



LAPIN YLIOPISTO
UNIVERSITY OF LAPLAND



University of Lapland

This is a self-archived version of the original article. It may differ somewhat from the publisher's final version, as the self-archived version is typically the accepted author manuscript.

Design Ethics for Including Those on the Margins

Ahvonen, Päivi; Miettinen, Satu

Published in:
DIID Disegno Industriale Industrial Design

DOI:
[10.30682/diid8023m](https://doi.org/10.30682/diid8023m)

Published: 01.01.2023

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (APA):
Ahvonen, P., & Miettinen, S. (2023). Design Ethics for Including Those on the Margins. *DIID Disegno Industriale Industrial Design*, (80), 157-167. <https://doi.org/10.30682/diid8023m>

Document License
CC BY-NC-SA

Forum and Reviews

Over the Mainstream

Edited by Andreas Sicklinger

Design Ethics for Including Those on the Margins

Päivi Ahvonen

Creative Peak

paivi.ahvonen@creativepeak.fi

Satu Miettinen

University of Lapland

satu.miettinen@ulapland.fi

ORCID 0000-0002-4440-0001

Copyright © 2023
diid disegno industriale
industrial design
CC BY-NC-SA

Introduction

This article discusses ethical questions related to design and social design. It addresses the need for ethical design tools to work with communities sustainably and ethically. Yet are design ethics only needed for work with communities or is there also a need to extend this tool to address designers' work from a more inclusive view? How ethical is an exclusive design that distinguishes between the advantaged and the disadvantaged? Finally, how do the cases we will present embrace marginalisation and enhance inclusion?

The objectives of social design are to identify and distinguish problems at the local level and develop solutions through artistic work that often involves various means of collaboration with community members, artists and researcher peers and thus resemble arts-based action research (Huhmarniemi & Jokela, 2020, p. 5). In recent decades, many artists have turned to socially engaged art or

social practice art — that is, forms of artistic practice that aim at transforming social conditions in specific communities or contexts.

This paper addresses social design and ethics. In this context, designers are challenged to examine the impact of their work on our society. Therefore, the paper asks, 'What is essential about social design, and how can the code of ethics for designers be developed such that it can accelerate change?' It focuses on questions about change and transformation while creating a clear principle for designers: 'Do no harm!' In the literature review of this paper, the most relevant findings in the field of social design are presented. They represent literature discussing the dimension of ethics (Chen, 2015; Cook, 2019). The research design section describes the qualitative research that was conducted using participant observation, collected datasets, reflective discussion and comparing case studies to devise ethical principles that should be considered when working with communities. This is a research

through design project which utilised methods from co-design. The case studies and their analysis are then presented. These findings enable us to further iterate the process and projects, and thus improve them to better meet the needs of those in the margins.

The research paper addresses the research gap by identifying actions that both influence and reframe the power structures for resistance and self-determination through arts-based methods and design in the margins. The paper critically reviews and discusses the impact of development in the margins. Marginality, or “the marginal”, is discussed in a vast body of literature in feminist and postcolonial studies, health care, pedagogy and other disciplines. The concept of marginalisation explores notions of the “other” as supported by feminist research (Pedwell, 2002; Petrilli, 2017). Art research proposes new ways to process and solve challenges related to marginalisation while exploring related roles (Harju-Tolppa, 2004). The potential of critically re-evaluating resources lies in their ability to enable self-expression and identity construction that resist traditional roles and polarisation between the giver and the receiver and thus have a longer-term impact on the development of self-serving capabilities.

Furthermore, this paper argues that raising awareness in the field of social design and innovation is necessary as there is currently momentum for it to become the guiding star for future designers. It is addressed to young professionals trying to make the world a better place and to designers who are willing to harness their skills to improve society by making it more democratic and inclusive. Research on this topic is needed, but there is an even greater need for practice-oriented hands-on learning by doing. Can the code of ethics be developed as a practical tool to be implemented? Most importantly, this paper argues that we need to make a virtue out of a necessity; that is, we must make social design the sought-after designing job in human-centred fields – “social design for a better future”, inspired by Papanek (1971), Manzini (2006), Escobar (2018) and Margolin (2019). Therefore, this research paper presents the state-of-the-art projects that the first author has realised. These projects are documented and ana-

lysed, and they create a dataset that is used to propose a framework for the designer’s code of ethics. The set of projects is also scalable and can contribute to the development of social innovation in practice.

The research is conducted in Loviisa, a city less than 100 kilometres from the Helsinki metropolitan area. The city is, by total area, bigger than the metropolitan area, yet it has only 15,000 inhabitants. About half of the population lives on the outskirts, meaning in the archipelago or in rural villages far away from the city centre.

This remoteness from the city centre and its services complicates accessibility. This also poses a danger of becoming a poverty trap as the municipality has little or no development actions targeting this area (Chimhowu, 2009). Social design projects or design for social innovation, as mapped by Manzini (2006), could trigger positive change in these areas with traditionally well-knit communities. Designing more cultural, low-threshold services with these communities and making them accessible could enhance inclusion and the feeling of togetherness with the rest of the community.

The goal of this research paper is to develop a social design canvas that addresses ethical questions in the context of design. This is developed as an ethical tool that can be used in the practical design context.

Theoretical Framework

Design ethics has been studied by various researchers (Devon & Van de Poel, 2004; Manzini, 2006; Margolin, 2016; Russ, 2010) from multiple standpoints and using various approaches, most of them relying on a Kantian view of categorical imperative meaning commands or a moral law that all persons must follow. D’Anjou (2010) even discusses Sartrean authenticity which embraces the thought that our actions and choices define who we are, meaning that we have freedom of choice. He points out that, especially in design, this standpoint indicates that the designer involved in the design dilemma authentically and unavoidably confronts indeterminacy. In his study on ethics and technology design, Albrechtslund (2007)

investigates ethically sound design and argues that the intentions of designers do not always correspond with the users' practice and that we must be aware of the limitations of what can be known to the designers and thus affect the outcome in terms of end-use. These philosophical questions have been discussed as more practice-oriented in research articles on ethics in engineering design, industrial design and information technology design. Devon and Van de Poel (2004) point out that the ethical costs and benefits are an integral part of the design process, and ethics is therefore an essential part of the design process, not a disconnected dimension. In their study on design ethics, they investigate how decisions are made during the design process and present the social ethics paradigm that distinguishes social responsibility approaches by focusing on who makes the decisions, how they make them, and with what implications. In other words, they focus on the design process more than on the individual designer (Devon & Van de Poel, 2004).

When examining social design from the perspective of design ethics, economic, social and environmental sustainability shifts the centre of interest (Cooper, 2005; Manzini, 2006; Russ, 2010). In his paper *Design Ethics as Futuring*, Fry (2004, p. 150) positions ethics as the 'division between creation and destruction' and underlines that economic decisions ignore ethics. He therefore calls for designers to predict the possible consequences of the design they intend to put in the world. Social design can be defined as the design of change, transformation design or design that reaches even greater dimensions than those advocated by design for transitions inspired by the *Transition Town* movement (Manzini, 2006; Miettinen, 2016; Tonkinwise, 2016). As social design is gaining popularity, the discussion on ethics in social design is inevitable as it is engineering change within communities, some of them marginal communities (Koskinen & Hush, 2016; Manzini, 2006). Ethics and social design are the subject of further research (Tromp & Vial, 2023) and are still in process in our work.

According to Armstrong et al. (2014, p. 15), the term "social design" highlights the concepts and activities enacted within

participatory approaches to researching, generating and realising new ways to effect change towards collective and social ends rather than predominantly commercial objectives. Social design and the public sector are interrelated. The neoliberal aspiration to privatise social work, health care and other social welfare services, which were originally the responsibility of municipalities and governments, give this discussion a socio-political nuance (Cook, 2019). Yet designers have very little, if no, knowledge of sociology, which can lead to problems (Chen et al., 2105). As social design is gaining popularity and becoming mainstream in the creative industries, design thinking is, according to Cook (2019), trivialising social change. As we must address pressing social, environmental and political issues, the need for diversification within the field of design is of uttermost importance (ibid.). Koskinen and Hush (2016, p. 67) analyse the use of the concept of social design and argue that in addition to utopian social design, it is possible to distinguish molecular social design and sociological social design. Molecular social design aims to change society incrementally, with no further ambition to tackle the whole world's problems at once: "aiming at doing the best in conditions that do not make it possible for them to make claims of initiating massive changes and they are sceptical about their peers making such claims". Moreover, sociological social design builds on sociological theory.

DiSalvo (2010) presents a critique of the notion of design for democracy through agonistic pluralism (Mouffe, 1999), which includes discussions on dissatisfaction with democratic institutions. The proposed research is aimed at searching for more plural views on democracy and participation through social design. The project moves closer to communities and embraces a post-modern perspective that abandons a positivistic outlook while making connections to the ideas of universality, progress and development. Without imposing Western ideas of democracy and freedom, the proposed research focuses on initiating a dialogue with local communities and enabling their autonomy and expression (Escobar, 2018).

Mike Monteiro is a design practitioner who has brought into the scope of discuss-

sion ethics and regulation in design professions as well as education. He questions whether non-profit work for a good cause can compensate for the “bad design” we do for a multinational company in designing something harmful, like guns. Monteiro (2019) states that designers have an ethical responsibility to the entire ecosystem within which they design. This is supported by Chen et al.’s (2015) findings about designers’ lack of knowledge and the need for a deeper understanding of sociology and a systems-thinking approach. Monteiro’s criticism is also directed at the education system of designers as it fails, in his opinion, in its curriculum. He points out that the prevailing education does not prepare students for the ethics that should be an essential, if not the most important, part of a designer’s work.

Ethical, Sustainable and Socially Responsible Social Design Projects for Cultural Services in Loviisa

In this case study, we present the qualitative research that has been conducted. The research design is based on a research-through-design approach (Stappers & Giaccardi, 2017; Zimmermann et al., 2007) where the design process and tools are utilised to both gather and analyse research data. The case studies represent services that were co-designed (Steen et al., 2011) with communities. This co-design process implemented the double diamond model (Design Council, 2015).

The case study analysis was conducted (Mills et al., 2009). In some cases, the whole community was affected. As the projects were experimental we leaned on participant observation (Musante & DeWalt, 2010) and reflective discussions (Sormunen et al., 2020) to evaluate the outcomes of the projects. The case studies were documented visually with photographs (Lehmann, 2012) and through a collection of newspaper articles. A valuable evaluative dataset was compiled both from the dissemination of materials from the different case studies and the project reports. This dataset confirmed our hypothesis that the services we designed were highly appreciated by the participants and by different stakeholders — namely, the parents (if children were the target group)

and educators (in projects we brought to schools).

A research methodology based on social design often relates to the principles of Participatory Action Research (PAR) (Kindon et al., 2007; Godden 2017). PAR supports the establishment of pragmatic connections with the community and the use of these connections for theorising (West, 1989). The objectives of social design are to identify and distinguish problems at the local level and to develop solutions through artistic work that often involves various means of collaboration with community members, artists and researcher peers and thus, again very similar to Art-Based Action Research (ABAR) (Huhmarniemi & Jokela 2020, p. 5). In recent decades, many artists have turned to socially engaged art or social practice art — that is, forms of artistic practice that aim for the transformation of social conditions in specific communities or contexts. Art-based methods can play novel roles in illustrating possible pluriversal futures. This approach can reframe ethics into formats that can better address the needs of communities (La Jevic & Springgay, 2008) while also guiding and presenting ways for art and design to contribute to more equal social agendas in globalised contexts. These agendas and actions are supported by social design. A main statement is formulated around social design as design for systems that unites communication, new product development and the environment (Miettinen, 2006). Miettinen (2007) presents social design cases that illustrate ways of implementing policy or good practices through a social design framework.

All the case studies were researched through design, and they gave us valuable information on how to develop the services designed. The intention was to create self-sustaining services. However, the evaluation of the realised cases clearly indicates their vulnerability — the reliance on the enabler and municipal financing.

In the dissemination process, we interviewed participants and other key figures, including teachers in the services delivered to schools and artists facilitating the workshops at schools. All parties showed great appreciation for the services, yet only some of them were adopted in the annual city budget.

In the following section, we present seven case studies carried out by the first author's agency, *Creative Peak*. They were conducted in different types of work groups. The case studies represent both social co-operatives and commissioned projects. Some of them are directly replicable, and in this way, they follow the pattern mapped by De Waal and Blomberg (2019). Yet they even better reflect molecular social design as defined by Koskinen and Hush (2016). The aim was to design and provide sustainable and inclusive content for the community. The logic of the most successful projects and their possibilities for serving as a guidepost to enrich the discussion are presented here. The projects were as follows.

- 1 Loviisa Baby, initiated in 2010, was commissioned by the city of Loviisa, Finland. The task was to create a present for newborns in the city. In a workgroup consisting of mothers, designers, a photographer and an artisan, we drafted an idea where local citizens could recycle clean and washed cotton textiles in the form of pillowcases and duvets. Members of an unemployment programme in the city participated in the sewing. There was a call for citizens to participate by donating raw materials for the pillowcases. The distribution was organised through the midwives of the child health centre. The project is still running.
- 2 Avoinna Öppet is another city-commissioned project that was initiated in 2012. Our intention was to enliven an empty central business space with big windows overlooking the market square. The work group for this project was one artist, one art teacher, three designers and two parents. As many of the shops in the city centre at that time had a 'Closed' sign on the door, we called the project Avoinna Öppet, which means 'Open' in both of Finland's national languages, Finnish and Swedish. This was important as the mother tongue of 40 percent of the inhabitants of Loviisa is Swedish. The programme was designed to be inclusive and accessible, and thus it was free of charge. Inhabitants could also suggest content, and the programme was designed to meet the aspirations of
- citizens. It included book readings, discussion groups and workshops in crochet, croquis drawing and sewing as well as performances and art activities directed at children. All instructors or performers were paid and so was our commission. This project turned out to be very organic. Both the process and the content have been iterated and transformed several times over the years and the project has been running annually ever since, in December.
- 3 Co-Work Loviisa was a city-commissioned project. The city wanted to create a co-working space in the town centre. We started with background research on different co-working spaces and their operating models. Then we found an empty space in the city centre and designed the renovation, the furniture, the interior, the service design and the logic from the beginning to its opening. The service was to be free of charge. The project was running well with an unemployment programme of the city used to handle cleaning. Changes in the personnel on the commissioner's side had a negative effect on the place as all further co-creation and communication efforts ceased. The city began charging for use of the service and the utilisation rate dropped until the city ended the service in January 2022. This demonstrates how vulnerable projects can be when the negotiating party on the commissioner's side changes.
- 4 Galleria Katu was initiated by our own studio to counteract all the empty shop windows in the city centre, which were making it look like an abandoned city. Motivated by our personal interest in the field of the arts and the substantial amount of existing research on its impact on people's well-being, we curated an art exhibition in these windows. People passing by would be exposed to art in their everyday lives. Professional, nationally and internationally known local visual artists participated in the project pro bono. Our studio bore a minor financial investment. 'Gallery Street' exhibited visual art for six weeks. The project did not continue after this as we were unable to obtain financing for it.
- 5 Piparkakkupaja was a gingerbread workshop where artists were invited to bake

and decorate gingerbread with children at an elderly care home. It was free of charge and a big success. It was repeated over three years in December, but then the enthusiasm of the volunteers faded.

- 6 Pikkukaupunki is a social community communications project that has been running since 2007. Of all the projects initiated by our studio, this is the one that can have the strongest positive influence on our community. It is a local, high-quality periodical with an emphasis on culture and art, but we present interesting persons from all backgrounds, occupations, levels of education and ages, reflecting on their lives and doings in the city. This gives a voice to all community members. This project is self-sustaining and financed with advertising.
- 7 We also started Pecha Kucha in Loviisa, but it remains in its early stages, according to the guidelines from the creators, Dytham-Klein. On the basis of trust and a handshake agreement, we set up Pecha Kucha evenings for networking and socialising according to the principles set by the founders.

These case studies were analysed utilising the main points from the literature review. In all the above-mentioned projects, our objective was to deliver something of value to the community with the intention of doing good and planting the seeds for a "Do no harm" mindset. In a relatively small community with 15,000 inhabitants, the impact of decisions or actions can easily be detected by observing and listening to people. This applies to the private, public and third sectors.

Marginalisation and Inclusion

As all the above-mentioned services were designed with and for the whole community, not just its wealthiest members, they were accessible to all. Only case 3, Co-Work Loviisa, was accessible for persons with physical disabilities/wheelchair users only by prior appointment; as the co-working space had no personnel on site, it required extra arrangements. Furthermore, as the city put a price on the usage of the co-work space, the visitor rates dropped. Therefore, here, accessibility was no longer fully granted as users

would have been required to pay a fee.

All the other cases were designed bearing in mind that they should be free of charge so that all community members could attend and benefit from the service, not just those that were socio-economically well-situated.

As the area of the city is larger than the whole metropolitan area but counts only 15,000 inhabitants, and has a poor public transportation system, we needed to bring the service to villages outside the city centre – the archipelago and the more rural areas on the geographical margins of the city. This was done in cooperation with the midwives in case 1, Loviisa Baby, and with schools in case 2, Avoinna Öppet. Therefore, accessibility in the sense of minimising physical distance was granted in these two cases and in case 6, Pikkukaupunki. The magazine is distributed via a postal delivery service to the whole community, including the archipelago and the more rural areas.

Politics plays a major role in economics and therefore in the distribution of funding to the municipalities and cities. In these more local units, politics is a central figure as well, and this is why designing these kinds of projects requires a considerable personal commitment from the designers. To be able to provide the services one designs, one must have the funding. This entails applying for it and convincing decision-makers of the necessity and benefits of these services. Poverty is the root not only of violence and conflicts but of personal dissatisfaction. The communities need zones free of obligatory consumption, where people can come together. To avoid feelings of exclusion, we need inclusive services, not exclusive services for those who are able to pay. If the design is made with governmental or municipal funding, it should always be inclusive and, henceforth, even reach more rural areas. This leads us back to the core: communities need initiators committed to the task of inclusive design.

Conclusion

How did the above-mentioned projects then accelerate change towards more ethical work?

These projects were conducted in a way that was (1) transparent and (2) participatory throughout the whole process, and they were (3) communicated well. They were initiated out of (4) personal commitment but also as a statement: projects like this need (5) a strong public sector. The desired impacts of culture and arts affect only those who are financially well-situated if the services are expensive; therefore, the public sector, the city and the municipality are key figures.

Increasing awareness around social design, design for social innovation and inter/related issues is essential if we want to broaden the scope of discussion to ethics. On all forums, the intention to 'Do no harm' should be brought into the discussion. Participating in social design projects can foster awareness and teach us to be unwilling to undertake work that is harmful. The growing polarisation can accelerate change derived from discontent if the design practice can be channelled into ways of being and doing that are in harmony with justice and the earth (Escobar, 2018; Manzini, 2006). 'People before profit' is again becoming a valid demand.

Two even more critical points can be highlighted: (1) communication and (2) financing. For participants to find the service designed for them, it needs to be well communicated. Regarding the other critical point of financing, as we argue that professionals should be paid for their work and that the designed service should be inclusive and accessible, we need to work with the necessary political figures. Continuously applying for project funding requires strong personal commitment and is time-consuming.

We argue that the molecular approach to social design, detected by Koskinen and Hush (2016), is essential. Yet we must accelerate change by addressing a wider audience; it is not sufficient if it is researched and discussed in academia alone. We need an action plan. Education needs to be updated to help students understand the consequences of what they design by introducing them to the DESIS Network's vision

of design schools as agents of change and to the thematic clusters of the DESIS Network. Sustainable, ethical design should be a central topic in the curriculum for all students. Design schools have the potential to become a real social resource (Manzini, 2006).

Our personal beliefs and values affect our work. As humans, we have limitations. We have rent to pay and children to take care of. What if we were to say 'no' to dubious commissions and function as gatekeepers as Monteiro (2019) suggests? This would certainly contribute to a better society. If there are many designers who adhere to the principle of not harming anyone as a guideline, it will have more power than if only one individual stands up. The problematics around social design and the complexity of this issue are presented in the introduction. This is a societal, political, economic and environmental problem. Can one design team solve this equation? Most likely not. Can a whole group of design experts, together with non-experts, create change? We want to make a call to the creative community and everyone involved in developing a roadmap to change towards making more ethical decisions by declaring 'Do no harm'.

The code of ethics relating to this simple yet strong statement, 'Do no harm!', can be developed as a practical tool if we start every assignment by asking questions such as 'Can this work?' and 'I am doing harm to anyone – or even worse – is it designed to harm somebody?' Practical tools of service design should include these essential questions as components. The Business Model Canvas from Osterwalder and Pigneur (2010) has already been further developed into a Social Enterprise Model Canvas by several designers. We developed the first prototype of the Design Ethics Canvas. Canvas 1 exhibits how social design can create fundamental change and redefine design thinking from a user-oriented approach to a society-oriented approach as stated by Jonas et al. (2015).

Discussion

The studied cases clearly indicate that to actually be accessible to the margin, in terms of physical marginality as well, services must be brought to the people, where they are

The Design Ethics Canvas 1.0

Project name

3 Transparency	1 Participation	5 Communication	2 Commitment	4 Public Sector
Who initiated the project Who is in charge of the project? Who is paying for the project? Who is the commissioner	Is the design team diverse Are experts and non-experts involved in the process	Open dialogue of the project and its impact on the community Good press & media contacts Open dialogue on the enhancement of transformation	Initiation of the project Commitment to conduct an ethical approach to the project and evaluation of its effects Strong commitment of design team	Is the public sector involved and if so how is it involved Continuous dialogue with representatives of the public sector and local politicians Willingness to enhance democracy and inclusion

How does this design project affect the community in question and how are its core elements communicated?

CRITICAL POINTS TO BE DISCUSSED

COMMUNICATION	LEADERSHIP	FINANCING
How does the information reach the targeted group? How are the core elements communicated?	Who is in charge How do the core values reflect the leadership of the project How is transformation enhanced	Who pays for the work, where does this money come from Can the finances influence the outcome or the core values Are professionals being compensated for their input Is the public sector involved

Detriments of outcome

CAN THIS DESIGN PROJECT DO ANY HARM?

Surpluses of outcome

DISSEMINATION

Has this project enhanced transformation towards more sustainable design in a way that is not harmful?
Is this project being continuously communicated to the public?
Are the outcomes being communicated properly to critical decision makers ?

located, and they need to be free of charge. The financing of many of the cases in this paper is dependent on both prevailing political values in the municipality and personal contacts. If culture and art and community well-being are not seen as investments but merely as expenses, it is difficult to obtain financing for projects that do not aim to be self-sustaining after the trial period. The point of origin for the cases was that they should be accessible and free of charge. As the city no longer had an interest in financing these projects, they could only be provided with financing from several foundations.

Loviisa Baby, Avoinna Öppet and Pikkukaupunki have proven to be the most successful projects if reviewed on the basis of their viability: Loviisa Baby because the city sees it as an important gesture to greet new community members, Avoinna Öppet as foundations find it worth financing and Pikkukaupunki as it is financially self-sustaining. The magazine is one of the most important community-building and empowering of our projects as it represents people from all walks of life, to enhance mutual understanding and inclusivity.

These cases reveal that projects depending on the voluntary work of professional artists have not been viable. By contrast, the projects that could offer compensation for the work done were very viable. This leads us to ponder whether financial compensation should be included in the design ethics canvas.

Like in grassroots organisations, these projects depend on passionate people. They are the key resource in terms of initiating services. Yet they have not led to systemic changes (design for social innovation). Nevertheless, this could be achieved if we succeed in being better activists, facilitators, strategists and critics and co-design future services for the margin (Manzini, 2006).

For those living in the margin, both in terms of physical distance, like in rural areas, or in terms of disability or poverty, digitalisation is not a miracle maker – it should be mentioned that digitalisation has severe consequences for both communities (e.g. eviction of locals to secure a supply of minerals) and nature (e.g. devastation of forests and rivers, e-waste; Escobar, 2018). People have a need to connect physically, not just online. They want to be part of shaping and designing their lives, their communities and their neighbourhoods. They want to be considered possible agents of solutions instead of a problem (Manzini, 2006).

References

- Albrechtslund, A. (2007). Ethics and technology design. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 9, 63-72.
- Armstrong, L., Bailey, J., Julier, G., & Kimbell, L. (2014). *Social design futures: HEI research and the AHRC*. Arts and Humanities Research Council. University of Brighton. V&A. <https://cris.brighton.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/341933/Social-Design-Report.pdf>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, vol. 2: Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological* (pp. 57-71). American Psychological Association.
- Chen, D.-S., Cheng, L.-L., Hummels, C., & Koskinen, I. (2015). Social design: An introduction. *International Journal of Design*, 10(1), 1-5.
- Chimhowu, A. (2009). *Moving forward in Zimbabwe: Reducing poverty and promoting productivity*. Brooks Poverty Institute, Manchester.
- Cook, R. (2019). *Design thinking, neoliberalism, and the trivialization of social change in higher education*. Department of Communication Design, Falmouth University. https://www.academia.edu/40296309/Design_Thinking_neoliberalism_and_the_trivialisation_of_social_change_in_higher_education
- Cooper, R. (2005). Ethics and altruism: what constitutes socially responsible design? *Design Management Review*, 16(3), 10-18.
- d'Anjou, P. (2010). Beyond duty and virtue in design ethics. *Design Issues*, 26(1), 95-105. <https://doi.org/10.1162/desi.2010.26.1.95>
- Design Council. (2015). *The design process: What is the double diamond*. <https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/our-work/news-opinion/doublediamond-universally-accepted-depiction-design-process/>
- Devon, R., & Van de Poel, I. (2004). Design ethics: The social ethics paradigm. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 20(3), 461-469.
- de Waal, M., & Blomberg, J. (2019). *Social Design Cookbook: Recipes for Social Cooperation*. Attila Bujdosó.
- DiSalvo, C. (2010). Design, democracy and agonistic pluralism. In D. Durling, R. Bousbaci, L. Chen, P. Gauthier, T. Poldma, S. Roworth-Stokes, & E. Stolterman (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Design Research Society International Conference, 2010: Design and complexity*. Design Research Society.
- Escobar, A. (2018). *Designs for the Pluriverse*. Duke University Press.
- Felton, E., Zelenko, O., & Vaughan, S. (2012). *Design and Ethics*. Routledge.
- Fox A., & Busher, H. (2022). Democratising ethical regulation and practice in educational research. *Educational Sciences*, 12(10), 674. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12100674>
- Fry, T. (2004). The voice of sustainment: Design ethics as futuring. *Design Philosophy Papers*, 2(2), 145-156.
- Godden, N.J. (2017). The Participation Imperative in Co-operative Inquiry: Personal Reflections of an Initiating Researcher. *Syst Pract Action Res* 30, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11213-016-9387-2>
- Harju-Tolppa, M. (2004). *Settlementin monikulttuuristen naisryhmien voimaantumisen ja sosiaaliset verkostot*. Tampereen yliopisto. Sosiaalipolitiikan ja sosiaalityön laitos. Ammatillinen lisensiaattityö.
- Huhmarniemi, M., & Jokela, T. (2020). Arctic art and material culture: Northern knowledge and cultural resilience in the northernmost Europe. In *Arctic Yearbook* (pp. 242-259). <https://arcticyearbook.com/>
- Jonas, W., Zerwas, S., & von Anshelm, K. (2015). *Transformation Design*. Birkhäuser.
- Kindon, S., Pain, R., & Kesby, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Participatory Action Research Approaches and Methods: Connecting People, Participation and Place*. Routledge.
- Koskinen, I., & Hush, G. (2016). Utopian, molecular and sociological social design. *International Journal of Design*, 10(1), 65-71.
- Kothari, A., Salleh, A., Escobar, A., Demaria, F., & Acosta, A. (2019). Crisis as opportunity: Finding universal paths. In E. Klein, & C. E. Morreo (Eds.), *Postdevelopment in practice*, (pp. 100-116). Routledge.
- La Jevic, L., & Springgay, S. (2008). A/r/tography as an ethics of embodiment: Visual journals in preservice education. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14(1), 67-89.
- Lehmann, A. S. (2012). Showing making: On visual documentation and creative practice. *The Journal of Modern Craft*, 5(1), 9-23.
- Manzini, E. (2015). *Design, When Everybody Designs: An Introduction to Design for Social Innovation*. MIT Press.
- Manzini, E. (2006). Design, ethics and sustainability. Guidelines for a transition phase. In *Cumulus Working Papers 16/06* (pp. 9-15). Publications series G. University of Art and Design Helsinki.
- Margolin, V. (2019). Social design: From utopia to the good society. In E. Resnick (Ed.), *The Social Design Reader* (pp. 17-30). Bloomsbury Visual Arts.

- Miettinen, S. (2006). Raising the status of Lappish communities through tourism development. In M. Smith, & M. Robinson (Eds.), *Global cultural tourism: Issues and case studies* (pp. 159-174). Channel View Publications.
- Miettinen, S. (Ed.). (2007). *Design your action*. Publication series of the University of Art and Design Helsinki B 82. University of Jyväskylä.
- Mills, A. J., Durepos, G., & Wiebe, E. (Eds.). (2009). *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research*. Sage Publications.
- Monteiro, M. (2019). *Ruined by design: How designers destroyed the world, and what we can do to fix it*. Mule Design.
- Mouffe, C. (1999). Deliberative democracy or agonistic pluralism? *Social Research*, 66(3), 74-75.
- Musante, K., & DeWalt, B. R. (2010). *Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers*. Rowman Altamira.
- Osterwalder, A., & Pigneur, Y. (2010). *Business Model Generation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Papanek, V. (1971). *What to design and why*. Selskabet for Industriel Formgivning.
- Pedwell, C., & Whitehead, A. (2012). Affecting feminism: Questions of feeling in feminist theory. *Feminist Theory*, 13(2), 115-129.
- Petrilli, S. (2017). *The Self as a Sign, the World, and the Other: Living Semiotics*. Routledge.
- Russ, T. (2010). *Sustainability and Design Ethics*. CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781439808559>
- Sormunen, K., Juuti, K., & Lavonen, J. (2020). Maker-centered project-based learning in inclusive classes: Supporting students' active participation with teacher-directed reflective discussions. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 18, 691-712.
- Stappers, P. J., & Giaccardi, E. (2017). Research through design. In *The encyclopedia of human computer interaction* (pp. 1-94). The Interaction Design Foundation.
- Steen, M., Manschot, M., & De Koning, N. (2011). Benefits of co-design in service design projects. *International Journal of Design*, 5(2), 53-60.
- Tonkinwise, C. (2016). Design for transitions — from and to what? *Design Philosophy Papers*, 13(1), 85-92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14487136.2015.1085686>
- Tromp, N., & Vial, S. (2023). Five components of social design: A unified framework to support research and practice. *The Design Journal*, 26(2), 210-228, DOI: 10.1080/14606925.2022.2088098
- van Papeveld, M. (2020). *Navigating the reflective design process*. <https://www.designingdifferently.org/portfolio/about/>
- West, C. (1989). *The American Evasion of Philosophy: A Genealogy of Pragmatism*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Zimmerman, J., Forlizzi, J., & Evenson, S. (2007). Research through design as a method for interaction design research in HCI. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems* (pp. 493-502). CHI 2007 Proceedings