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ABSTRACT
Design is increasingly becoming a part of the university curriculum and research agenda. A theory about the process and practice of design might be important to establish design as a main subject at universities. We believe it is in the interest of many design communities – not least the Participatory Design (PD) community – to engage in theorizing design, on the basis of our understanding of design and design practices. This theory could be positioned as an alternative to other attempts to theorize design, for example the influential efforts of the Information Systems (IS) community. We urge the PD community to engage in collective theory building, and we present a framework intended to support our shared reflections on the design of human technologies.
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INTRODUCTION
Human and societal problems are to a considerable extent addressed with technological means, and there is widespread recognition of the importance of technology in ensuring our welfare in the future. The design of new technologies has also become the subject of university-based research and led to new educational programs. In Europe, schools within design and architecture have traditionally been rooted in practice and craftsmanship but now increasingly implement academic criteria in their programs. The emergence of university curricula that approach design on a scientific basis creates a need to theorize the practices and processes of designing.

Within IS a widely cited attempt to characterize design science suggests a conceptual framework combining interactions of build-evaluate iterations with the environment and business needs (stressing relevance) as well as the use of, and contribution to, the existing knowledge base (stressing rigor) (Hevner et al., 2004). The framework is accompanied by seven general guidelines “in order to illustrate how authors, reviewers, and editors can apply them consistently” (p. 76). We believe that such frameworks play an influential role in establishing design as a scientific discipline at the universities. IS has a focus on business, management, and organization. Their frameworks do, however, not explicitly address all issues and concerns of other design communities.

How should PD, and other communities involved in the design of human technologies respond to the challenge of theorizing design? We suggest that they should engage in developing design theories that embrace our understanding of design and the core identity of our communities. There is, we contend, a need for a science-based, design-oriented main subject at the universities to explain the role of technologies in contemporary societies, to conceptualize the contributions of designing to fulfilling human needs, and to provide a foundation for the education of future academic designers. We propose building frameworks that acknowledge design as “a process of investigating, understanding, reflecting upon, establishing, developing, and supporting mutual learning between multiple participants in collective ‘reflection-in-action’” (Simonsen and Robertson, 2012, p. 2). In addition, we emphasize multiplicity rather than a universalistic worldview, and collective reflections rather than a position of “all learning takes place inside individual human heads” (Simon, 1991, p. 125).

A design-oriented main subject at the universities should embrace broad approaches to design and include multiple, diverse, interdisciplinary subject areas, application domains, researchers, and projects. At Roskilde University, Denmark, we have since 2008 strived to establish a new main subject area – Designing Human Technologies – alongside the three longstanding main subject areas: Natural Science, the Humanities, and Social Science. The purpose of this design-oriented area is to be constructive (to make designs) and solution-oriented in close dialogue with citizens, users, and other stakeholders in design projects. The university's contribution toward fulfilling this purpose is (1) to provide an analysis of the relevant issues, (2) to design solutions for specified issues through, for example, action research, and (3) to reflect on how designs are used and incorporated in human lives. We
subscribe to the basic human principle that users, target groups, and other central stakeholders must take part in the design and the design process, in ethical and society-related discussions, and in evaluating how designs fulfill needs and solve problems. Designing Human Technologies espouses a broad conception of technology, including information, communication, mobile, environmental, and energy technologies as well as technologies relating to performances, experiences, urban design, climate adaptation and so forth.

One of our key activities has been engaging in collectively discussing and reflecting upon our different design project experiences. This has led to two recent anthologies in which a total of 46 researchers reflect on 33 design projects dealing with organization and information technology design in for example the health sector, the design of urban spaces, the design of performances and museum events, and the design of environment-friendly alternative technologies in the transport sector. In spite of diverse backgrounds, our reflections have uncovered a shared understanding of the design process depicted in a general process model that emphasizes the emergent properties of design (Simonsen et al., 2010) and in a collection of 18 situated methods for design (Simonsen et al., 2014).

We do not mean to suggest that existing work in PD, human-computer interaction, and related fields has not produced and been informed by theory. It has. What we do mean to propose is that further theorizing about design in PD and related fields should preferably be a collective process anchored in the experiences of multiple research groups, their projects, and disciplinary backgrounds. Based on our experiences so far, we present an initial design framework and propose using it to stimulate and coordinate a dialogue about shared theory building. The framework is at an early stage of development and intended to evolve over the coming years.

AN INITIAL DESIGN FRAMEWORK

Our initial framework consists of four themes, each characterized by four dimensions, see Figure 1. We hope the framework can serve as a vehicle for researchers with different backgrounds to reflect on their design experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Different knowledges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent</td>
<td>Mutual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity-based</td>
<td>Joint goal negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable</td>
<td>Infrastructuring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situatedness</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situated knowledges</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situated learning</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situated action</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situating contexts</td>
<td>Societal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. A framework intended for supporting reflection on the design of human technologies.

Design processes aim to produce change, the first theme of our framework. Simon (1996) considers this aim the defining characteristic of design when he states that “everyone designs who devises courses of action aimed at changing existing situations into preferred ones” (p. 111). The relation between design and change is, however, dynamic and unruly. Many studies find that change defies detailed planning, that the changes resulting from a design may contradict the changes that motivated the design, and that the changes that accompany a design may not persist. In the last case, the preferred situation reverts back into the old situation, or transforms into a third situation, thereby suggesting that the design process was based on a partial understanding of the preferred situation. While this can be considered evidence of substandard design work, it is increasingly perceived as an unavoidable condition we need to face in our understanding of design and change. One response is to broaden the conception of design to include also the activities that produce the changes not initially planned for (e.g., Dittrich et al., 2002).

We distinguish between four dimensions of change: Planned change is intended, planned ahead, and occurs as anticipated by the originators of the change. Emergent change is local and spontaneous. It grows out of practice, rather than happens as the result of deliberate and originally planned action. Opportunity-based changes are purposefully introduced changes resulting from unexpected opportunities, events, or breakdowns that arise after the introduction of a new technology (Orlikowski & Hofman, 1997). Sustainable change implies that changes must accord with ideological, moral, and ethical points of view and must strive for a small ecological footprint in terms of their environmental effects and consumption of resources.

The second theme of our framework is participation. Participation involves that representatives of all actors with a stake in the use of the designed technology must take part in the process of its design. Taking part means that “any user needs to participate willingly as a way of working both as themselves (respecting their individual and group’s/community’s genuine interests) and with themselves (being concentrated present in order to sense how they feel about an issue, being open toward reflections on their own opinions)” (Simonsen and Robertson, 2012, p. 5). This definition stresses the conditions necessary for genuine participation in projects. In the absence of the necessary conditions user representatives may face a troubling tension between their role as representatives of their group and that as members of the design project. In addition to personal authenticity, participation is normally associated with genuine influence. This way, participation, for example, goes beyond user roles such as those of being an informant in interviews aimed at gathering user needs or a subject in evaluations aimed at identifying usability or efficiency problems.

Participation encompasses some of the basic principles of participatory design (Simonsen and Robertson, 2012). We recognize the importance of respect for different knowledges, which is a prerequisite for participation to occur, and of the commitment to mutual learning, which means that designers must learn about the realities of the users’ work and the users must learn about available technologi-
tal options to be able to articulate their desired aims. In
addition, the dimensions of participation include joint
goal negotiation to achieve “shared and agreed-upon
goals of the design task and project at hand” (Simonsen
and Robertson, 2012, p. 5). Infrastructuring, the final
dimension of participation, involves that participation
serves to make designs part of existing structures and
practices. Participation introduces user needs and situa-
tional constraints that shape design products and, at the
same time, participation results in design products that
shape the structures and practices.

Design is inextricably woven into the particulars of the
situation in which the design takes place. It is situated.
This third theme of our framework is in opposition to a
universalistic view of design as an activity for which we
can devise principles and methods that apply unaltered
across situations. It is, however, also in opposition to a
relativistic view of design because such a view treats all
situations as different but equally important and, thereby,
refrains from engaging with the particulars of the con-
crete design situation. Viewing design as situated means
that the situation with its possibilities, constraints, and
other particulars co-determines the design process and the
resulting design. It also means that what is being designed
is a transformation of the situation, not merely an add-on
to it (Simonsen et al., 2014). The situation shapes the
design process, positively as well as negatively; it is not
simply a passive background upon which the design takes
place.

We identify four related but different ways of approach-
ing situatedness: Situated knowledges imply that design is
always carried out with partiality and from a specific,
embedded position, as “politics and epistemologies of
location, positioning, and situating” (Haraway, 1988, p.
589). Situated learning emphasizes design processes and
designers’ learning as embedded in communities of prac-
tice (Lave and Wenger, 1991). Situated action emphasizes
the role and pervasiveness of “ad hoc improvisation –
the part of us, so to speak, that actually acts” (Suchman,
2007, p. 71), as opposed to representations of action in
the form of prescriptive accounts such as plans, proce-
dures, and guidelines. Situating contexts (Simonsen et al.,
2014) point to the multiple relations between the societal
context and the design situation, including structures
given by institutions, regulation, market mechanisms, and
infrastructures.

The fourth theme of our framework is scope. Design pro-
jects, technologies, and associated use situations may
differ drastically in scope. Some have argued that re-
searchers should to a larger extent engage in projects with
a wider scope (e.g., Shapiro, 2005). Whereas PD projects
have often focused on technologies with a collaborative
or organizational scope, overarching issues, such as
workplace democracy, are societal in scope. In addition,
technological infrastructures may have consequences for
individuals, organizations, as well as societies and, there-
fore, warrant analyses and design efforts at multiple lev-
els of scope. Different levels of scope demand different
types of change management, create different conditions
for participation, and entail situated design activities with
different extents of partiality and heterogeneity.

At the most intimate level, the scope is personal and fo-
cuses on individuals’ motivation for interacting with a
technology, their experiences from using and incorporat-
ing technologies in their lives, and their reasons for taking
part in design processes. A collaborative scope concerns
design processes, technologies, and use situations that
bring multiple people together, often across professions,
disciplines, seniority levels, age groups, and other bound-
aries. The scope of design work is frequently organiza-
tional as emphasized within IS. Thereby, design becomes
entangled in managerial decisions, organizational commu-
nication structures, employee motivation, and the like.
At the same time, a scope corresponding to an organiza-
tion provides better opportunities for managerial support
than designs targeting the collaborative processes of sub-
groups within organizations. Finally, design work may
have a societal scope. At this macro level sustainability,
infrastructures, social development, technological re-

gimes, and the cultivation of alternative design spaces are
among the important issues.

**DISCUSSION**

The primary interest of designers has to do with changing
things, connecting entities, and altering the world we are
living in. Whereas natural scientists are preoccupied with
descriptive analysis of nature, designers are engaged with
normative constructions. We may express these differ-
ences by asserting that ontology is to the natural sciences
what epistemology is to the field of design. It is in this
sense crucial that the designers know the meaning and
implications of the four themes in the framework we have
outlined above. The designers of course also need to
know the materials they are working with, but this only as
means toward a different end, namely change, alteration,
adjustment, improvement and so forth. Due to the norma-
tive quality of design, we maintain that design does not
merely build on a priori knowledge, but continuously
needs to reflect on previous design experiences and its
own history. We also maintain that designers need to
operate interdisciplinarily to make good designs in line
with the four themes of the framework.

The framework is deliberately not referencing any specif-
cic disciplines or application domains. Our intention is to
suggest a framework enabling researchers to engage in
collaborative and coordinated reflections independently
of disciplinary perspectives, such as computer science,
informatics, sociology, geography, organization studies,
performance design, urban studies, communication, and
education, as well as independently of application do-
 mains, such as government, engineering, healthcare, ser-
vice design, education, sustainable production, public
exhibitions, performances, and tourist experiences.

A theory for the design of human technologies must syn-
thesize the extensive empirical experience acquired by
design researchers. This entails a focus on learning with
an emphasis on mutual learning. New paradigms have
emerged with a greater focus on how learning and
knowledge are created through the interaction and active
participation of researchers as well as practitioners in
collaborative design processes. Within education, stu-
dents as well as professors engaged in mutual learning
must be aware of what they are doing, and how they are
interacting while they are doing it, to paraphrase Schön (1983, p. 275). Due to the complexity of the processes, activities can only be planned tentatively and through continuing iterations. It is therefore necessary for the participants – be it students, professors or practitioners – to engage in dialogues and negotiations in order to reach strategies for action. Barab and Squire (2004) explain that

A theory for the design of human technologies should be interdisciplinary, and in order to achieve this objective the approach to theorizing design must be inclusive. Our aim is to provide a meeting point for a plurality of voices, to stimulate discussion across different perspectives, knowledges, and ontologies, and to shed light on design as it is practiced in different contexts. Patterns in the contributions to such a theory might well emerge and stabilize but should not be taken for granted. Rather, the theory should itself remain open to change, invite participation, embrace its situatedness, and strive to interconnect multiple levels of scope.
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