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What we will do today

- Overview of Coursework 1.1
- Questions for this week
- Definitions of design (research)
  - Products, Services, Systems
  - User, Human, More-than-Human
  - Usability, Experience, Values
  - Co, Critical, Speculative
- Prep work for next week
Overview of Coursework 1.1
# Coursework 1.1

## Lectures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (w/c 18th Sept)</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>JV/SL</td>
<td>Course Introduction + Introduction to Design Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (w/c 25th Sept)</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>JV</td>
<td>Research into, for and through Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (w/c 2nd Oct)</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>JV</td>
<td>Ethical Design Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (w/c 9th Oct)</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Case Studies in IoT and Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (w/c 16th Oct)</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Case Studies in XR and Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (w/c 23rd Oct)</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Case Studies in LLMs and Creative Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (w/c 30th Oct)</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>JV</td>
<td>Case Studies in Blockchain and Civic Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (w/c 6th Nov)</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>JV</td>
<td>Case Studies in Autonomous Systems and Ageing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (w/c 13th Nov)</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Probes in Design Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (w/c 20th Nov)</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>JV</td>
<td>Co-Design in Design Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (w/c 27th Nov)</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Q&amp;A refresher session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JV:** John Vines  
**SL:** Susan Lechelt

---

## Tutorials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Tutorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (w/c 2nd Oct)</td>
<td>How to use the ACM Digital Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (w/c 9th Oct)</td>
<td>How to analyse a case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (w/c 23rd Oct)</td>
<td>Analysis of a case study #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (w/c 30th Oct)</td>
<td>Analysis of a case study #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (w/c 13th Nov)</td>
<td>Cultural Probes #1 - Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (w/c 20th Nov)</td>
<td>Cultural Probes #2 - Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Block 1 - What is design (research)**
Coursework 1.1

CW1 – Studying Case Studies (Individual) – 50%
- 1.1. - Comparing two different approaches to design research – 5% - 9th October 2023 (PASS/FAIL)
- 1.2. - Case study reflection and analysis – 45% - 27th November 2023

CW2 – Applying a Design Method and Weekly Engagement (Individual) – 50%
- 2.1 - Portfolio of materials for Probe study – 45% - 10th January 2024
- 2.2 - Evidence of weekly engagement in Course Notebook – 5% - each week throughout the course!
Coursework 1.1

CW1.1: Comparing two different approaches to design research (5%).

This is an initial simple PASS/FAIL coursework to see how well you and search for and cite literature on the ACM Digital Library, and to give you an opportunity to review and compare two examples of published literature that you have identified as using different approaches to design research.

You are asked to:
• Search for and identify two published research articles that:
  • (1) you identify as relevant to design informatics, and;
  • (2) use different approaches to design research (which can include different conceptualisations or methods).
• Write a 300 word (+/- 10%) review of how the approaches used in the two papers compare and differ from one another, with citation to key references.
• Include a short list of References, in ACM format, which should include the two papers you have selected.

Template to be found on: Blackboard LEARN, Assessment -> Assignment Submission -> CW1.1.
Deadline: 9th October 2023, 12:00.
Questions for this week
Questions for this week

91.5% submission

Approx. 5000 words (just for questions…)

Note: *It’s NOT the place to ask questions like …
“where are the lectures?”!*
Research for, into, through Design

RfD = You conduct research without designing something. You have the intention of designing something later on, or to pass what you find out to someone else to design something.
Research for, into, through Design

**RfD** = You conduct research without designing something. You have the intention of designing something later on, or to pass what you find out to someone else to design something.
Research for, into, through Design

RfD = You conduct research without designing something. You have the intention of designing something later on, or to pass what you find out to someone else to design something.

RiD = You conduct research into someone else doing some designing. You have the intention to learn from someone else’s design process for your own practice, or you are more interested in understanding how people do design than designing yourself.
Research for, into, through Design

**RfD** = You conduct research without designing something. You have the intention of designing something later on, or to pass what you find out to someone else to design something.
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Research for, into, through Design

RfD = You conduct research without designing something. You have the intention of designing something later on, or to pass what you find out to someone else to design something.

RiD = You conduct research into someone else doing some designing. You have the intention learn from someone elses design process for your own practice, or you are more interested in understanding how people do design than designing yourself.

RtD = You conduct research as part of an iterative design process. You realise / materialize / represent aspects of a design and use research (e.g., engagements with users) to develop your ideas and design as you go along, eventually leading to a refined design.
Research for, into, through Design

**RfD** = You conduct research without designing something. You have the intention of designing something later on, or to pass what you find out to someone else to design something.

**RiD** = You conduct research into someone else doing some designing. You have the intention learn from someone else’s design process for your own practice, or you are more interested in understanding how people do design than designing yourself.

**RtD** = You conduct research as part of an iterative design process. You realise / materialize / represent aspects of a design and use research (e.g., engagements with users) to develop your ideas and design as you go along, eventually leading to a refined design.
These concepts (RfD, RiD and RtD) seems similar to Design from, with, by Data. Are they related?
Design Informatics: is about design + data

It’s about **design + data**

Design **from** data: when systems are designed by people, where they are inspired by measurable features of humans, computers, things, and their contexts.

Design **with** data: when systems are designed by people, where they take into account the flows of data through systems, and the need to sustain and enhance human values.

Design **by** data: when systems are designed by other systems, largely autonomously, where new products and services can be synthesised via the data-intensive analysis of existing combinations of humans, computers, things, and contexts.
What does the article mean when it refers to “quick and dirty” methods? Are there examples?
Why You Only Need to Test with 5 Users

Summary: Elaborate usability tests are a waste of resources. The best results come from testing no more than 5 users and running as many small tests as you can afford.

By Jakob Nielsen on March 18, 2000
Topics: User Testing


What does the article mean when it talks about the need to avoid being too methodical (RiD) or not methodical enough (RtD)?
What does the article mean when it talks about the need to avoid being too methodical (RiD) or not methodical enough (RtD)?
What does the article mean when it talks about the need to avoid being too methodical (RiD) or not methodical enough (RtD)?
Where can I find examples of new and cutting edge research related to design informatics?
Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies

The Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies (IMWUT) is a premier journal series for...

Interactions

Interactions is a magazine intended for professionals interested in the connections between experiences, people an...

Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction

The Proceedings of the ACM on Human Computer Interaction (HCI) is a journal series for research relevant to multiple aspects of...

https://dl.acm.org/sig/sigchi/publications
• **Human Factors in Computer Systems (CHI)**
• ACM Conference on Supporting Groupwork (GROUP)
• International Conference on **Tangible, Embedded and Embodied Interaction (TEI)**
• International Conference on **Intelligent User Interfaces (IUI)**
• ACM/IEEE International Conference on **Human Robot Interaction (HRI)**
• Symposium on Eye Tracking Research and Applications (ETRA)
• ACM International Conference on **Interactive Media Experiences (IMX)**
• Collective Intelligence (CI)
• Interaction, Design and Children (IDC)
• ACM SIGCHI Symposium on Engineering Interactive Computing Systems (EICS)
• **Designing Interactive Systems Conference (DIS)**
• International Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation, and Personalization (UMAP)
• ACM International Joint Conference on **Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (UbiComp)**
• International Conference on Automotive User Interfaces and Interactive Vehicular Applications (AutomotiveUI)
• ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys)
• International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction with Mobile Devices and Services (MobileHCI)
• Computer-Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)
• ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (UIST)
• International Conference on **Multimodal Interaction (ICMI)**
• Symposium on Spatial User Interaction (SUI)
• ACM Symposium and Virtual Reality Software and Technology
• Symposium on Computer-Human Interaction in Play (CHIPLAY)
• Interactive Surfaces and Spaces (ISS)
• **Creativity and Cognition (C&C)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lectures</th>
<th>Tutorials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (w/c 18th Sept) Mon JV/SL</td>
<td>Course Introduction + Introduction to Design Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (w/c 25th Sept) Mon JV</td>
<td>Research into, for and through Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (w/c 2nd Oct) Mon JV</td>
<td>Ethical Design Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (w/c 9th Oct) Mon SL</td>
<td>Case Studies in IoT and Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (w/c 16th Oct) Mon SL</td>
<td>Case Studies in XR and Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (w/c 23rd Oct) Mon SL</td>
<td>Case Studies in LLMs and Creative Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (w/c 30th Oct) Mon JV</td>
<td>Case Studies in Blockchain and Civic Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (w/c 6th Nov) Mon JV</td>
<td>Case Studies in Autonomous Systems and Ageing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (w/c 13th Nov) Mon SL</td>
<td>Probes in Design Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (w/c 20th Nov) Mon JV</td>
<td>Co-Design in Design Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (w/c 27th Nov) Mon SL</td>
<td>Q&amp;A refresher session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (w/c 2nd Oct)</td>
<td>How to use the ACM Digital Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (w/c 9th Oct)</td>
<td>How to analyse a case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (w/c 23rd Oct)</td>
<td>Analysis of a case study #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (w/c 30th Oct)</td>
<td>Analysis of a case study #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (w/c 13th Nov)</td>
<td>Cultural Probes #1 - Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (w/c 20th Nov)</td>
<td>Cultural Probes #2 - Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JV: John Vines - SL: Susan Lechelt
How do we know what the best method is for a particular project?
Let’s jump into Miro!

https://miro.com/app/board/uXjVMhv2i14=/?share_link_id=777455618197
Activity 1!: 10 minutes

In the Miro …

… write down examples of research and design methods you know of.
Activity 1!: 10 minutes

In the Miro …

… write down examples of research and design methods you know of.

… add these to where in the process illustrated here you think they fit.
Take a break!
Back at 16:10
Definitions of design
Defining design in relation to *what type of thing is being made*

**Product Design / Interaction Design**


**Service Design**

**Systemic Design**

**Key references:**
Defining design in relation to what type of thing is being made

Product Design / Interaction Design

Service Design

Systemic Design

Example: Any projects focused on designing mobile apps

Key references:

When engaging in product or interaction design, you are primarily interested in how people interact with, use and experience the “artefact” you have designed.
Defining design in relation to **what type of thing is being made**

**Product Design / Interaction Design**

**Service Design**

**Systemic Design**


When engaging in services design, you are interested in the multiple ways people may use a service (multiple “artefacts”) and how these are embedded in an organisation's service.
Defining design in relation to **what type of thing is being made**

**Product Design / Interaction Design**

**Service Design**

**Systemic Design**

**Key references:**

**Example:** Peace and Conflict Resolution Platform

When engaging in systemic design, you are interested in how different “artefacts” might be design to change the attitudes, beliefs or practices of a collective or group of people

[https://peacerep.org/](https://peacerep.org/)
Defining design in relation to what is at the centre of the process

User-centered design

Human-centered design

More than human centered design


Key references:

When engaging in user centered design, you try to focus on understanding the goals, tasks and aims of the intended user. Historically this has focused on workplaces and individual users.
Defining design in relation to **what is at the centre of the process**

**User-centered design**

**Human-centered design**

**More than human centered design**

**Example:** IDEO. 2015. DESIGN KIT. https://www.designkit.org/methods.html

**Key references:**

When engaging in human centered design (HCD), you are interested in not just a person’s tasks, but their emotions, aspirations, and unmet needs. HCD was adopted as technology moves from workplaces to all manner of everyday situations.
Defining design in relation to **what is at the centre of the process**

**User-centered design**

**Human-centered design**

**More than human centered design**


**Key references:**
- Wakkary. 2021. Things we could design: For more than human centered worlds. MIT Press.

When engaging in more than human centered design, you look at the wider implications for any new design on the environment, on other lifeforms, and long-term effects.
Defining design in relation to **what is being enhanced**

**Usability**

User experience / Experience design / Experience-centered design

Value sensitive design


Usability is defined by **5 quality components:**

- **Learnability:** How easy is it for users to accomplish basic tasks the first time they encounter the design?
- **Efficiency:** Once users have learned the design, how quickly can they perform tasks?
- **Memorability:** When users return to the design after a period of not using it, how easily can they reestablish proficiency?
- **Errors:** How many errors do users make, how severe are these errors, and how easily can they recover from the errors?
- **Satisfaction:** How pleasant is it to use the design?

When focused on usability, you are interested in designing interfaces that are efficient to use, and work in a way a user would expect them to.
Defining design in relation to what is being enhanced

Usability

User experience / Experience design / Experience-centered design

Value sensitive design

Key references:


When focused on user experience, you are trying to go beyond just making something usable, and considering how a design might delight someone, provoke them to engage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desirable aspects</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable</td>
<td>Motivating</td>
<td>Provocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Surprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasurable</td>
<td>Enhancing sociability</td>
<td>Rewarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>Supporting creativity</td>
<td>Emotionally fulfilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining</td>
<td>Cognitively stimulating</td>
<td>Experiencing flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undesirable aspects</th>
<th>Unpleasant</th>
<th>Patronizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making one feel guilty</td>
<td>Making one feel stupid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoying</td>
<td>Cutesy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childish</td>
<td>Gimmicky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defining design in relation to what is being enhanced

Usability

User experience / Experience design / Experience-centered design

Value sensitive design

Key references:
  https://vsdesign.org/


When focused on values, you are dealing with the complexity of the values and ethics (i.e., priorities, assumptions) of many different stakeholders, and long-term adoption.
Defining design in relation to an ethical stance

Co-design / Participatory design / Co-creation

Critical design

Speculative design / Design fiction

Key references:


When taking a co-design stance, you prioritise the involvement of people affected by introduction of a new product, service, system in the design decision making process.
Defining design in relation to an ethical stance

Co-design / Participatory design / Co-creation

Critical design

Speculative design / Design fiction

Key references:


When taking a critical design stance, you prioritise design's role to question “taken for granted” technological, political and social developments, and focus on provoking audiences imaginations.
Defining design in relation to an ethical stance

Co-design / Participatory design / Co-creation

Critical design

Speculative design / Design fiction

Key references:


When taking a speculative design stance, you place emphasis on representing exploring future scenarios where emerging technologies are adopted to stimulate engagement with stakeholders now.
Let’s go back into Miro!

https://miro.com/app/board/uXjVMhv2i14=/?share_link_id=777455618197
Activity 2!: 10 minutes

In the Miro …

Which of the examples of different design approaches are you most familiar with?

Which of the examples of different design approaches would you like to find out more about?

Go out on the Internet… find an example of this approach…. 
Some final reflections ....

- You can see a general trend over time from “designing for one person and one thing” to “designing for many people connected to many things within a complex social and environmental context”.

- These different definitions and approaches are not mutually exclusive or “either / or”.
  - For e.g., You can use co-design as part of human centered approaches, or as part of value sensitive design processes.
  - For e.g., You can design for both usability and user experience
  - For e.g., You may want to support systemic change through systemic design, but the designs you use as part of that need to be efficient to use

- Authors of papers and practitioners that share there work online might not actually “define” what type of design approach they take – you often need to analyse and interpret this

- There is a lot of mis-use of some of these terms – especially user centered / human centered, and usability / user experience
What we’ve covered so far.... the basics

In Week 1:

• 3 different ways to view the role of data in design
• High-level overviews of design processes / key qualities

In Week 2:

• 3 different ways to see the role of research in design processes
• Examples of research and design methods and mapped these onto design processes
• 12 different definitions of design
What we’ve covered so far.... the basics

In Week 1:

• 3 different ways to view the role of data in design
• High-level overviews of design processes / key qualities

In Week 2:

• 3 different ways to see the role of research in design processes
• Examples of research and design methods and mapped these onto design processes
• 12 different definitions of design

In CW1.1, we’re looking for you to show you’ve can identify examples of two of these and explain how they differ
Prep work for next week
Tasks for the next 7 days:

1. Your prep work for next week’s lecture
   i. Read the ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct: [https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics](https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics)
   iii. Read “Box 10.4: Data Ethics Principles (FATE)” (from page 380) in “Interaction Design: Beyond the Interface” – “What is Interaction Design?” Access this by going to the CDI1 Learn, Library Resources, Resource List and choose the book (you can read online).

2. Complete your Class Notebook submission in MS Teams:
   i. Write 3 reflections from last week’s prep work and today’s lecture – what did you learn (go beyond what you wrote last week)?
   ii. Write 2 questions you have based on the prep work for us (John and Susan) to consider for our lecture next week.
   iii. Write 1 comment – something you have learned, are intrigued by, something related to your background and interests – prompted by the prep work.
Any questions?

If you have any questions about this week or next week, contact me at:
john.vines@ed.ac.uk