Innovation in Knowledge Exchange

An approach to the dissemination of research findings in support of design practice

James Self, School of Design, Kingston University, UK

Hilary Dalke, School of Design, Kingston University, UK

Mark Evans, Loughborough Design School, Loughborough University, UK

Abstract

The ability to embody design intentions is critical to an industrial designer's studio practice. These design embodiments support both the exploration of the design problem and the emergence and communication of solution ideas. From the ever present design sketch through to 3D computer aided design and rapid prototyping technologies, an increasing variety of digital, analogue and hybrid design tools are employed in the embodiment of design proposals during practice. A literature review identified existing studies of the implicit characteristics of tool use during design activity. These characteristics where employed in the design of a survey study. The survey took samples from two distinct groups, industrial design practitioners and students. A total of 244 designers; 138 practitioners and 106 students, were surveyed. Findings indicated a tendency for student design activity to be characterised by strong convergence and less exploration, leading to early fixation and attachment to concept. This was in contrast to practitioner responses suggesting a more open, divergent and iterative approach. A concern for conventional research dissemination, articulated through conference papers and academic journals, to engage a practice orientated audience lead to the development of a digital resource (IDsite) to disseminate the survey findings. Work on the digital resource is ongoing; however the paper describes an interim pilot of the resource with a small sample of design practitioners. Findings suggest that, although the resource requires further development in terms of the presentation of information, practitioners consider the approach to be of relevance to the profession.

Key Words:

Industrial Design; Design Activity, Design Tools, Research Dissemination

Industrial design, as part of a process of new product development, is characterised by a responsibility for the form and aesthetic of the final design solution (Dormer, 1993). Industrial designers must also be aware of and sensitive to the processes of engineering and manufacture through which the final design solution is realised (Cross, 2000). In this way industrial design may be described as located between the creative stylist, sensitive to the expectations of end users; their needs and requirements; and the pragmatic constraints of the materials and engineering processes employed in the realisation of the designed artifact. Sitting between these two principles, the industrial designer must address an often ill-defined design problem, generating and reflecting upon solution ideas in an attempt to better define these problems (Cross, 2007). To support the generation of proposals, the practitioner employs a variety of analog, digital and hybrid tools that embody design intentions through drawings, sketches, digital models, prototypes and handmade concept models (Goldschmidt,

1997; Purcell and Gero, 1998). It is through this process of embodiment and reflection-on-action (Schon, 1983) that the industrial designer continually works design solution ideas towards the final specification of design intent prior to manufacture.

1. Industrial Design Process

Figure 1 illustrates a model of the industrial design process based upon Cross' (Cross, 2000) description of convergent and divergent design activity. Although the model is a simplification of what is in reality a complex activity influenced by many factors (stakeholder requirements, working practices within individual consultancies, the designer's own idiosyncratic working methods) it is useful as a means of making explicit some of the universal characteristics of industrial design activity.


Fig 1. Generic model of industrial design process

The model (Figure 1) describes design activity as converging towards the final specification of design intent prior to manufacture. This convergence is the culmination of activity, the end specification of intent, and the outcome of the design process. All design activity during studio practice is influenced by a requirement for the specification of a final design solution prior to manufacture (Powell, 2007). In order to achieve this, the industrial designer will move through stages in the design process, evolving solution ideas through increasing levels of detail (Pipes, 2007). These stages are illustrated in the model as concept, development and detail design. Concept design is an initial phase of design activity involving the generation of a variety of design solutions to be reduced and refined as design moves from concept to development design. During development design, solution proposals are considered in greater detail before a single design direction is agreed and activity progresses towards detail design and specification for manufacture.

The industrial design process is both convergent and divergent in that, although it is concerned with the final specification of intent (Cross, 2000), design activity is characterised by both periods of divergent iteration (returning arrows and looping vertical lines, Figure 1) and convergent specification (converging horizontal lines, Figure 1). The weighting of divergent/convergent design activity will differ from project to project dependent upon the requirements of individual design problems and the ways in which the designer or design team work in their exploration of solution ideas. However a constant in this is the need to evolve the solution towards a final specification of intent.

Throughout this process the industrial designer will use design tools to embody design intentions as sketches, drawings, digital models, visual renderings and prototypes of various kinds and degrees of fidelity (Goldschmidt, 1997; Pipes, 2007; Badke-Schaub and Frankenberger, 2004; Dahl, Chattopadhyay and Gorn, 2001; Johnson, 2005; Stolterman, 2008; Visser, 2006). These embodiments are critical to design activity. They are used to explore the design problem and generate solution proposals that may then be employed to both communicate design intent to others and as a way for the designer to reflect-in-action (Schon, 1983) upon the physical embodiment of design ideas. In this way there exists a relationship between the designer, the particular design tool used during activity and the kinds of embodiments made in support of the various requirements of practice. The character of an individual tool will influence the kinds of embodiments made (Tovey and Owen, 2000). The skills and experience of the designer have implications for the ways in which the design tool is used during design activity which in turn influences the character of the design embodiment (Lawson and Dorst, 2009). Finally, all design activity is tied to and influenced by the various requirements of the design process (simplified model, Figure 1), within which activity locates as solutions are progressed towards final specification (Cross, 2007).

2. Universal Characteristics of Design Activity

A literature review was conducted to identify existing work relating to design tool use for the embodiment of design intent during design activity. The outcome of this review was the identification and synthesis of a number of universal characteristics of design activity. These characteristics served as a means to investigate relationships between tool use, the character of activity and the various requirements of practice as activity progresses from conceptual design through development and into detailed specification (Figure 1). Table 1 illustrates the identified universal characteristics of design activity. The Table shows five characteristics of activity; a brief descriptor outlines each of the five characteristics; source literature and terms of reference used within the literature to describe the five characteristics.

Characteristics	Description	Terms of Reference	
1. Modes of Communication	Design activity as communication to stakeholders and/or as reflection-on-action	(Dorta, Pérez and Lesage, 2008)	self-reflective mode
		(Schon, 1983)	representation, analysis, emergence
		(Goldschmidt, 1997)	dialogue with self
		(Jonson, 2005)	I-representations
2. Levels of Ambiguity	The extent to which the embodiment of design intent may be described as ambiguous (leaving room for interpretation and revision)	(Fish, 2004)	vagueness
		(Goldschmidt, 2004)	Unstructured nature
		(Goel, 1995)	Ambiguity/ Density
		(Visser, 2006)	unspecific

3.Transformational Ability	To what extent design activity is characterized by the movement from one design direction to another (lateral), or the evolution of a single design direction (vertical)	(Goel, 1995)	Transformation
		(Visser, 2006)	duplicate, add, detail, concretize, modify, revolutionize
4. Levels of Detail	The depth of detail considered during design activity and externalised through the embodiment of design intent	(Brereton, 2004)	kinds of information available
		(Visser, 2006)	precision
		(Goldschmidt, 1997)	Less/more specific
5. Levels of Commitment	The extent to which design embodiments appear to communicate commitment to design proposals	(Goel, 1995)	Early Crystallisation/ completeness
		(Pipes, 1990)	More Committed
		(Powell, 2007)	less committed
		(Tovey, Porter and Newman, 2003)	uncommitted/ more committed

Table 1: Universal characteristics of design activity

The first characteristic, modes of communication, refers to the nature of design activity as it is used to support communication of solution ideas to others and/or the designers themselves as the embodiment of design intentions are reflected upon. All design embodiments, be they sketches or high-fidelity prototypes, may be used to a greater or lesser extent in both models of communication. However, it is the weighting of one over the other, and how the use of different tools influences this weighting, that was of interest to the study of design tools.

Levels of ambiguity refer to the extent to which design tools are used to embody intentions during design activity that appear to be more or less ambiguous. For example, a key characteristic of design sketching is often described as its ability to the support ambiguous embodiment of design intent. This ambiguity is described as aiding conceptual design activity; helping the designer to avoid early fixation or attachment to initial concept ideas.

Transformational ability is referred to within the literature as the movement from one design idea to another new idea (lateral transformations), or the evolution of a single design direction (vertical transformations). Again design activity is often characterised by these two characteristics working together within a given design project. However, it was the weighting of one over the other that was often discussed in the literature, with, for example, the activity of sketching being characterised by an ability to laterally move between concept proposals in contrast to computer aided design, tending towards vertical transformations.

Levels of detail refer to design activity as being characterised by a concern for the specification of more or less design detail. As design activity progresses through development and on towards detail design, levels of detail are often described as increasing in response to a requirement for final specification prior to manufacture.

Finally levels of commitment refer to design activity as it is characterised by the degree to which design embodiments may communicate weaker or stronger level of commitment to the design proposal.

Instead of representing a prescriptive or definitive description of design activity, the five characteristics were used as a means to engage designers on their attitudes towards design activity, tool use and design embodiment. The five universal characteristics where therefore used as a framework for analysing designer attitudes towards design tools and their support of various design activities. The aim of this investigation was to attempt to explore relationships between the practitioners' influence upon tool use, the character of individual design tools and the ways they may be used to embody design intent to support the various requirements of practice. The aim of the study was to provide a more holistic understanding of tool use during design activity, and in doing, support designers in their approach to and critical engagement with design tools.

3. Research Methods

To consider relationships between the design practitioner, the design tool and the character of design embodiments made during design activity, a survey of industrial designers was conducted. A total of 244 designers comprised of 138 practitioners and 106 students were surveyed. The practitioners had been active in professional practice for three years or more. The students were all graduating designers and third year undergraduates. All participants were drawn from the discipline of industrial design, including product and transportation design.

The survey questions were designed to analyse designer attitudes towards the character of design activity when using different tools to embody design intent. Designers were asked about their attitudes towards a given design tool in terms of its ability to support the five universal characteristics of design activity described in Table 1. Survey questions are presented in table 2 below along with the characteristics of design activity each question was designed to measure.

Questions to measure 5 Universal Characteristics of Design Activity	Characteristics Measured
Q1.The design tools listed below are useful for: Representing the engineering detail of design ideas: Do you agree or disagree?	**Levels of Detail** To what extent the design tool affords a high or low level of specific detail.
Q2. The design tools listed below are useful for: Representing the artistic/creative form of design ideas: Do you agree or disagree?	**Levels of Detail** To what extent the design tool affords an overall or artistic impression of detail.
Q3. The design tools listed below are useful for: Representing design ideas in a more constrained, unambiguous way: Do you agree or disagree?	**Levels of Ambiguity** To what extent the design tool affords design ideas to be represented unambiguously

Q4 The design tools below are most useful for: Design work that can move easily between design ideas (Lateral Transformations): Do you agree or disagree?	**Transformational Ability** To what extent the design tool affords movement from one design idea to a new idea – horizontal transformations.
Q5 The design tools below are most useful for: Design work on variations of one or the same design idea (Vertical Transformations): Do you agree or disagree?	**Transformational Ability** To what extent the design tool affords movement from one idea to a variation of the same idea – vertical transformations
Q6 The design tools below: Communicate a high level of commitment to design ideas: Do you agree or disagree?	**Levels of Commitment** How the design tool communicates a high or low level of commitment to design ideas.
Q7 The design tools below are more useful for: Communicating design intentions to others: Do you agree or disagree?	**Modes of Communication** How the design tool affords communication of design ideas to others.
Q8 The design tools below: Aid self reflection and the dynamic generation and evolution of design ideas: Do you agree or disagree?	**Modes of Communication** How the design tool affords self-reflection and the emergence of design ideas

Table 2: Survey questions and the characteristics of design activity measured

Responses to survey questions were registered using a five point Likert-scale (Bryman 2008), whereby the following response values were given: Strongly Agree (+2); Agree (+1); Neutral (0); Disagree (-1); Strongly Disagree (-2).

4. Research Results

In addition to presenting empirical research outcomes, this paper also describes the ongoing translation of research findings into an interactive digital resource to support industrial design practice. As such, the presentation of research findings is restricted to an overview. A more detailed account of the results can be found in Self, Dalke and Evans (2009).

A survey study of designers sampled two distinct groups: practicing industrial designers and design students. The Dreyfus model of skills acquisition was used as a means to identify difference within the skills and levels of expertise present within the two samples (Dreyfus and Dreyfus, 1986). Dreyfus (ibid) proposes a generic model of expertise consisting of six stages: 'novice', 'advanced beginner', 'competent', 'expert', 'master' and 'visionary'. Applying the Dreyfus model (ibid) to the skilled embodiment of design intentions through drawing and sketching, Lawson and Dorst (Lawson and Dorst, 2009) suggest the critical importance of the designer's level of expertise, describing the designer who is less able to represent ideas effectively as, 'severely handicapped and unlikely to be able to reach an advanced level of expertise' (ibid). In terms of the survey's two sample groups, student participants were classified as 'advanced beginners' (Dreyfus, Op cit), practitioners falling within the levels of 'expert' to 'master'.

Figure 2 illustrates the responses for students and practitioners to a survey question asking of attitudes towards the ability of hand sketching to support unambiguous design embodiment during design activity. The horizontal axis lists the five items of a Likert-scale question.

Fig 2. Hand sketching is useful for representing design ideas in a more constrained, unambiguous way. Do you agree or disagree?

In terms of ambiguity and sketching, responses suggested different attitudes towards the ability of design activity, through sketching, to be characterised by the unambiguous embodiment of design intent. This may suggest different approaches to design activity when using hand sketching to embody design proposals. The students tending towards unambiguous embodiment (indicated in a larger percentage of students registering agreement, Figure 2, 61%). The practitioners, on the other hand, may tend to be more inclined to use sketching in an activity that supports more ambiguous embodiments (indicated by a greater number of neutral or negative responses, neutral: 32%, disagree: 30%, strongly disagree: 7%).

Difference in response between sample groups was also seen in findings relating to the use of other design tools. Figure 3 illustrates results relating to sketch modelling (the use of foam, card and paper to quickly embody design intentions as physical models) and its ability to support the ambiguous embodiment of design intentions during design activity.


Fig 3. Sketch modelling is useful for representing design ideas in a more constrained, unambiguous way. Do you agree or disagree?

As was the case with results relating to hand sketching (Figure 2), findings suggested different attitudes towards the capacity of sketch modelling to support design activity that may be described as unambiguous in its embodiment of design intent. The more positive response from the student sample may suggest an approach to design activity when using

sketch modelling that tends towards unambiguity and fixation of concept compared to the practitioners (seen in greater number of positive student response, Figure 3).

Figure 4 illustrates survey findings relating to a question asking of sketch modelling's ability to support reflection-on-action during design activity.


Fig 4. Sketch modelling aids self reflection and the dynamic generation and evolution of design ideas. Do you agree or disagree?

Again, the survey results suggested a contrast in attitudes towards design activity when using sketch modelling tools. The practitioners were more inclined to strongly agree (51%) or agree (36%) sketch modelling aids reflection-on-action (black bars, Figure 4). Student findings were mixed across the five items of the Likert-scale, some in agreement (30%) others in disagreement (37%). This may indicate different attitudes towards and approaches to design activity when engaged in design embodiment through sketch modelling, with practitioners employing greater reflection and students tending to reflect less and move design towards specification more quickly.

Responses towards the ability of sketch modelling to support design activity characterised by the lateral movement between design proposals, and so support divergent design activity, also indicated contrasting attitudes between the two sample groups (Figure 5).


Fig 5. Sketch modelling is useful for design work that can move easily between design ideas (Lateral Transformations). Do you agree or disagree?

The design practitioners tended to register responses of strong agreement (45%) or agreement (40%) in contrast to the students' more mixed response across the five items of

the Likert-scale (grey bars, Figure 5). This again suggested different approaches to design activity during design embodiment through sketch modelling tools; practitioners being more inclined to lateral transformations, divergence and iterations; students erring towards earlier fixation and attachment to a concept.

Emergent in survey findings was a tendency, across a variety of design tools, for less experienced designers (design students) to respond more negatively to questions relating to those characteristics associated with divergent design activity; ambiguity in embodiment; the lateral transformation between various design proposals; and reflection-on-action during design embodiment. This may suggest a significant difference in the students' approach to design activity and the ways tools are used to support studio practice. It may be that less experienced designers err towards design convergence during design activity. The ways in which they approach design embodiment, through the use of design tools, is a reflection of this. In contrast, and with experience of practice, design practitioners tend to remain more open to iterative divergence, and it is this open approach that influences more positive attitudes towards the characteristics of design activity associated with exploitive conceptual design; lateral transformations, ambiguity of embodiment and reflection-on-action.

5. Research Dissemination as Digital Resource (IDsite)

The following section discusses the ongoing development of a digital resource, branded IDsite. The aim of IDsite is to present research findings in a way that is both relevant to and accessible by an intended audience of industrial design students and practitioners. A pilot proposed as an initial test study at an interim stage of the site's development is presented.

The challenge of engaging practicing designers in design research is identified by Dorst (2007):

> We [design research] need to re-engage with practitioners, and get involved in experiments within the rapidly changing design arena. Design researchers should join design practitioners in co-creating the design expertise and design practices of the future.

> (Dorst, 2007: p.11)

The aim of the resource was to engage practitioners and design students through dissemination of research outcomes in a format and style that might be more relevant and accessible compared to more conventional forms of research dissemination (publication of findings through journal papers for example). The objective was to provide a platform to promote awareness of the role tools play within the wider contexts of studio practice, supporting a more critical engagement with tools during design embodiment during design activity.

The following objectives informed the design and realisation of the digital resource:

1. To illustrate and describe the industrial design process as a staged model, progressing towards the specification of deign intent prior to manufacture.

2. To describe the iterative nature of design activity between periods of convergent evolution and divergent exploration.

3. Illustrate where, typically, tools of various kinds are used to support practice.

4. Articulate tool effectiveness in support of the various requirements of practice through relating the character of tools to the requirements of practice.

And to:

5. Engage an audience of practicing and student designers through the presentation of knowledge in a way that is immediately accessible and clearly relevant to studio practice.

A review of existing attempts to engage practice through systems and tools for supporting design activity identified a card-based approach as a popular option (*Methods cards for IDEO.* 2010; Lockton, Harrison and Stanton, 2010; Pei 2009). However it was decided that a web-based, interactive resource would be advantageous when compared to an approach based upon the use of physical cards. The logistical and financial cost of web-based publication through hosting was seen as more economic in terms of time and cost compared to a printed publication. Importantly, for a study wishing to disseminate findings to the widest possible audience, web publication affords the opportunity to reach larger audiences. Given a requirement to include visual images as reference points to aid explanation and engage the audience, a web-based approach would provide an opportunity for the use of multimedia through the layering of information in the form of images and graphic animation. A web-based approach would also provide opportunity for continually revision and evolution of the resource in light of testing and validation studies.

6. Design & Realisation of Digital Resource
Figure 6 illustrates a screenshot of the resource's home page. The page presents a simplified model of industrial design practice as illustrated in Figure 1 above. Interactive buttons were embedded within the model. As the curser hovers over each of these buttons, information relating to the stage in practice is displayed.

Fig 6. Home page of IDsite with curser hovering over Detail Design button

Navigation of the site is achieved via a horizontal navigation bar consisting of four buttons: 'Home', 'Concept Design Tools', 'Development Design Tools' and 'Detail Design Tools' (Figure 6). Hovering over any of these brings down a panel of tool options. Clicking on these tool options navigates to the corresponding tool. Figure 7 illustrates the web page relating to the design tool sketch modelling. On the left two variants of sketch modelling, 'Explorative Sketch Models and 'Explorative 'Ad hoc' Sketch Models' are shown. Hovering over either one of these variants brings up a descriptor of the tool and its place of use during studio practice (red oval, Figure 7).

Fig 7. Page relating to the design tool sketch modelling

In addition to communicate information relating to the various design tools investigated during a period of empirical research, IDsite attempts to describe relationships between the character of various tools, the requirements of practice and the practitioner's own idiosyncratic use of tools during design activity. To achieve this, a second 'characteristics' menu, to the right, is included on each of the tool pages. This menu comprises of five buttons: 'transformational ability', 'levels of ambiguity', 'levels of detail', 'levels of commitment', and 'modes of communication' (Figure 8). Hovering over any of these five provides a description of the characteristic and explains how it may relate to the tool's ability to support design activity during concept, development and detail design. Figure 8 illustrates the curser hovering over 'Transformational Ability'. Information relating to the relationship between sketch modelling and design activity as it is characterised by lateral and vertical transformations is displayed.


Fig 8. Sketch modelling page showing relationship between design tool and its ability to support transformative design activity

7. Pilot Survey of Site

An alpha version of IDsite was piloted as a means to initially test the resource at an interim point in its development. A sample of 50 design practitioners were contacted via email and invited to take part in a survey asking of their opinion of the resource; its ability to support understanding of design tool use during design activity. Attribute questions were first used to gather information on the designers' employment, education and experience. These consisted of four questions asking of the practitioners' place of work, job title, the discipline within which the designer worked and the length of time worked within the design industry. A further six questions asked of the practitioner's response to the digital resource. Rating scales were used to gather qualitative data on designer attitudes, with practitioners registering responses using a five item Likert-scale consisting of the following response values: Excellent, Very Good, Average, Below Average and Poor. A final survey question provided the respondents with an opportunity to add comments and suggestions. Of the 50 designers contacted, 16 completed the online survey which represented a response rate of 32%.

8. Pilot Results

Figure 10 illustrates results relating to the attribute question asking respondents about their job title. As the figure suggests, the majority of practitioners described themselves as company directors. This may be related to findings from Question 1, indicating a majority of respondents worked in smaller sized consultancies. Together with findings from other attribute questions (length of time within industry); the findings suggest that a majority of respondents had four or more years experience of practice and held senior positions within the companies within which they worked.


Figure 9: Q2.What is your job title?

Figure 10 illustrates findings for pilot survey question 5 which explored the ability of practitioners to navigate the site.


Fig 10. Q5. How do you fell about your ability to navigate the site?

The majority of practitioners registered a below average response to this question (black segment), suggesting respondents found the resource difficult to navigate. Problems with the speed and response of the drop-down menus and hover panels were identified as a possible reason for the designer's more negative responses. Moreover, some of the qualitative feedback suggested the navigation menu, and the overall presentation of information

seemed difficult to understand. As I respondent suggested, 'The degree of complexity is off-putting.'

Figure 11 illustrates results for Question 11 that explored the capacity of the resource to clearly communicate information relating to design tool use during design activity. Although a majority of respondents rated the site as average in its clarity of information, others registered below average or poor responses. Again, qualitative responses indicated concerns over clarity in terms of the complexity of the resource, as on respondent suggested, 'In fact I find the general graphics a bit 'unfinished'.


Figure 11: Q6.How would you rate the clarity and understandability
of textual and pictorial content?

When asked about the ability of the digital resource to describe the design process (Figure 12), 45% registered an average response, with others rating the site as very good and, fewer, as below average. Responses suggested designers generally reacted positively to the description of the design process presented in the digital resource.


Figure 12: Q7.How would you rate the site's description of the design process?

Figure 13 illustrates results relating to practitioner responses to the ability of the resource to foster understanding of tool use within design activity. A majority of the pilot sample registered an average response, with the remainder indicating a negative attitude towards IDsite's ability to foster improved understanding. Of the 16 respondents, only half completed

question 8, with all responses falling within two of the five items of the Likert-scale: poor and average, Figure 13).


Figure 13: Q8.How would you rate the ability of the site to foster enhanced understanding of various design tools and their support of practice?

Findings from this initial pilot study, as part of the ongoing development of IDsite, highlighted problems in terms of the site's ability to communicate research outcomes clearly. However, as a pilot study, these findings were successful in indicating how IDsite might be revised and further developed before additional validation is undertaken. Encouragingly, although concern was voiced over the design and execution of the digital resource, practitioners considered the idea of a new approach to research dissemination interesting and relevant, 'A great idea for students.'; 'It seemed like a good idea but it misses the target in execution'.

The pilot was required to identify problems which could be addressed, at an interim stage of the site's development. At the time of writing, IDsite continues to be developed in light of the pilot's findings. Further testing and validation using larger samples of industrial design students, educators and practitioners are planned.

9. Conclusion

This paper has presented empirical findings from a survey study of two distinct groups of industrial designers; design students and design practitioners. The survey explored approaches to design activity through analysis of relationships between a designer's level of expertise and attitudes towards the use of design tools during studio practice. Findings were then considered in terms of the designers' approach to design activity during studio practice.

Existing work relating to the character of design activity was identified and synthesised in the design of the survey study (see Table 1). Instead of constituting a prescriptive or definitive set of principles through which design activity may be described, five characteristics acted as a framework for investigating designer attitudes towards design activity when using various design tools. The survey questions facilitated feedback on designer attitudes towards the ability of various design tools to support the five characteristics of design activity.

Empirical findings have suggested differences in attitudes between samples towards the ways various tools support the five characteristics. Significantly, findings may indicate student designers err towards an early fixation and attachment to concept. Evidence of this

was seen in attitudes towards the ability of design tools to support those characteristics of activity often associated with divergent concept design: reflection-on-action, lateral transformations and ambiguity in the embodiment of design intent. Practitioner findings indicated a more positive response to questions on the tools' ability to support the same conceptual, explorative characteristics. This may be evidence of a tendency for experienced practitioners to take a more open, divergent and iterative approach to design activity during their studio practice.

The paper has also described the embodiment of these empirical findings within a digital resource (IDsite). The resource attempts to engage the audience and communicate research outcomes using a highly visual and interactive web-site, through which designers may explore relationships between design tools, the various requirements of studio practice and the character of design activity.

The survey study identified a relationship between designer expertise and approaches to practice that relates to the divergent/convergent model of the design (Figure 1). In response to this IDsite attempts to provide a platform for understanding the rich and complex activity of industrial design; how the use of tools and the designer's own idiosyncratic approach has influence upon design activity during studio practice; and the final specification of design intent.

A pilot of the site at an interim stage of its development has suggested, although the approach to research dissemination was seen as significant and relevant, challenges remain in the design of the resource and its ability to communicate research clearly. In the ongoing development of IDsite, the authors are working to address these concerns through a second iteration of the resource in response to the pilot study. A beta version of IDsite will undergo a period of further validation, helping to continue the evolution of the resource. Although the digital resource is clearly a work in progress, it represents an example of how innovation in research knowledge dissemination can be used to engage an audience of design practitioners.

This approach to research dissemination has the potential to facilitate improved engagement with a practice orientated audience. Whilst acknowledging the role of more conventional methods of dissemination, more relevant approaches to the articulation and exchange of design research knowledge are required. These approaches call for innovation in knowledge dissemination that exploits the highly visual language of design in order to best engage practice.

References

Methods cards for IDEO (2010) Available at: http://www.ideo.com/work/method-cards/. IDEO. (Accessed: 8/23 2010).

Badke-Schaub, P. and Frankenberger, E (2004) 'Design Representations in Critical Situations of Product Development', in Goldschmidt, G. &Porter, W. (eds.) *Design Representation.* pp. 105-126.

Brereton, M. (2004) 'Distributed Cognition in Engineering Design: Negotiating between Abstract and Material Representations', in Goldschmidt, G. & Porter, W. (eds.) *Design Representation.* London: Springer, pp. 83-103.

Bryman, A. (2008) *Social Research Methods.* 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cross, N. (2007) *Designerly Ways of Knowing.* Basel: Birkhauser.

Cross, N. (2000) *Engineering Design Methods: Strategies for product design.* 3rd edn. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Dahl, D. W., Chattopadhyay, A. and Gorn, G. J. (2001) 'The importance of visualisation in concept design', *Design Studies,* 22 (1), pp. 5-26.

Dormer, P. (1993) *Design Since 1945.* London: Thames & Hudson.

Dorst, K. (2007) 'Design research: a revolution-waiting-to-happen', *Design Studies,* 29 (1), pp. 4-11.

Dorta, T., Pérez, E. and Lesage, A. (2008) 'The ideation gap:: hybrid tools, design flow and practice', *Design Studies,* 29 (2), pp. 121-141.

Dreyfus, H. L. and Dreyfus, S. E. (1986) *Mind over Machine: the power of human intuition and expertise in the age of the computer.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Fish, J. (2004) 'Cognitive Catalysis: Sketches for a Time-lagged Brain', in Goldschmidt, G. & Porter, W. (eds.) *Design Representation.* London: Springer, pp. 151-184.

Goel, V. (1995) *Sketches of Thought.* London: The MIT Press.

Goldschmidt, G. (2004) 'Design Representation: Private Process, Public Image', in Goldschmidt, G. & Porter, W. (eds.) *Design Representation.* London: Springer, pp. 203-217.
Goldschmidt, G. (1997) 'Capturing indeterminism: representation in the design problem space', *Design Studies,* 18 (4), pp. 441-455.

Jonson, B. (2005) 'Design ideation: the conceptual sketch in the digital age', *Design Studies,* 26 (6), pp. 613-624.

Lawson, B. and Dorst, K. (2009) *Design Expertise.* Oxford: Architectural Press.

Lockton, D., Harrison, D. and stanton, N. (2010) 'The design with intent method: A design tool for influencing user behaviour', *Applied Ergonomics,* 41 (3), pp. 382-392.

Pei, E. (2009) *Building a common Language of design Representation for Industrial Designers & Engineering Designers.* PhD Thesis. Department of design and technology. Loughborough University. UK.

Pipes, A. (2007) *Drawing for Designers.* London: Laurance King Publishing.

Pipes, A. (1990) *Drawing for 3-Dimensional Design.* London: Thames & Hudson.

Powell, D. (2007) *Product Design: The essentials of Product Design.* Available at: http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/en/About-Design/Design-Disciplines/Product-design/ Design Resaerch Council. (First Accessed: 04.03.2007).

Purcell, A. T. and Gero, J. S. (1998) 'Drawings and the design process: A review of protocol studies in design and other disciplines and related research in cognitive psychology', *Design Studies,* 19 (4), pp. 389-430.

Schon, D. (1983) *The Reflective Practishioner.* London: Ashgate.

Self, J., Dalke, H. and Evans, M. (2009) Industrial Design Tools and Design Practice: An approach for understanding relationships between design tools and practice, *IASDR 2009 Proceedings, Design Rigor and Relevance*, Korea Society of Design Science.

Stolterman, E. (2008) *Designerly Tools. DRS2008 Conference.* Sheffield University. Sheffield. UK. 16-19 July 2008.

Tovey, M., Porter, S. and Newman, R. (2003) 'Sketching, concept development and automotive design', *Design Studies,* 24 (2), pp. 135-153.

Tovey, M. and Owen, J. (2000) 'Sketching and direct CAD modelling in automotive design', *Design Studies,* 21 (6), pp. 569-588.

Visser, W. (2006) *The Cognitive Artifacts of Designing.* New York: Routledge.

James Self

James Self is a doctoral scholar and visiting Lecturer at the Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture, Kingston University London, with research interests in design representation and the use of design tools of embodiment; sketching, Cad, rapid prototyping. He has a bachelor's degree in Design Representation and a master's qualification in Digital Modelling with Rapid Prototyping, both awarded at the University of Hertfordshire. Between being awarded his degrees he worked as a freelance professional model maker, both in the UK and abroad. His work involved the physical representation of design intentions as models and prototypes for the communication and development of design ideas at various stages in their development. After seven years experience in practice his Masters dissertation compared the use of conventional workshop processes in the modelling of design intentionality with emergent and established digital (rapid prototyping) and hybrid (haptic devices) soft/hard ware and systems. His Doctoral research, funded through scholarship, is interested in the effective use of design tools in support of industrial design for manufacture. Research findings continue to be disseminated through paper presentation, including presentation at the biannual international Association of Societies of Design Research, Seoul and publications in professional journals (KIOSK Magazine). The doctoral study is now in the final stages of write-up before submission for external examination. James is a member of the Design Research Society.

Hilary Dalke

Professor Hilary Dalke, Director of the Design Research Centre and Design for Environments, has built an internationally recognised centre of excellence on colour design and lighting. Professor Dalke is an expert in accessibility, sensory design and the healthcare sector and specialises in colour contrast for the built environment and is active in knowledge transfer as a designer, educator and leader.

Mark Evans

Dr Mark Evans is a Senior Lecturer at Loughborough Design School in the UK. He has bachelors, masters and PhD qualifications in industrial design and prior to joining Loughborough University worked as a consultant and in-house industrial designer. On joining the University he continued to undertake professional practice for organisations such as British Airways, Honda, Unilever and British Gas. His PhD employed practice-based methods that resulted in the design of four consumer products. An experienced PhD supervisor and examiner, current research is supported by five PhD students working in the areas of design modelling, design management and sustainable design. Overseas appointments include International Scholar at MIT and visiting professor at Rhode Island School of Design. He is a reviewer for the UK's Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council and member of the Arts and Humanities Research Council's Peer Review College.