysis	2495
Vasilije Kokotovich and Kees Dorst	
The cycle of interdisciplinary learning and theory-solution building in design research	2507
Young-ae Hahn	
Don't Look Back: The Paradoxical Role of Recording in the Fashion Design Process	2521
Helen McGilp, Claudia Eckert and Christopher F Earl	
Contrasting similarities and differences between academia and industry: evaluating processes used for product development	2535
Nathan Kotlarewski, Christine Thong, Blair Kuys and Evan Danahay	
What is the Nature and Intended Use of Design Methods?	2551
Colin M. Gray	
Becoming a More User-Centred Organization: A Design Tool to Support Transformation	2565
Lennart Kaland and Christine de Lille	

– Volume 7 –

SECTION 16

DESIGN RESEARCH – HISTORY, THEORY, PRACTICE: HISTORIES FOR FUTURE-FOCUSED THINKING

Introduction: Design Research – History, Theory, Practice: Histories for Future-Focused Thinking	2585
Harriet Atkinson and Maya Rae Oppenheimer	
The Structure of Design Processes: ideal and reality in Bruce Archer's 1968 doctoral thesis	2593
Stephen Boyd Davis and Simone Gristwood	
Closing the circle	2613
Douglas Tomkin	
Re-integrating Design Education: Lessons from History	2627
Peter A. Hall	
(Re)working the Past, (Dis)playing the Future. Italy: The New Domestic Landscape at MoMA, 1972	2639
Ingrid Halland Rashidi	
Recommendations to rebuild the body of feminist work in industrial design	2655
Isabel Prochner and Anne Marchand	
Design practice and design research: finally together?	2669
Kees Dorst	
Design Research is Alive and Kicking	2679
Paul A. Rodgers and Joyce S.R. Yee	
Reverse Innovation: How Has Design in the Greater Pearl River Delta Region Changed the World	2701
Ningchang Zhou and Tao Huang	
Beautiful Nerds: Growing a rigorous design research dialogue in the Irish context	2711
Adam de Eyto Carmel Maher, Mark Hadfield and Maggie Hutchings	
Design Research in the East – at Universities and the Board of Industrial Design of the GDR between the 1960s and 1990	2723
Sylvia Wölfel and Christian Wölfel	
International Norms and Local Design Research: ICSID and the Promotion of Industrial Design in Latin America, 1970-1979	2739
Tania Messell	

SECTION 17

DESIGN-ING AND CREATIVE PHILOSOPHIES

Introduction: Design-ing and Creative Philosophies	2757
Betti Marenko	
Probing the future by anticipative design acts	2761
Annelies De Smet and Nel Janssens	
Making polychronic objects for a networked society	2795
Jane Norris	
Responsibility in design: applying the philosophy of Gilbert Simondon	2809
Sander Mulder	
Space as a Becoming: Fresh Water Expo Pavilion as a Creative Practice for an Architecture to Come	2825
Emine Görgül	
The Foam: a Possible Model for the Motion Graphic Design	2837
Anamaria Galeotti and Clice Mazzilli	
Experience – A Central Concept in Design and its Roots in the History of Science	2869
Johannes Uhlmann, Christian Wölfel and Jens Krzywinski	

SECTION 18
EMBODIED MAKING AND LEARNING

Introduction: Embodied Making and Learning	2889
Marte S. Gulliksen, Camilla Groth, Maarit Mäkelä and Pirita Seitamaa-Hakkarainen	
The role of sensory experiences and emotions in craft practice	2895
Camilla Groth	
Learning to learn: What can be learned from first-hand experience with materials?	2911
Biljana C. Fredriksen	
Why making matters—developing an interdisciplinary research project on how embodied making may contribute to learning	2925
Marte S. Gulliksen	
Physiological measurements of drawing and forming activities	2941
Marianne Leinikka, Minna Huotilainen, Pirita Seitamaa-Hakkarainen, Camilla Groth, Mimmu Rankanen and Maarit Mäkelä	
Code, Decode, Recode: Constructing, deconstructing and reconstructing knowledge through making	2959
Anna Piper	
Experience Labs: co-creating health and care innovations using design tools and artefacts	2965
Tara French, Gemma Teal and Sneha Raman	

– Volume 8 –

SECTION 19
DESIGN FOR TANGIBLE, EMBEDDED AND NETWORKED TECHNOLOGIES

Introduction: Design for Tangible, Embedded and Networked Technologies	2985
Sarah Kettley and Anne Cranny-Francis	
Designing from, with and by Data: Introducing the ablative framework	2991
Chris Speed and Jon Oberlander	
Feel it! See it! Hear it! Probing Tangible Interaction and Data Representational Modality	3005
Trevor Hogan and Eva Hornecker	
Designing Information Feedback within Hybrid Physical/Digital Interactions	3019
David Gullick and Paul Coulton	
Harnessing the Digital Records of Everyday Things	3033
Dimitrios Darzentas, Adrian Hazzard, Michael Brown, Martin Flintham and Steve Benford	
A Toaster For Life: Using Design Fiction To Facilitate Discussion On The Creation Of A Sustainable Internet of Things	3049
Michael Stead	
Making Service Design in a Digital Business	3069
Piia Rytilahti, Simo Rontti, Titta Jylkäs, Mira Alhonsuo, Hanna-Riina Vuontisjärvi and Laura Laivamaa	
Ad Hoc Pairings: Semantic Relationships and Mobile Devices	3085
Jason O. Germany	
Serious Play Strategies in the Design of Kinetic and Wearable Devices	3103
Lois Frankel and Ellen Hrinivich	
Tangibility in e-textile participatory service design with mental health participants	3121
Sarah Kettley, Anna Sadkowska and Rachel Lucas	
Wearable Sensory Devices for Children in Play Areas	3133
Cai-Ru Liao, Wen-Huei Chou and Chung-Wen Hung	
Intuitive Interaction in a Mixed Reality System	3149
Shital Desai, Alethea Blackler and Vesna Popovic	
From nano to macro: material inspiration within ubiquitous computing research	3165
Isabel Paiva	

SECTION 20
Experiential Knowledge

Introduction: Experiential Knowledge	3177
Nithikul Nimkulrat	
Double-loop reflective practice as an approach to understanding knowledge and experience	3181
John Gribbin, Mersha Aftab, Robert Young and Sumin Park	
Designing “little worlds” in Walnut Park: How architects adopted an ethnographic case study on living with dementia	3199
Valerie Van der Linden, Iris Van Steenwinkel, Hua Dong and Ann Heylighen	
Bonding through Designing; how a participatory approach to videography can catalyse an emotive and reflective dialogue with young people	3213
Marianne McAra	
Capturing architects’ designerly ways of knowing about users: Exploring an ethnographic research approach	3229
Valerie Van der Linden, Hua Dong and Ann Heylighen	

SECTION 21
INCLUSIVE DESIGN

Introduction: Inclusive Design	3247
Hua Dong	

Designing for older people: But who is an older person?	3251
Raghavendra Reddy Gudur, Alethea Blackler, Vesna Popovic and Doug Mahar	
Towards designing inclusion: insights from a user data collection study in China	3263
Weining Ning and Hua Dong	
'Difficult' packaging for older Chinese adults	3279
Xuezi Ma, Hua Dong	
Crafted with Care: Reflections from co-designing wearable technologies with care home residents	3295
Christopher Sze Chong Lim and Sara Nevay	
To Shed Some Light on Empowerment: Towards Designing for Embodied Functionality	3313
Jelle van Dijk and Fenne Verhoeven	
Measuring Product-Related Stigma in Design	3329
Kristof Vaes, Pieter Jan Stappers and Achiel Standaert	
Towards more culturally inclusive communication design practices: exploring creative participation between non-Indigenous and Indigenous people in Australia	3349
Nicola St John	
Designing meaningful vehicle for older users: culture, technology, and experience	3373
Chao Zhao, Vesna Popovic and Xiaobo Lu	
Towards Innovative and Inclusive Architecture	3393
Sidse Grangaard	
Hidden public spaces: when a university campus becomes a place for communities	3407
Davide Fassi, Laura Galluzzo and Liat Rogel	

– Volume 9 –

SECTION 22 FOOD AND EATING DESIGN

Introduction: Food and Eating Design	3427
Hendrik N.J. Schifferstein	
Designing with Empathy: Implications for Food Design	3435
Hafdis Sunna Hermannsdóttir, Cecilie Dawes, Hanne Gideonsen and Eva De Moor	
Designing for sustainability: a dialogue-based approach to the design of food packaging experiences	3449
Zoi Stergiadou, Jenny Darzentas and Spyros Bofylatos	
Towards a sensory congruent beer bottle: Consumer associations between beer brands, flavours, and bottle designs	3467
Anna Fenko, Sanne Heitjes and Lianne van den Berg-Weitzel	

SECTION 23 OBJECTS, PRACTICES, EXPERIENCES AND NETWORKS

Introduction: Objects, Practices, Experiences and Networks	3479
Tom Fisher and Lorraine Gamman	
Stories in a Beespoon: Exploring Future Folklore through Design	3485
Deborah Maxwell, Liz Edwards, Toby Pillatt and Niamh Downing	
Uber and Language/Action Theory	3503
Michael Arnold Mages	
Emotional Fit: Developing a new fashion design methodology for mature women	3521
Katherine Townsend, Ania Sadkowska and Juliana Sissons	
From Afterthought to Precondition: re-engaging Design Ethics from Technology, Sustainability, and Responsibility	3539
Jeffrey Chan	
Design for Resourceful Ageing: Intervening in the Ethics of Gerontechnology	3553
Elisa Giaccardi, Lenneke Kuijjer and Louis Neven	

SECTION 24 REFRAMING THE PARADOX – EXAMINING THE INTERSECTIONS BETWEEN EVIDENCE-BASED DESIGN AND DESIGN FOR THE PUBLIC SECTOR

Introduction: Reframing the Paradox – Evidence-based Design and Design for the Public Sector	3569
Luke Feast	
Open Practices: lessons from co-design of public services for behaviour change	3573
Simon O'Rafferty, Adam DeEyto and Huw Lewis	
Capturing the "How": Showing the value of co-design through creative evaluation	3591
Arthi Kanchana Manohar, Madeline Smith and Mirian Calvo	
Design in the Time of Policy Problems	3605
Lucy Kimbell	
The introduction of design to policymaking: Policy Lab and the UK government	3619
Jocelyn Bailey and Peter Lloyd	
Problematizing Evidence-Based Design: A Case Study of Designing for Services in the Finnish Government	3635
Helena Sustar and Luke Feast	

Designed Engagement	3653
Gemma Teal and Tara French	
Public design and social innovation: Learning from applied research	3669
Caroline Gagnon and Valérie Côté	
Design as analysis: examining the use of precedents in parliamentary debate.	3687
Darren Umney, Christopher Earl and Peter Lloyd	
Exposing charities to design-led approaches through design research.	3705
Laura Warwick and Robert Djaelani	

– Volume 10 –

**SECTION 25
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN**

Introduction: Sustainable Design	3725
Rhoda Trimmingham	
Design for Sustainability: An Evolutionary Review	3731
Fabrizio Ceschin and Idil Gaziulusoy	
Consumer Product Design and Innovation: Past, present and future	3755
Robin Roy	
Product-Service Systems or Service Design ‘By-Products’? A Systems Thinking Approach	3771
John Darzentas and Jenny Darzentas	
Supporting SMEs in designing sustainable business models for energy access for the BoP: a strategic design tool	3785
Silvia Emili, Fabrizio Ceschin and David Harrison	
Extending clothing lifetimes: an exploration of design and supply chain challenges.	3815
Lynn Oxborrow and Stella Claxton	
The effect of consumer attitudes on design for product longevity: The case of the fashion industry	3831
Angharad McLaren, Helen Goworek, Tim Cooper, Lynn Oxborrow and Helen Hill	
Framing Complexity in Design through theories of Social Practice and Structuration: A comparative case study of urban cycling	3847
Tobias Barnes Hofmeister and Martina Keitsch	
Integrating Sustainability Literacy into Design Education	3861
Andrea Quam	
Design of resilient consumer products	3873
Anders Haug	
Designing for Sustainable Transition through Value Sensitive Design	3889
Luisa Sze-man Mok, Sampsa Hyysalo and Jenni Väänänen	
Mixing up everyday life - uncovering sufficiency practices through designerly tools	3913
Miriam Lahusen, Susanne Ritzmann, Florian Sametinger, Gesche Joost and Lars-Arvid Brischke	
Give car-free life a try: Designing seeds for changed practices	3929
Mia Hesselgren and Hanna Hesselqvist	
A sociotechnical framework for the design of collaborative services: diagnosis and conceptualisation	3943
Joon Sang Baek, Sojung Kim and Yoonee Pahk	
Moving Textile Artisans’ Communities towards a Sustainable Future – A Theoretical Framework	3961
Francesco Mazzarella, Carolina Escobar-Tello and Val Mitchell	
Sharing 10 years of experience with class AUP0479 – Design for Sustainability	3983
Maria Cecília Santos, Tatiana Sakurai and Verena Lima	

**SECTION 26
THE POLITICS OF COMMONING AND DESIGN**

Introduction: The Politics of Commoning and Design	4005
Bianca Elzenbaumer, Valeria Graziano and Kim Trogal	
Commons & community economies: entry points to design for eco-social justice?	4015
Fabio Franz and Bianca Elzenbaumer	
Design Togetherness, Pluralism and Convergence	4029
Monica Lindh Karlsson and Johan Redström	
Designing participation for commoning in temporary spaces: A case study in Aveiro, Portugal	4045
Janaina Teles Barbosa, Maria Hellström Reimer and João Almeida Mota	
From Rules in Use to Culture in Use – Commoning and Infrastructuring Practices in an Open Cultural Movement	4063
Sanna Marttila	

Index of Authors	4080
-------------------------------	-------------

This page is intentionally left blank

Skilling and learning through digital Do-It-Yourself: the role of (Co-)Design

Giuseppe Salvia^{a*}, Carmen Bruno^a, Marita Canina^a

^a Design Department, Politecnico di Milano, Italy

*Corresponding author e-mail: giuseppe.salvia@polimi.it

Abstract: The current trend of digitally enabled self-production (i.e. digital DIY) is emblematic of the contemporary attitude to making. Its investigation represents an opportunity for better understanding the dynamics underpinning the acquisition of competences for the next century citizens through making. The objective of this paper is presenting our preliminary reflections on the factors characterising the current trend of digital DIY, envisaged as a phenomenon of social innovation empowering people by developing skills through making collaboratively. We introduce a model representing the dynamics (over the three levels of social innovation, social practice and creative process) and factors (i.e. technology, motivation and collaboration) for learning and skilling in this context. The concluding section describes future developments based on co-design for the delivery of tools enabling designers and key players in four main areas of intervention in which the model can be transferred.

Keywords: Digital Do-It-Yourself (DIY); Making and makers; Learning; Competences and skills; Co-Design Tools

1. Skilling through digital DIY and the role of Design

The modern concept of competence comprises not only relevant knowledge and skills, but also a range of personal qualities and the ability to perform adequately and flexibly in well-known and unknown situations. This set is often called 21st century competences which are considered of fundamental importance for people to face the complexity of contemporary age. Creativity and the ability to produce ideas, knowledge and innovations is a key player. It represents the intangible substrate for innovation (Kozbelt et al. 2010), however its management requires the development of specific techniques and educational programmes. Since the last decades of the 20th century, research in learning processes have suggested the importance of making and doing as a means to foster the acquisition of skills, especially the



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

creative ones. Therefore, observing and understanding the dynamics of making-based activities could shed more light on how creativity unfolds and skills are acquired.

The current trend of self-production (i.e. Do-It-Yourself or DIY) (Anderson, 2012) is emblematic of the contemporary attitude to making and its investigation may represent an opportunity for a better understanding of the dynamics underpinning the acquisition of the 21st century competences. The spreading of digital fabrication technologies and infrastructures are sustaining a self-production trend re-emerged over the last decade (Atkinson, 2006) thus leading to what has been called ‘the new DIY age’ (Hoftijzer, 2009) or also a new industrial revolution (Anderson, 2012) and even a paradigm shift (Fox, 2010). Collaborative self-production is one of the ongoing social innovation phenomena in which people reinvent their ways of living, especially thanks to ubiquitous digital technologies, connecting people on a global scale (e.g. Internet 2.0) and bringing production closer to consumption (e.g. digital fabrication and distributed systems) (Manzini, 2015).

Digital fabrication-based DIY – or simply digital DIY – is here envisaged as a creative practice through which people may increase their self-confidence and empowerment by developing new skills and knowledge. Rooted in design and construction, these digital making activities often emphasize the development of 21st century skills, such as problem-solving, critical thinking, and collaboration.

1.1 Why design?

Given the skilling potential of the making trend especially in terms of creativity, major implications for professional designers are expected. Design literature has suggested since a long time that everybody is a designer (Simon, 1969; Cross, 2011), and more recently that “in a world in rapid and profound transformation, we are all designers” (Manzini, 2015:1). These theories refer to the ability and need for untrained people to create what they need even without the support of professional designers. The role of design in the era when everybody does design is therefore questioned and needs to be reshaped.

The Industrial Designer Society of America (IDSA),¹ discussed the implications of DIY for designers at the 2010 conference named ‘DIY Design: threat or opportunity?’ and acknowledged that, although DIY is not a totally new phenomenon, the implications of this shift for the design professions are potentially massive. The DIY resurgence is making consumers question the need for mass production, and by extension, the need for designers.

Atkinson (2006:1) concluded that

“[n]o accounts have really developed the key issue of how DIY acts as the antithesis of the prescribed design of the mass marketplace [considering that] DIY as a design activity has not been the focus of a great deal of attention.”

However, Manzini (2006) stresses that

¹ <http://www.idsa.org/>

“if it is true that we live in a society where ‘everybody designs’, designers should accept that they can no longer aspire to a monopoly on design and, at the same time, they have to be able to recognise what could be their new, and (...) important, specific role.”

Past research suggested possible roles of designers for the contemporary DIYers (Salvia, 2016). In this paper we propose that professional designers may contribute by facilitating the creative process of making, especially within the digital social innovation phenomenon frame, as a means to foster people empowerment.

The EU funded project ‘Digital Do-It-Yourself (DiDIY)’ aims at developing a human-centric and multi-perspective approach to the scientific study of current self-production trend enabled by digital fabrication technology, in order to better understand its impacts on all areas of society and to support both education and policy making on Digital DIY, through models and guidelines driven by social and cultural strategies.²

In particular, we – as partners of the DiDIY project – are going to explore the dynamics facilitating the acquisition of skills and 21st competences through this practice. As design researchers, we aim at contributing by developing (co)design-driven tools facilitating the identification of the skilling dynamics where digital DIY takes place and explore models for including them in working and educational environments.

1.2 Objective and structure of the paper

The objective of this paper is presenting our preliminary reflections on the factors characterising the current trend of digital DIY, envisaged as a significant phenomenon of social innovation which may foster skilling processes with ultimate effects on people empowerment through the act of making collaboratively.

To this purpose, section 2 introduces the (mainly constructionism-based) theories of learning through making; section 3 describes the current trend of digital DIY and highlights main debated topics in literature; section 4 presents our research area and summarises the research activities that will be carried out.

2. Making as a learning opportunity

The intellectual capital of citizens is envisaged as the driving force for the 21st century (Sahin, 2009), during which a global paradigm shift affects frames of reference about the ways of living, working, and socialising.

Advanced economies, innovative industries and firms and high-growth jobs require more skilled and empowered workers with the ability to respond flexibly to complex problems, communicate effectively, manage information, work in teams and produce new knowledge. In the United States, for instance, companies have made significant organizational and

² <http://www.didiy.eu/>

behavioural shifts, providing higher levels of responsibility to workers for increasing productivity and innovation (The Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2008).

The acquisition of different forms of knowledge and skills is needed for people to thrive as tomorrow's leaders, workers, and citizens in a constantly changing world and never-ending learning process. To cope with the demands of this century, people need to know more than core subjects and to develop such skills as thinking critically, applying knowledge to new situations, analysing information, comprehending new ideas, communicating, collaborating, solving problems, making decisions (Sahin, 2009).

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2008) identify three broad categories of these learning – mainly cognitive – skills, which include:

- Information, i.e. technical skills enabling the confronting of the technology and media-driven environment;
- Learning and innovation, i.e. skills focusing on creativity, critical thinking, communication and collaboration;
- Life and career, i.e. skills that give people the ability to navigate the complex life and work environments in the globally competitive information age.

The 21st century skills require the development of an *ad-hoc* education system that prepares students, workers and citizens adequately. We envisage that significant benefits may be gained if the development of this system is based on *Constructionism*, a theory developed in the 1980s by Seymour Papert, one of the founders of MIT Media Lab. This theory bases learning on creativity, tinkering, exploring, building, and presentation (Papert, 1980), thus covering a significant number of the 21st century skills. Learners apply concepts, skills and strategies to solve real-world problems that are relevant and personally meaningful. In this process, they engage with problem-solving, decision-making, and collaboration (Bers et al, 2002).

Built upon Piaget's *Constructivism* theory (Piaget, 1970) according to which learners' knowledge is the result of the construction of ideas and their relations yet within the mind of the learner, Papert's theory involves learners in the construction of physical artefacts and in their sharing with others. In other words, Constructionism emphasises the benefits of making *external* artefacts as a powerful means to achieve Piaget's *internal* (reads 'in the mind') construction of understanding.

Making encourages a deep engagement with content, critical thinking, problem solving and collaboration while sparking curiosity (Peppler and Bender, 2013). As a consequence, it is agreed that making fosters lifelong learning by encouraging learning by doing (Peppler and Bender, 2013). The potential of making as a way for more effective learning has been increasingly sustained over the last decade and has inspired several other Constructionism-based theories – which we will further explore – such as *Authorship learning* for which collaboration is fundamental (Donaldson, 2014).

The current challenge is to encompass learning at all ages in both formal and informal situations with a practice that involves a wide variety of the digital tools that form the landscape of students' future learning and working environment (Donaldson, 2014).

Current socio-technical trend of self-production and making facilitated by digital media represents an opportunity for the engagement of a wider audience in the development of the 21st century skills. A number of researchers and educational leaders see in the digital DIY the potential to engage young people in personally compelling, creative investigations of the material and social world (Vossoughi and Bevans, 2014). Furthermore this will democratize tasks and skills previously available only to experts (Blikstein, 2013), expanding participation in STEM fields.

The next section describes the self-production trend and highlights the benefits that this phenomenon may bring about in the acquisition of skills.

3. The creative practice of digital DIY for social innovation

DIY generally refers to the activity carried on by untrained people for the realisation (designing and making) of a product, instead of having it done by a specialist (Kuznetsov and Paulos 2010). The outcome of this activity is eventually used or consumed by the creator or people with personal connections (e.g. relatives or friends), without the generation of direct profits (i.e. sales). Over the last decade engaged individuals described as 'makers' (Anderson 2012), 'craft consumers' (Campbell 2005), 'lead users' (Von Hippel 2005), 'professional amateurs' (Leadbeater and Miller 2004) and 'prosumers' have been united by the will and ability to create artefacts that they desire and may be supported by innovative technologies (e.g. Atkinson et al. 2008), networks (e.g. Leadbeater 2008) and companies with new business models (e.g. Franke, Von Hippel, and Schreier 2006).

The contemporary making attitude is considered creative, innovative, inventive, collaborative, resourceful and empowering. Makers and digital DIYers play with technology to learn about it, to figure out how things are made, how to fix them, or how to use them in a whole new way. They are non-linear thinkers, curious inventors and problem-solvers. According to Thomas Kalil, deputy director of the White House's Office of Science and Technology Policy, the maker movement really

“begins with the Makers themselves — who find making, tinkering, inventing, problem solving, discovering and sharing intrinsically rewarding.” (in Dougherty, 2010)

The socio-technical change taking place has dramatically contributed to reshape (at least some streams of) DIY towards a phenomenon of social innovation, moving from a more traditional individualistic practice to a collaborative one for positive impact on society.

We believe that the exploration of the making-based digital DIY phenomenon may generate beneficial insights for the facilitation of the 21st century skills development. However, these opportunities are still debated in literature and the main elements of this social practice are reported in the following section.

3.1 The social practice of digital DIY and the (de-)skilling debate

Digital DIY may be described as a 'practice' from sociology perspective, as it emerges from, constitutes, and makes sense of

"forms of bodily activity, forms of mental activity, things and their use, background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion, and motivational knowledge" (Reckwitz, 2002:249).

As a practice, digital DIY evolves over the time because of the active integration of both existing and new elements in practices (Shove and Pantzar, 2005), including:

- Materials, i.e. tangible resources, such as tools, parts and materials;
- Meanings, i.e. motivations, such as personal satisfaction, self-development and monetary saving;
- Competences, i.e. capabilities and skills, such as manual dexterity, technical knowledge and creativity.

Literature on digital DIY is still emerging and has been mainly focused on the first two elements above, i.e. materials and meanings. Research focused on the material set namely addresses the technological development of automated machines for digital fabrication, comparison of these machine performances and outputs, and the places where such practice takes place amongst others (Hielscher and Smith 2014).

Research focused on the motivational component (i.e. meanings) mainly refers to attitudes and aims of the digital DIY communities which include the will to make and innovate, supporting the *glocal* community through sharing and expressing a political statement.

Lastly, research on competences regards the skills involved in this practice, typically the technical ones such as coding, making virtual models, interacting with digital fabrication technologies (e.g. 3D printers and laser cutters).

However, making is creating and as so it requires adequate skills for the development of creativity. The creative elements of all DIY enhance people's notion of themselves as an agent of design rather than merely a passive consumer (Atkinson, 2006). It is plausible that the level of attitude, experience and skills in delivering creative ideas and managing the creative process affects the way in which the digital DIY practice is carried out and the output is generated. However, little research addressed creative process in (especially digital) DIY and further research could explore if digital DIYers approach the creative process differently from trained designers, how the creative process may change when addressed collaboratively, or the difficulties encountered by digital DIYers when developing the creative process. Such research questions could enable the identification of potential areas of intervention for designers aiming at supporting them.

Further research is needed to shed light on the technical, cognitive and social skills mainly involved in this practice, which may help to address more debated questions such as how the materials set influences the acquisition of new skills. In fact, the spreading of digital

fabrication raises arguments on its potentially skilling or even deskilling effect (Hielscher and Smith, 2014):

"On the one hand, these technologies are said to encourage passive consumers to engage in creative making process in their spare time without having to pick up years of craft learning – reskilling, whilst on the other, they are said to automate making processes previously requiring craft skill – deskilling." (Ree, 2011:34)

The main argument on the deskilling effect refers to the highly digital nature of the creative process through such machines as 3D printers, CNC mills and laser cutters. The digital DIYer is supposed to develop a virtual model of the object to be made and eventually the machines will produce this as a whole or as components to be assembled. Focusing on the virtual representation of the object undermines the ability for the practitioner to experience material qualities (e.g. hardness) and manufacturability (e.g. lathing, melting), and to learn through hand making, thus flattening the three-dimensional knowledge of hand making to the bi-dimensional realm. The ultimate effect is the development of a creative process which is led by a virtual idea disconnected from the material world. The potential consequences of such deskilling effect include inefficient and ineffective ways of producing due to a lack of knowledge of materials characteristics.

As a response to such arguments, Ree (2011) has claimed that although such tools turn much of the *in-situ* effort of materialisation over to a machine, the machine itself is a manifestation of knowledge, skills and labour involved in its design, manufacture and maintenance. Moreover, he has tried to argue that there is an element of improvisation and experimentation within the digital fabrication making process. Once the object is created it can be held and studied and therefore altered (often there is the need to finish off the digitally fabricated objects through handwork).

Furthermore, digital fabrication technologies need to be set according to the materials used. Therefore, the fruition of such machines requires knowledge of material physical qualities which possibly were not so fundamental for non-digital DIYers, such as melting temperature for plastics to be 3D printed.

Digital fabrication technologies could represent an appealing opportunity of being involved in creative processes for less engaged DIYers who are let down by the often long lapses of time required to acquire manual skills of the traditional non-digital DIY. As Watson and Shove (2008:80) inferred from a study about craft consumption, such machines are

“not instruments of de-skilling and dumbing down but as agents that rearrange the distribution of competence within the entire network of entities that must be integrated to accomplish the job in hand.”

Although we are aware that the debate could benefit from an even wider framework including political context and power relations (Soderberg, 2013), drawing on the arguments above we envisage the potential for digital DIY practice to foster the development of creative skills; the involved material set (e.g. technologies) opens up the range of artefacts that can be made thus stimulating the creativity of people. Tools fostering creativity during

the creative process may limit the deskilling chances for digital DIYers, namely supporting with the identification of the most effective material to be used.

3.2 Digital DIY as a phenomenon of social innovation

The reconfiguration of the elements of the digital DIY practice mentioned above (i.e. materials, meanings and competences) triggers the evolution of the practice and the recruitment of more practitioners over time. The establishment of the Internet, web 2.0 and social media has contributed to the spreading of groups who collaborate on a wider – sometimes even global – scale, for common purposes. This is an example of commons-based peer production, whereby

“large groups of individuals...co-operate effectively to provide information, knowledge or cultural goods without relying on either market pricing or managerial hierarchies to co-ordinate their common enterprise” (Benkler and Nissenbaum, 2006:394).

It has led to several phenomena, initiatives and communities (e.g. open source, peer-to-peer, etc.) emerging with the aim of contributing to a more community-oriented society. Peer production has been envisaged as

“an opportunity for more people to engage in practices that permit them to exhibit and experience virtuous behavior” (Benkler and Nissenbaum, 2006:394).

This is in our view the most significant element of social innovation in digital DIY, i.e. the opportunity for people to acquire competences and trigger virtuous behaviours through and with others, in a collaborative way and often for the benefit of the local or global community.

Likewise, places play a key role. FabLabs and Hackerspaces, for instance, are distributed systems of fabrication, i.e.

“sociotechnical systems that are scattered in many different but connected, relatively autonomous parts, which are mutually linked within wider networks.” (Manzini, 2015:17)

This is enabling the coalescing of committed individuals who support each other in ‘communities of practice’ (Lave and Wenger, 1991) or even ‘creative communities’, i.e. groups of people who cooperatively invent, enhance and manage innovative solutions for new ways of living (Manzini, in Bœuf et al. 2006). Although the distribution of fabrication systems may be the result of the need to make products as local as possible, thus lightening the whole system, other fundamental reasons regard the quest for autonomy, self-sufficiency and ultimately for resilience (Manzini, 2015).

Making oriented activities, such as digital DIY, are opportunities for individual and social empowerment, as they provide opportunity for

“giving people independence and self-reliance, freedom from professional help, encouraging the wider dissemination and adoption of modernist design principles, providing an opportunity to create more personal meaning in their own environments or self-identity” (Atkinson, 2006:5-6).

This effect is closely related to its connecting nature (Gauntlett, 2011). Watson and Shove (2008:74) infer that different approaches to DIY converge in its fundamental role of

“mediating and maintaining relationships between people, whether it is in family relations within the household, construction and maintenance of self-identity and self-esteem, or broader constructions of space and identity”.

The digitalization of the making based practice is a contemporary form social innovation, which

“meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations. [...] innovations that are both good for society and enhance society’s capacity to act.” (Murray et al. 2010:3)

It can be inferred that such benefits are dramatically sustained by a socio-technical system based on the importance of sharing, collaborating and supporting each other. Making creates a supportive community of learners that can leverage the interests and skills of each member of the group towards shared goals. Therefore, digital DIY can potentially sustain the development of the 21st century skills.

Inter-disciplinary attitude is also a potential benefit of making as an educative and collaborative practice. Disciplinary boundaries are considered *inauthentic to makerspace practice according to* Sheridan et al. (2014:526-7) and the

“blending of traditional and digital tools, arts and engineering can create a learning environment with multiple entry points that foster innovative combinations, juxtapositions and uses of disciplinary content and skill.”

This element characterises the contemporary evolution of DIY and therefore individualistic- (although digital-) oriented activities are out of scope for this study.

Observing the development of digital DIY activities may be informative about the dynamics of acquisition of new skills through collaborative tasks.

4. Hypotheses and future developments

The analysis of the current scenario of digital DIY as a social innovation phenomenon will enable us to define a model through which it will be possible to identify the crucial dynamics and factors for learning and skilling. Eventually the model could be used for enabling the replication and adaptation of such dynamics into a different environment, such as school and work.

The model takes into account the interplay of digital DIY main expressions enacting on different levels also addressed above, which include:

1. Digital DIY as a phenomenon of social innovation for the fundamental role of collaboration and sharing;
2. Digital DIY as a practice carried out by the individual connecting materials, meanings and competences;
3. Digital DIY as a creative process, developed through cognitive tasks.

On the basis of preliminary reflections on literature review, we propose that three are the main factors which influence such learning and skilling process across the three levels above:

- Technology;
- Motivation;
- Collaboration.

The evolution toward digital technology (from Materials component) facilitates both the connection of people and the accessibility to tools with appreciable results in a relatively short-term substantially. On the one hand, it is radically easier to interact with other people across geographical boundaries for collaborating and sharing knowledge. On the other hand, rapid manufacturing technology allows the creation of products even at earlier stages of the acquisition of the required technical skills, in contrast with the generally lengthy skilling process in manual crafting.

The motivational aspects of DIY practices widely intended (from Meaning component) are believed here to be crucial for sustaining the practice over time. The practitioner is supposed to persevere (or being strongly motivated) in overcoming the difficulties related to self-organization and the use of spare time on the one hand, and on the other social interactions when collaborating and participating (either for the rewarding sensation of being with the others or for social impact).

Collaboration, both with peers (i.e. other digital DIYers) and with facilitators (who are acknowledged as so by the digital DIYers) is here believed to be possibly the most significant elements characterising the latter evolution of conventional DIY towards the digital one. Collaborating is an opportunity to acquire knowledge and develop skills through other peers, to strengthen social bonds and to make an impact on a wider level than the individual one, which are less likely to happen in conventional individualistic DIY.

Our future research steps aim at the identification of the dynamics interlinking the factors and the levels above, with direct observations and interviews amongst others in the places where digital DIY is carried out, in order to deliver the model described above. Eventually, we aim at interpreting and translating the model for (some of) the areas of the DiDIY project (i.e. organization and work, education and research, creative societies, and legal rights and obligations), which may benefit from the potential skilling processes of the digital DIY practice.

Investigating the complexity of Digital DIY calls for a transdisciplinary research methodology able to enhance people needs and visions. A bottom-up approach where people are directly involved in the research and production of knowledge seems necessary to achieve a complete understanding of digital DIY.

To this purpose, we believe that the involvement of practitioners in the investigation and creation of enabling solutions is crucial. Therefore, we aim at contributing by developing design- (and in particular codesign-) driven tools facilitating the analysis of the learning process and the identification of the skilling dynamics and generate models for including

such dynamics in working and educational environments which may benefit from the skilling process enabled by digital DIY practice.

Co-design is a research approach which involves non-trained designers in activities, or *collaborations*, for the development of solutions that aim at improving their lives with the support of professional designers or, as in this case, with design researchers. The close relationship with the final user of the co-designed solution makes this approach a powerful means for accessing and making explicit people's (also tacit) needs, desires and aspirations for the construction of new possible futures.

In this perspective, people are considered all the way as co-design researchers and companions. The division between expert designers and laypeople becomes blurred and so do the borders between research and practice. In order to do so, Scheldeman (2012) suggests that the designers should allow for “meaningful relation... design should not prescribe or predict, but enable.”

Enabling may result a challenging task for professional designers and this calls for suitable toolboxes and modes of experimentation, which may not still exist. In our case, we planned to make use of human-centred co-design workshops for the purposes mentioned above. Two series of four workshops each, one per thematic area of the DiDIY project, will be held in two different European countries (one in Northern Europe and the other in Southern Europe).

The first set of workshops will be explorative, aiming at exploring and understanding the skilling dynamics in the selected area on investigation, while the second set of generative workshops will aim at delivering solutions for implementing the skilling processes. For instance, a teaching module for primary school or a toolkit for professionals.

Acknowledgements: This paper presents reflections from the research tasks carried out by the authors for the DiDIY Project proposal, which addresses the call ICT 31-2014 Human-centric Digital Age of the Leadership in enabling and industrial technologies, Information and Communication Technologies Horizon 2020 work programme. This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 644344. The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the views of the EC.

5. References

- Anderson, C. (2012) *Makers: The New Industrial Revolution*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Atkinson, P. (2006) Do It Yourself: Democracy and Design. *Journal of Design History*, 19(1), 1–10.
- Atkinson, P., Unver, E., Marshall, J., & Dean, L. T. (2008) Post Industrial Manufacturing Systems: the undisciplined nature of generative design. In *Proceedings of the Design Research Society Conference, Sheffield Hallam University, 194/1-17*.
- Benkler, Y., & Nissenbaum, H. (2006) Commons-based Peer Production and Virtue. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 14(4), 394–419.

- Bers, M. U., Ponte, I., Juelich, K., & Schenker, J. (2002) Teachers as Designers: Integrating Robotics in Early Childhood Education. *Information Technology in Childhood Education Annual*, 1, 123–145.
- Bœuf, J. Le, Amatullo, M., Breitenberg, M., Maffei, S., Villari, B., Menzi, R., ... Lynch, G. (2006) Cumulus Working Papers (Publication Series G No. 16/06). Nantes.
- Blikstein, P. (2013) Digital Fabrication and “Making” in Education: The Democratization of Invention. In J. Walter-Herrmann & C. Büching (Eds.), *FabLabs: Of Machines, Makers and Inventors*. Transcript, 203-222.
- Campbell, C. (2005) The Craft Consumer: Culture, craft and consumption in a postmodern society. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 5(1), 23–42.
- Cross, N. (2011) *Design thinking: Understanding how designers think and work*. Berg.
- Donaldson, J. (2014) The Maker Movement and the Rebirth of Constructionism. Hybrid Pedagogy. <http://www.hybridpedagogy.com/journal/constructionism-reborn> (16 November 2015)
- Dougherty, D. (2010) Remarks on Innovation, Education, and the Maker Movement. New York Hall of Science, September 29, 2010. Accessed from <http://radar.oreilly.com/2010/10/innovation-education-and-the-m.html> (16 November 2015)
- Fox, S. (2012) The new do-it-yourself paradigm: financial and ethical rewards for businesses. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 33(1), 21–26.
- Franke, N., Von Hippel, E., & Schreier, M. (2006) Finding Commercially Attractive User Innovations: A Test of Lead-User Theory. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 23(4), 301–315.
- Gauntlett, D. (2011). *Making is Connecting: The social meaning of creativity, from DIY and knitting to YouTube and Web 2.0*. Polity Press.
- Hielscher, S., & Smith, A. (2014) *Community-based digital fabrication workshops: A review of the research literature* (No. 08). *SPRU Working Paper Series*.
- Hoftijzer, J. (2009) DIY and Co-creation: Representatives of a Democratizing Tendency. *Design Principles & Practices, An International Journal*, 3(6), 69–81.
- Kozbelt, A., Beghetto, R. A., & Runco, M. A. (2010) Theories of creativity. In Kaufman, J. C., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.) *The Cambridge handbook of creativity*. Cambridge University Press, 20-47.
- Kuznetsov, S., & Paulos, E. (2010) Rise of the expert amateur: DIY projects, communities, and cultures. In *Proceedings of the 6th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Extending Boundaries* (pp. 295-304). ACM.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leadbeater, C. (2008) *We-Think: Mass innovation, not mass production*. London: Profile Books.
- Leadbeater, C., & Miller, P. (2004) *The Pro-Am revolution: How enthusiasts are changing our economy and society*. London: Demos.
- Manzini, E. (2015) *Design, when everybody designs: An introduction to design for social innovation*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Manzini, E. (2006) Design Research for Sustainable Social Innovation. In R. Michel (Ed.), *Design Research Now: Essays and Selected Projects (Board of International Research in Design)* (pp. 233–245). Birkhäuser Basel.
- Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J., & Mulgan, G. (2010) *The open book of social innovation*. Nesta and Young Foundation.
- Papert, S. (1980) *Mindstorms: Children, Computers, And Powerful Ideas*. New York: Basic Books.
- Peppler, K., & Bender, S. (2013) Maker movement spreads innovation one project at a time. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 95(3), 22-27.

- Piaget, J. (1970) Piaget's theory. In Mussen, P.H. (Ed.), *Carmichael's Handbook of Child Psychology*, 3rd ed., (pp. 703-732). New York: John Wiley and Son, Inc.
- Reckwitz, A. (2002) Toward a Theory of Social Practices A Development in Culturalist Theorizing. *European Journal Of Social Theory*, 5(2), 243–263.
- Ree, R. (2011) *3D Printing : Convergences , Frictions , Fluidity*. University of Toronto: Master thesis.
- Sahin, M. C. (2009) Instructional design principles for 21 st century learning skills, 1(1), 1464–1468.
- Salvia, G. (2016) The satisfactory and (possibly) sustainable practice of do-it-yourself: the catalyst role of design. *Journal of design research*, 14(1), 22-41.
- Scheldeman, G. (2012) Gliding Effortlessly Through Life? Surfaces and Friction. In W. Gunn and J. Donovan (Eds.) *Design and Anthropology*. Farnham: Ashgate, 57-68.
- Sheridan, K.M., Halverson, E.R., Litts, B., Brahms, L., Jacobs-Priebe, L. & Owns, T. (2014) Learning in the making: A Comparative study of three Makerspaces. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(4), 505-531.
- Shove, E., & Pantzar, M. (2005) Consumers, Producers and Practices Understanding the invention and reinvention of Nordic walking. *Journal of consumer culture*, 5(1), 43-64.
- Simon, H. A. (1969) *The sciences of the artificial*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Soderberg, J. (2013) Automating amateurs in the 3D printing community. *Work Organisation, Labour & Globalisation*, 7(1), 124–139.
- The Partnership of 21st Century Skills. (2008) *21st Century Skills, Education & Competitiveness. A Resource and Policy Guide*.
- Von Hippel, E. (2005) *Democratizing Innovation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Vossoughi, S., & Bevan, B. (2014) *Making and Tinkering: A Review of the Literature*. National Research Council Committee on Out of School Time STEM.
- Watson, M., & Shove, E. (2008) Product, Competence, Project and Practice: DIY and the dynamics of craft consumption. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 8(1), 69–89.

About the Authors:

Giuseppe Salvia Interested to the relationship between people and artefacts to promote a shift towards sustainable patterns of consumption and production with the contribution of design, focused on attitudes throughout product lifespan; making and repairing; grassroots innovations; skills development and empowerment.

Carmen Bruno interested to investigate new spaces for designer in the emerging design landscape from a human-centered perspective. Interested also in experiment new approaches, based on design thinking and co-design, that leads organization in private and public sectors to radical innovation.

Marita Canina Interested to give value to creativity, promoting innovation through design, as well as to activate and re-enforce all phases of the 'creative process' within any given context. Also interested to Bio-design and the use of new technologies for psycho-physical well-being.

This page is intentionally left blank

Index of Authors

- Abdelmohsen, Sherif, 1969
Aftab, Mersha, 3181
Ahmadpour, Naseem, 1457
Ahmer, Arif, 593
Aish, Robert, 111
Alhonsuo, Mira, 3069
Alshawaf, Eman, 959
Andrietc, Ekaterina, 157
Annable, Louise, 303
Arvidsson, Anna-Karin, 1411
Arvola, Mattias, 1089
Atkin, Ross, 2391
Atkinson, Harriet, 2583
Atman, Cynthia J., 593
Bachman, Leonard, 295
Baek, Joon Sang, 3943
Bailey, Jocelyn, 3619
Bakir, Ramy, 1969
Barbosa, Janaina Teles, 4045
Bastian, Michelle, 2107
Bauer, Birgit S., 569
Baule, Giovanni, 1039, 1047
Baur, Ruedi, 1139
Beck, Jordan, 17
Benford, Steve, 3033
Berghman, Michaël, 139, 277
Bingham, Guy, 2239
Bissett-Johnson, Katherine, 637
Bitterman, Noemi, 1433
Black, Alison, 2301
Blackler, Alethea, 2063, 3149, 3251
Blomqvist, Mikael, 1411
Bobroff, Julien, 555
Boehnert, Joanna, 2359
Boess, Stella, 625, 1573
Bofylatos, Spyros, 3449
Boggs, Charles, 513
Bohemia, Erik, 1699, 1881
Bonja, Susanne, 1411
Börekcü, Naz A.G.Z., 795
Borgford-Parnell, Jim, 593
Boyd Davis, Stephen, 2591
Boyko, Chris, 1677
Boztepe, Suzan, 1253
Braga, Mariana Fonseca, 1863
Brischke, Lars-Arvid, 3913
Broadley, Cara, 1737
Brooks, Judy, 539
Brown, Michael, 3033
Brulé, Émeline, 1985
Burnett, Dan, 1609, 1625
Burns, Kathryn, 303
Büscher, Monika, 1123
Buur, Jacob, 1723
Cadavid, Ana, 179
Cain, Rebecca, 1271, 1433
Calvo, Mirian, 3591
Canina, Marita, 2075
Caratti, Elena, 1039, 1047
Carmen Bruno, 2075
Casais, Mafalda, 1553
Castanedo, Rebeca Torres, 2163
Catoir-Brisson, Marie-Julie, 2285
Celi, Manuela, 2015
Ceschin, Fabrizio, 3731, 3785
Chamberlain, Paul, 1499
Chamorro-Koc, Marianella, 1643
Champion, Katherine, 1737
Chan, Jeffrey, 3539
Chatzakis, Emmanouil, 1881
Cheng, Peiyao, 215
Chiapello, Laureline, 17
Chou, Wen-Huei, 3133
Christensen, Anders, 1757
Chueng-Nainby, Priscilla, 969
Chun, Min Hi, 1935
Ciastellardi, Matteo, 1111
Ciuccarelli, Paolo, 941
Claxton, Stella, 3815
Coddington, Alicen, 781
Connor, Andy M., 83
Cooney, Richard, 2201
Cooper, Rachel, 1677, 1699
Cooper, Tim, 1277, 3831
Corrigan-Doyle, Emily, 1529
Coskun, Aykut, 1357
Côté, Valérie, 3669
Coulton, Paul, 369, 1609, 3019
Craib, David, 385, 2325
Craig, Claire, 1499
Craig, Mark, 609
Cranny-Francis, Anne, 2985
Dallison, Delphine, 609
Danahay, Evan, 2533
Darzentas, Dimitrios, 3033
Darzentas, Jenny, 3449, 3771
Darzentas, Jenny S., 2307
Darzentas, John, 3771
Dawes, Cecilie, 3435
de Eyto, Adam, 2709
de Kerckhove, Derrick, 1111
de la Rosa, Juan, 2121
de Lille, Christine, 2423, 2563
De Moor, Eva, 3435
De Paoli, Giovanni, 853
de Ruijter, Laura, 1473

Index of Authors

- De Smet, Annelies, 2759
DeEyto, Adam, 3573
Del Gaudio, Chiara, 2121
Deni, Michela, 2285
Derksen, Gerry, 2121
Desai, Shital, 3149
Deserti, Alessandro, 2015
Desmet, Pieter, 1553, 1589
Desmet, Pieter M. A., 1999
Dhadphale, Tejas, 2415
Dias, Julia, 2121
Djaelani, Robert, 3705
Dong, Hua, 3199, 3229, 3247, 3263, 3279
Dorst, Kees, 2493, 2667
Downing, Niamh, 3485
Downs, Simon, 321
Dunn, Nick, 1677
Durrant, Abigail C., 2181
Duste, Tessa, 1589
Dziobczenski, Paulo Roberto Nicoletti, 705
Earl, Christopher, 3687
Earl, Christopher F, 2519
Eckert, Claudia, 2519
Edwards, Liz, 3485
Eftekhari, Farzaneh, 1389
Elliott-Cirigottis, Gary, 609
Elzenbaumer, Bianca, 4005, 4015
Emili, Silvia, 3785
Erbug, Cigdem, 1357
Escobar-Tello, Carolina, 1433, 1529, 3961
Evans, Mark, 813, 2239
Evans, Martyn, 97
Fassi, Davide, 3407
Feast, Luke, 3569, 3635
Felsing, Ulrike, 1139
Fenko, Anna, 3467
Fennell, Jac, 1441
Feronato, Priscilla, 2121
Fisher, Tom, 3479
Flintham, Martin, 3033
Forlano, Laura, 927
Frankel, Lois, 3103
Franz, Fabio, 4015
Fredriksen, Biljana C., 2911
Freimane, Aija, 1271
French, Tara, 2965, 3653
Fundneider, Thomas, 401
Gabrielse, Gorm, 1211
Gagnon, Caroline, 3669
Galeotti, Anamaria, 2837
Galluzzo, Laura, 3407
Gamman, Lorraine, 3479
Garde, Julia Anne, 2043
Gardin, Astury, 969
Gasparin, Marta, 881
Gaved, Mark, 609
Gaziulusoy, Idil, 3731
Gentes, Annie, 555
Germany, Jason O., 3085
Ghassan, Aysar, 471
Giaccardi, Elisa, 3553
Giang, Colin, 781
Gideonsen, Hanne, 3435
Godin, Danny, 355
Görgül, Emine, 2825
Goworek, Helen, 3831
Gradinar, Adrian, 1609
Graf, Laura K. M., 203
Graham, Alexander, 781
Grangaard, Sidse, 3393
Gray, Colin M., 2549
Graziano, Valeria, 4005
Green, William, 881
Gribbin, John, 3181
Gristwood, Simone, 2591
Groth, Camilla, 2889, 2895, 2941
Grover, Shruti, 2391
Gudiksen, Sune, 1757
Gudur, Raghavendra Reddy, 3251
Guité, Manon, 853
Gullick, David, 3019
Gulliksen, Marte S., 2889, 2925
Hadfield, Mark, 2709
Håkansson, Lena, 1411
Hall, Ashley, 2481
Hall, Peter A., 2625
Hands, David, 2445
Hanington, Bruce, 729
Harland, Robert, 385
Harrison, David, 3785
Haslem, Neal, 2201
Hasselqvist, Hanna, 3929
Haug, Anders, 1903, 3873
Hazzard, Adrian, 3033
Heaton, Lorna, 853
Heiltjes, Sanne, 3467
Hekkert, Paul, 139, 277
Henriksen, Pernille, 1757
Hermansdóttir, Hafdís Sunna, 3435
Hermansen, Pablo, 895
Hermsen, Sander, 1323, 1375
Hernandez, Maria Gabriela, 2089
Hesselgren, Mia, 3929
Heylighen, Ann, 3199, 3229
Hill, Helen, 3831
Hofmeister, Tobias Barnes, 3847
Hogan, Trevor, 3005
Hornecker, Eva, 3005
Hough, Simge, 751
Hrinivich, Ellen, 3103

Index of Authors

- Huang, Tao, 2699
Hung, Chung-Wen, 3133
Huotilainen, Minna, 2941
Hutchings, Maggie, 2709
Hyltén-Cavallius, Sara, 1411
Hyysalo, Sampsa, 3889
Imbesi, Lorenzo, 2325
Ingram, Jack, 303
Ings, Welby, 483
Ivanka, Tania, 2201
James, Meredith, 719
Janssens, Nel, 2759
Jernegan, Elizabeth, 2121
Johnson, Michael Pierre, 1737
Johnson, Simon, 2391
Jones, Derek, 295
Jonkmans, Anna, 767
Joost, Gesche, 3913
Joutsela, Markus, 259
Jowers, Iestyn, 609
Jun, Gyuchan Thomas, 1809
Jylkäs, Titta, 3069
Kaland, Lennart, 835, 2563
Kantorovitch, Julia, 2463
Karlsson, Monica Lindh, 4029
Keirnan, Alen, 1457
Keitsch, Martina, 3847
Kelly, Veronika, 425
Kempenaar, Annet, 2271
Kennings, Gail, 1441
Kerridge, Tobie, 1025
Ketola, Anne, 1179
Kettley, Sarah, 1277, 2985, 3121
Kim, KwanMyung, 1919
Kim, Sojung, 3943
Kimbell, Lucy, 3605
Kirk, David S., 2181
Knutz, Eva, 1827
Kocsis, Anita, 781
Kokotovich, Vasilije, 2493
Komatsu, Tamami, 2015
Koskinen, Ilpo, 1013
Kotlarewski, Nathan, 2533
Koumoundourou, Myrto, 2307
Koutsabasis, Panayiotis, 2307
Kristensen, Tore, 1205, 1211
Krzywinski, Jens, 2869
Kuijer, Lenneke, 3553
Kuys, Blair, 1163, 2533
Kuzmina, Ksenija, 1809
Kymäläinen, Tiina, 1627
Lahusen, Miriam, 3913
Laivamaa, Laura, 3069
Landwehr, Jan R., 145, 203
Langrish, John Z., 51
Lee, John, 969
Lee, Seong geun, 157
Leinikka, Marianne, 2941
Lenskjold, Tau U., 1827
Lewis, Huw, 3573
Liao, Cai-Ru, 3133
Liapis, Aggelos, 2463
Lim, Christopher Sze Chong, 3295
Lima, Verena, 3983
Linde, Per, 913
Lindley, Joseph, 369
Liu, Sylvia, 1205, 1237
Liu, Tsai Lu, 501, 1389
Lloyd, Peter, 3619, 3687
Lønne, Irene Alma, 1223
Loudon, David, 1515
Lu, Xiaobo, 3373
Lucas, Rachel, 3121
Ludden, Geke, 245, 1271, 1305, 1433, 1473
Lulham, Rohan, 1777
Ma, Xuezi, 3279
Macdonald, Alastair S., 1515
Macduff, Colin, 1515
Maciver, Fiona, 2463
Mackrill, Jamie, 1433
Mages, Michael Arnold, 3503
Maguire, Martin, 1809
Mahar, Doug, 3251
Maher, Carmel, 2709
Mäkelä, Maarit, 2889, 2941
Malins, Julian, 2463
Manohar, Arthi Kanchana, 3591
Marchand, Anne, 2653
Marenko, Betti, 2755
Margolin, Victor, 5
Markussen, Thomas, 1827
Marlen Dobler, Judith, 997
Marttila, Sanna, 4063
Mattila, Pauliina, 781
Mauri, Michele, 941
Maxwell, Deborah, 3485
Maya, Jorge, 179
Mayer, Stefan, 145
Mazzarella, Francesco, 3961
Mazzilli, Clice, 2837
McAra, Marianne, 3213
McGaw, Janet, 669
McGilp, Helen, 2519
Mcginley, Chris, 2391
McHattie, Lynn-Sayers, 1737
McLaren, Angharad, 3831
Mercer, Lisa, 2029
Messell, Tania, 2737
Meyer, Guilherme, 2121
Michura, Piotr, 2121

Index of Authors

- Micklethwaite, Paul, 2163
Mitchell, Cynthia, 2255
Mitchell, Val, 1809, 3961
Mok, Luisa Sze-man, 3889
Moncur, Wendy, 2181
Moreno, Mariale, 1809
Morris, Andrew, 1271
Mota, João Almeida, 4045
Moussatche, Helena, 513
Mugge, Ruth, 215, 1553
Mulder, Sander, 1375, 2809
Munro, Tasman, 2219
Murphy, Emma, 97
Murray, Lesley, 1123
Neira, José, 895
Nevay, Sara, 3295
Neven, Louis, 3553
Niedderer, Kristina, 1271
Nimkulrat, Nithikul, 3177
Ning, Weining, 3263
Noel, Lesley-Ann, 455, 501
Nordvall, Mathias, 1089
Norris, Jane, 2795
Ó Catháin, Conall, 125
O'Rafferty, Simon, 3573
Oberlander, Jon, 2991
Olander, Sissel, 985
Oppenheimer, Maya Rae, 2583
Orzech, Kathryn, 2181
Ou, Li-Chen, 233
Oxborrow, Lynn, 3815, 3831
Ozcan, Elif, 1433
Ozkaramanli, Deger, 1999
Paepcke-Hjeltness, Verena, 2415
Page, Rowan, 1487
Pahk, Yoonee, 3943
Paiva, Isabel, 3165
Palmgren, Marianne, 653
Park, Sumin, 3181
Parker, Chris, 1809
Paskan, Gert, 1659
Person, Oscar, 705
Peschl, Markus F., 401
Petermans, Ann, 1433
Pillatt, Toby, 3485
Piper, Anna, 2959
Pisanty, Diego Trujillo, 2181
Piscicelli, Laura, 1305
Pizzichemi, Catherine, 513
Plowright, Philip, 295
Plowright, Philip D., 339
Pohlmeyer, Anna E., 1573
Poldma, Tiiu, 295
Pollastri, Serena, 1677
Popovic, Vesna, 2063, 3149, 3251, 3373
Porter, Samantha, 1809
Potter, Eden, 2379
Prince, Anne, 781
Prochner, Isabel, 2653
Prytherch, David, 1441
Pschetz, Larissa, 2107
Pui Ying Lo, Kathy, 1529
Quam, Andrea, 3861
Radtke, Rebekah, 685
Raman, Sneha, 2965
Rankanen, Mimmu, 2941
Ranscombe, Charlie, 637
Rashidi, Ingrid Halland, 2637
Reddy, Anuradha, 913
Redström, Johan, 4029
Reimer, Maria Hellström, 4045
Renes, Reint Jan, 1323, 1375
Renner, Michael, 1073
Renon, Anne-Lyse, 555
Renström, Sara, 1339
Reumont, Marie, 853
Revsbæk, Line, 1723
Riccò, Dina, 1101
Richardson, Mark, 1487
Ritzmann, Susanne, 3913
Rive, Pete, 83
Rizzo, Francesca, 2015
Roberts, Maxwell J., 2341
Rothead, Alan, 609
Rodgers, Paul A., 2677
Rogel, Liat, 3407
Rontti, Simo, 3069
Rosenqvist, Tanja, 2255
Roto, Virpi, 259
Roy, Robin, 3755
Ruecker, Stan, 2121
Ruiz-Córdoba, Stefany, 179
Rytilahti, Piia, 3069
Sadkowska, Ania, 3521
Sadkowska, Anna, 3121
Sakurai, Tatiana, 3983
Salinas, Miguel, 1411
Salvia, Giuseppe, 2075
Sametinger, Florian, 3913
Santos, Maria Cecília, 3983
Sarmiento, Ricardo Mejia, 1659
Scaletsky, Celso, 2121
Schaeffer, Jennie Andersson, 653
Schifferstein, Hendrik N.J., 3427
Scupelli, Peter, 539, 729
Seitamaa-Hakkarainen, Pirita, 2889, 2941
Self, James, 157
Selvefors, Anneli, 1339
Shroyer, Kathryn E., 593
Sice, Petia, 1291

“Over fifty years the Design Research Society has been fundamental to developing and supporting the field of Design Research. In that time many influential and innovative conferences have been held and the 50th Anniversary in Brighton conference continues that tradition. The breadth and depth of design research represented in these proceedings is extremely impressive and shows, I think, not only how important design research has become, but also the considerable potential that it holds for the future.”

- Professor Nigel Cross
PRESIDENT OF THE DRS

drs2016.org



University of Brighton
DesignResearchSociety

