

Review Details



Scroll To...

The manuscript has been thoroughly amended in response to the reviewers' comments and suggestions. The revision has been made by using Track Changes in MS Word, so the reviewers can see what things have been changed in the revised manuscript. The major change is to build a connection with participatory design and co-creation design. In doing so, more than ten latest articles in the fields was reviewed and included in the revised manuscript.

For Reviewer 1's comments and suggestions,

- 'Design process' and 'design techniques' have been clearly distinguished by defining design process as a conceptualised framework and design techniques as design methods in text.
- The second-order cybernetics was included in order to extend the argument of a user-evolving collaborative process and in terms of designer's role change.
- Participatory design related articles have been reviewed and included in references by particularly focusing on its linear pattern characteristics and intrinsic purposes towards co-creation design.
- 'Responsive architecture' (Sterk, 2006 and Ebenreuter, 2007) has been also included by discussing the benefits of 'the form of second-order cybernetics' for user-centred and participatory design
- The revised manuscript now clearly states that it mainly discusses within a context of web site development and interactive media design, enhances the perspective of the designer and user's ontology in the design processes, and articulates the designer's role as a facilitator and the user as a partner and an advocate. This extended argument has been achieved by providing further discussions of co-creation design – building a partnership and collective decision-making.

For Reviewer 2's comments and suggestions,

- Co-creation and user-centred design have been clearly distinguished by articulating the differences throughout the manuscript and co-creation has been extended further to propose a solution to a perspective of linear pattern in participatory design. I believe that the manuscript has also tightened up on web site development and interactive media design.
- Some ambiguous expressions have been corrected (i.e., p.3 "...inclusion and exclusion of the user needs..." was removed)
- I also added and discussed how iterative models overcome the limitations of linear models and at the same time, also discussed the former's limitation in practice for user participation.
- The missed reference (Simon, 1996) and the reference styles have been updated.
- I introduced co-creation design based on Ertner, Kragelund and Malmborg's (2010) article and some other articles, and extended it with discussing the designer's and user's ontological and sequential structural issues in design processes.
- The proposed co-creation model has been finely re-arranged to focus on "the user evolution" and "co-creation activities" for the designer's and users' ontological position as equal participants in design processes.

The two reviewers' feedback was absolutely constructive for this revision. I believe that the revised manuscript provides opportunities for designers in web and interactive media design filed to realise that their ontological dilemma is originated from the structural limitation of design processes, to reflect the user's participation issues in a more systematic perspective, and to actively act upon co-creation activities based on the user evolution.

[top](#)

Your manuscript entitled "Design process excludes users: the co-creation between user and designer", which you submitted to Digital Creativity, has been reviewed. The reviewer comments are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) would like to see some revisions made to your manuscript before publication. Therefore, we invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

When you revise your manuscript please highlight the changes you make in the manuscript by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or colored text.

To submit the revision, log into <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ndcr> and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision. Please enter your responses to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you made to the original manuscript. Please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Digital Creativity, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Digital Creativity and we look forward to receiving your revision.

Best regards,
Lone Malmborg and Julia Sussner
Editors

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Publish with minor changes

Comments:

The paper identifies the problem of the ontological status of the user in the design process, criticizes typical design processes and presents a new design methodology wherein the focus is on the evolution of user needs rather than the generation process; in doing so the representation of the user is transformed from a passive factor to active participant. In such a generation process designer and user are given equal status. However, while reading the article I was confused by the way 'design process' is used in the beginning of the text, referring both to the design process (in terms of the sequence of design-orientated activities) and design techniques (e.g., the medium/technology that facilitates the communication and actualization of ideas and concepts). This point should be clarified.

Also, I would welcome:

- 1) A contextualization of the work presented by theoretical viewpoints that link the discussion to the origins of design methodologies, and the way these were influenced by first-order cybernetics (and to the second wave of the design methodologies inspired by second-order cybernetics);
- 2) A few references of historical examples of participatory design, and how these early attempts have failed to enhance creativity;
- 3) Reference to contemporary examples that succeeded in facilitating the communication between stakeholders, such as B. Franken's DYNAFORM (cf. Gernot Brauer. 2002. Architektur als Markenkommunikation: dynaform + cube, Basel) who used customized computer software for collaboration and communication during the design process. Also, see the Gamesetandmatch I Conference Proceedings; Sterk, Tristan d'Estree. "Responsive Architecture: User-centred Interactions within the Hybridized Model of Control, Game Set and Match II." Conference Proceedings of the Faculty Of Architecture, Delft University Of Technology, 2006.

Finally, I found the paper missing a contextualization of its theoretical scope by contemporary discussions of open-source architectures, wherein the designer is a participant and not the person who exercises top-down control.

A concluding remark about the significance of the proposed understanding of the designer as facilitator and its implications on the role of professional designers in our contemporary societies would certainly strengthen the purpose of this research.

Additional Questions:

Is the paper interesting, timely and thought provoking? : 2

Is the subject matter relevant to this journal?: 1

Is the intellectual level appropriate?: 1

Is the paper written and structured clearly?: 1

Are there adequate references to related work?: 3

Are there sufficient graphics?: 2

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Request a major revision

Comments:

Core references from the co-design/co-creation field are lacking. Norman, Garrett and Graham are not representing co-design/co-creation, but user-oriented / user-friendly design, which is something radically different. The author makes no distinction between co-creation and user-oriented design, which is crucial for the arguments in the paper. One place to start in order to understand the co-design/co-creation area is looking into proceedings from the Participatory Design Conference, where most influential ideas and voices on co-design are published.

The paper mixes terminology from the software engineering field and the co-design field, and it seems like the author is confident with the software engineering field, but less confident with research and methods in the co-design field. This needs to be balanced in order to have an interesting paper.

Reflecting user needs in a design process (abstract) is not making it a co-creation process!

'User-centered' design (p. 2) is not co-creation!

P. 3: "user-centred design, as a conceptualized framework(s), allows inclusion and exclusion of user needs from the beginning to the end" - it is hard to understand this statement, as it seems to be quite contradictory and at the same time a central argument.

p. 5: "At present, designers are only involved in the development of visual outcomes, which are normally given from the project manager to the client." This claim is grounded in a linear process model. Many iterative models allow the designer to be engaged throughout the project. (e.g. Buxton). Also the assumption that design is equal to "visual outcomes" is far from most interaction design and experience design schools, where design also includes interaction and use contexts in general.

p. 7: Simon (1996) - this reference is not the reference list.

p. 9-10: You talk about designers' active participation as co-creation and the users should be empowered. Empowered users in a co-creation process, means that users are active participants in the design process, not just that designers 'treat users as (empowered) partners' (p. 9). On empowerment and participation you can take a look at: Ertner, M., A. Kragelund, L. Malmberg (2010). Five Enunciations of Empowerment in Participatory Design. In: Proceedings of PDC2010, Sydney, Australia, November 29 - December 3.

p. 12 and conclusion: The proposed co-creation model is not a co-creation model seen from a PDC-perspective. It does not allow direct users' participation in the design process, but just as 'communicators' of their needs in the different stages of development.

Additional Questions:

Is the paper interesting, timely and thought provoking? : 4

Is the subject matter relevant to this journal?: 4

Is the intellectual level appropriate?: 3

Is the paper written and structured clearly?: 3

Are there adequate references to related work?: 4

Are there sufficient graphics?: 3

Date Sent: 03-Aug-2011

[▲ top](#)

req Recommendation

Publish with no changes

Publish with minor changes

Request a major revision

Reject

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes

No

Comments

Confidential Comments to the Editors

I find the article 'Design process excludes users: the co-creation between user and designer' very interesting and thought provoking as it addresses the linear design process model and the way user needs are (pre)conceptualized by it. This issue is timely and requires rethinking due to the capacity of contemporary digital design techniques for dynamic interaction and communication which transforms the design process. The subject matter of the article is at the core of the journal's interests as it deals with new ways of approaching creativity in design. The argument is presented through well-defined terminology and the concepts discussed were selected carefully: there is a very interesting analysis of 'conceptualization in design' in terms of activities in an open system. The text is well structured, clearly written and with sufficient references to key bibliography of contemporary design methodology. The paper identifies the problem of the ontological status of the user in the design process, criticizes typical design processes and presents a new design methodology wherein the focus is on the evolution of user needs rather than the generation process; in doing so the representation of the user is transformed from a passive factor to active participant. In such a generation process designer and user are given equal status. However, while reading the article I was confused by the way 'design process' is used in the beginning of the text, referring both to the design process (in terms of the sequence of design-orientated activities) and design techniques (e.g., the medium/technology that facilitates the communication and actualization of ideas and concepts). This point should be clarified.

Also, I would welcome:

- 1) A contextualization of the work presented by theoretical viewpoints that link the discussion to the origins of design methodologies, and the way these were influenced by first-order cybernetics (and to the second wave of the design methodologies inspired by second-order cybernetics);
- 2) A few references of historical examples of participatory design, and how these early attempts have failed to enhance creativity;
- 3) Reference to contemporary examples that succeeded in facilitating the communication between stakeholders, such as B. Franken's DYNIFORM (cf. Gernot Brauer. 2002. Architektur als Markenkommunikation: dyniform + cube, Basel) who used customized computer software for collaboration and communication during the design process. Also, see the Gamesetandmatch I Conference Proceedings; Sterk, Tristan d'Estree. "Responsive Architecture: User-centred Interactions within the Hybridized Model of Control, Game Set and Match II." Conference Proceedings of the Faculty Of Architecture, Delft University Of Technology, 2006.

Finally, I found the paper missing a contextualization of its theoretical scope by contemporary discussions of open-source architectures, wherein the designer is a participant and not the person who exercises top-down control. A concluding remark about the significance of the proposed understanding of the designer as facilitator and its implications on the role of professional designers in our contemporary societies would certainly strengthen the purpose of this research.

I am willing to recommend the publication of the article without changes if the other reviewer agrees.

req Comments to the Author

The paper identifies the problem of the ontological status of the user in the design process, criticizes typical design processes and presents a new design methodology wherein the focus is on the evolution of user needs rather than the generation process; in doing so the representation of the user is transformed from a passive factor to active participant. In such a generation process designer and user are given equal status. However, while reading the article I was confused by the way 'design process' is used in the beginning of the text, referring both to the design process (in terms of the sequence of design-orientated activities) and design techniques (e.g., the medium/technology that facilitates the communication and actualization of ideas and concepts). This point should be clarified.

Also, I would welcome:

- 1) A contextualization of the work presented by theoretical viewpoints that link the discussion to the origins of design methodologies, and the way these were influenced by first-order cybernetics (and to the second wave of the design methodologies inspired by second-order cybernetics);
- 2) A few references of historical examples of participatory design, and how these early attempts have failed to enhance creativity;
- 3) Reference to contemporary examples that succeeded in facilitating the communication between stakeholders, such as B. Franken's DYNIFORM (cf. Gernot Brauer. 2002. Architektur als Markenkommunikation: dyniform + cube, Basel) who used customized computer software for collaboration and communication during the design process. Also, see the Gamesetandmatch I Conference Proceedings; Sterk, Tristan d'Estree. "Responsive Architecture: User-centred Interactions within the Hybridized Model of Control, Game Set and Match II." Conference Proceedings of the Faculty Of Architecture, Delft University Of Technology, 2006.

Finally, I found the paper missing a contextualization of its theoretical scope by contemporary discussions of open-source architectures, wherein the designer is a participant and not the person who exercises top-down control. A concluding remark about the significance of the proposed understanding of the designer as facilitator and its implications on the role of professional designers in our contemporary societies would certainly strengthen the purpose of this research.

Rating Table

Rating	Strong Yes	Weak Yes	Average	Weak No	Strong No	N/A
req Is the paper interesting, timely and thought provoking?		✓				
req Is the subject matter relevant to this journal?	✓					
req Is the intellectual level appropriate?	✓					
req Is the paper written and structured clearly?	✓					
req Are there adequate references to related work?			✓			
req Are there sufficient graphics?		✓				

[▲ top](#)



req Recommendation

- Publish with no changes
- Publish with minor changes
- Request a major revision
- Reject

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

- Yes
- No

Comments

Confidential Comments to the Editors

req Comments to the Author

Core references from the co-design/co-creation field are lacking. Norman, Garrett and Graham are not representing co-design/co-creation, but user-oriented / user-friendly design, which is something radically different. The author makes no distinction between co-creation and user-oriented design, which is crucial for the arguments in the paper. One place to start in order to understand the co-design/co-creation area is looking into proceedings from the Participatory Design Conference, where most influential ideas and voices on co-design are published. The paper mixes terminology from the software engineering field and the co-design field, and it seems like the author is confident with the software engineering field, but less confident with research and methods in the co-design field. This need to be balanced in order to have an interesting paper. Reflecting user needs in a design process (abstract) is not making it a co-creation process!

'User-centered' design (p. 2) is not co-creation!

P. 3: "user-centred design, as a conceptualized framework(s), allows inclusion and exclusion of user needs from the beginning to the end" - it is hard to understand this statement, as it seems to be quite contradictory and at the same time a central argument.

p. 5: "At present, designers are only involved in the development of visual outcomes, which are normally given from the project manager to the client. " This claim is grounded in a linear process model. Many iterative models allow the designer to be engaged throughout the project. (e.g. Buxton). Also the assumption that design is equal to "visual outcomes" is far from most interaction design and experience design schools, where design also includes interaction and use contexts in general.

p. 7: Simon (1996) - this reference is not the reference list.

p. 9-10: You talk about designers' active participation as co-creation and the the users should be empowered. Empowered users in a co-creation process, means that users are active participants in the design process, not just that designers 'treat users as (empowered) partners' (p. 9). On empowerment and participation you can take a look at: Ertner, M., A. Kragelund, L. Malmberg (2010). Five Enunciations of Empowerment in Participatory Design. In: Proceedings of PDC2010, Sydney, Australia, November 29 - December 3.

p. 12 and conclusion: The proposed co-creation model is not a co-creation model seen from a PDC-perspective. It does not allow direct users' participation participation in the design process, but just as 'communicators' of their needs in the different stages of development.

Rating Table

Rating	Strong Yes	Weak Yes	Average	Weak No	Strong No	N/A
req Is the paper interesting, timely and thought provoking?				✓		
req Is the subject matter relevant to this journal?				✓		
req Is the intellectual level appropriate?			✓			
req Is the paper written and structured clearly?			✓			
req Are there adequate references to related work?				✓		
req Are there sufficient graphics?			✓			

[▲ top](#)

Decision Comments - Malmborg, Lone (NDCR-2011-0012)

none

[▲ top](#)

 Print

 Close Window