

# DESIGN

Principles & Practices:  
*An International Journal*

Volume 2, Number 3

Design Digestion: Work in Progress

Jamie Brassett and Peter Booth

DESIGN PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL  
<http://www.Design-Journal.com>

First published in 2008 in Melbourne, Australia by Common Ground Publishing Pty Ltd  
[www.CommonGroundPublishing.com](http://www.CommonGroundPublishing.com).

© 2008 (individual papers), the author(s)  
© 2008 (selection and editorial matter) Common Ground

Authors are responsible for the accuracy of citations, quotations, diagrams, tables and maps.

All rights reserved. Apart from fair use for the purposes of study, research, criticism or review as permitted under the Copyright Act (Australia), no part of this work may be reproduced without written permission from the publisher. For permissions and other inquiries, please contact [<cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com>](mailto:cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com).

ISSN: 1833-1874  
Publisher Site: <http://www.Design-Journal.com>

DESIGN PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL is a peer refereed journal. Full papers submitted for publication are refereed by Associate Editors through anonymous referee processes.

Typeset in Common Ground Markup Language using CGCreator multichannel typesetting system  
<http://www.CommonGroundSoftware.com>.

## Design Digestion: Work in Progress

Jamie Brassett, University of the Arts, UNITED KINGDOM

Peter Booth, Tin Horse Design Ltd., UNITED KINGDOM

*Abstract: Enough of taste and mastication. It is time to look beyond the momentary, tasteful consumption of designed objects, in order to make account of the various meanings that are generated through their more drawn-out engagements. It seems to us that the discourses around consumption that have abounded in Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences in the last 40 years have simultaneously limited their focus on one aspect of our relationship with designed objects, services, images &c., and confused such a limited focus with all characteristics of this relationship: the term “consumption” seems to refer to everything from desire through acquisition to use. Under the auspices of discourses of consumption, objects, once consumed, are destined only for the rubbish tip. Is there any wonder that consumer culture is one that prioritizes taste and waste? The long, alimentary process in-between seems to be largely forgotten. We will offer a furthering of the biological metaphor beyond the mouth—the site of consumption—by stating that after the initial burst of taste that consuming designed objects gives, there is a more prolonged digestion. Digestion takes time; it breaks down the thing(s) digested and thus broken, the digested bits are used by our systems in various ways. In this paper we will focus on this process, in order to outline the beginnings of a theory of digestion; an outline that is based-upon an analysis of the rituals, practices and other experiences that people have with designed objects. It is important for us that such an account is not merely reflective and analytical of the culture in which design operates. Once we have articulated this theory of digestion, it is our intention to use it to generate real design outcomes in a commercial setting. The move from, and relationship between, the theoretical/analytical and the creative/synthetic is an important one.*

Keywords: Consumer Culture, Design Theory, Design Practice, Innovation, User Practices

“How things are designed may well be about ‘performance’ or ‘engineering’ or ‘excellence’ or ‘communication.’ But I think most of all that the way things take their shape, form, size, color gives us a sense of measure in the physical world; it assures us that the world accommodates us and that we, in turn, can accommodate it and what it brings. That mutual reassurance can be in the way a backpack folds into one’s shoulders and back, the way a comfortable desk offers a view of the world, or the way the handle of a vegetable peeler conforms to the human grip.” (Busch 2004: 21)

### Preface

**WE NEED TO** take some time to locate this work. What follows represents the early stages of a collaboration between a professional designer with day-to-day experience of clients, design projects, manufacturing, focusing particularly on packaging and branding but with an increasing involvement in strategy and innovation; and a design academic, an educator of designers with a background in philosophy. The essay before you is an attempt to outline some of the concerns that have brought us together in this project. It is our hope that this project will produce other outcomes:

theoretical expressions of the particular design processes that emerge from these ideas; practical accounts of ways of doing design according to these principles; and engagements with issues that stem from all of these concerns (notably to do with waste—or, the excretions of our design digestions). Much of this will follow in other outcomes. It remains for us to open up the possibilities for debate that is the premise of this collaboration.

### Introduction

It must first be stated that this paper represents a critique of consumption that seeks to refine the concept and not a denial of it—and its multitude of related discourses’—relevance. In addition, many of the important social, political and cultural notions that abound around this discourse are accepted. In this respect, this paper will not attempt to plough through the myriad texts and constellations of ideas that currently serve to define the discourse of consumption. (Frank Trentmann in a note to his introduction to the 2006 collection *The Making of the Consumer* mentions that the “corpus of books and articles [on consumption] now runs into several thousands” (21 n.2).) What, then, is the point of going over a discourse—or the homogenizing name for a set of discourses, to introduce a taste of our critique—that appears to be working well and getting its job done?



It appears that in today's culture consumption is everything; it is the saviour of social systems in, or approaching, crisis (as explained by Trentmann 2006) and the destroyer of the planet (all eco-discourses, but for the classic examples in the realm of design theory see Papanek 1984 and 1995); consumption is the reason for the breakdown of social bonds (Bauman 2007) or the driver behind their creation and cementation (much Material Cultural discourse, see Attfield 2000, Buchli 2002, Miller 1987 and 2005, and so many others). Almost any contemporary cultural benefit or malaise can be attributed to the act, the process, even the very idea, of consumption. The interest in refining the notion has one immediate and practical point of impact, and one effect that might be longer in materializing.

First, it should be stated that the metaphor of consumption itself is being used to stand for more than it should. Whatever the (undoubtedly valid) historical reasons for such a stretching of the metaphor, the metaphor needs readdressing in order to ensure that consumption is located at the most useful part of a process in which it is only a part. Consumption, in the end, is just the beginning. This allows focus to be placed on another part of the metaphor: digestion. To differentiate digestion from consumption is our opening conceit and its proposal is the focus of this piece. But this, too, needs to be put into sharper focus: we should say that digestion will be examined insofar as it is made manifest by people's real life engagement with designed objects. That designed objects (information, services and images as well as packages, furniture and other products) are used in so many ways, over times that stretch well beyond that of those initial moments of consumption—from pre-purchase to first use—shows the paucity of a notion of consumption which attempts to stand for everything that such relationships (between people and designed stuff) offer. If a sofa once bought and used in the home over a number of years should not be described as being continually consumed, if consumption is inadequate in the understanding of how such things have meaning for people over a period of time, then digestion is the only other option. A watch, lived with everyday, is not consumed; neither is a packet of frozen peas consumed, after the moments of purchase and first use, even as the contents are. This paper offers the more durable *digestion* to describe the process that will fit with these lived-in processes. It must be noted, therefore, that this discussion will focus neither on consumers (as is the case in most social science and marketing discourse about consumption) nor on users (as in design), but on people. This echoes Trentmann's (2006) central positioning of the notion of *subjectivity* or *identity* of 'the consumer' (the inverted commas often show his distancing from the concept of

'the consumer'); and some of the work that Shove (on her own 2003, with Matt Watson and Jack Ingram 2006 and 2007, and with others 2008) have done in rethinking the product design process, where they locate 'consumers' now as 'practitioners' who take part in the designing of products (we will return to this idea later). In the end, this discussion is about people, not consumers, 'consumers', users, practitioners, or any other construction: just people digesting designed objects.

The longer-term objectives, mentioned above, are themselves manifold. It is possible that introducing a concept of designed objects being digested can affect the very process of designing itself; and if so, this design process needs itself to be designed. Furthermore, if this is the case—and digesting and designing can be changed through their mutual interaction within a world that appears to prioritize consuming—can a repositioning of a digestion-conscious design process affect the problems that are attributed to consumption with such quasi-religious zeal? If consumption-waste is the current obsession, what happens when the entire digestive tract is re-inserted into this process? But to posit these questions now is a little presumptive. The scene must first be set before examining some of the ways that designed things are digested. The issues about rethinking the design process will be intimated in the conclusion of this paper and should be considered to be triggers for further investigation, not the final words on the subject.

### Outlining the Problem

Zygmunt Bauman has recently discussed consumption in his *Consuming Life* (2007) and makes some insightful critiques, albeit with a number of unexamined theoretical assumptions. First, his position stems from a basic phenomenology, where the thinking, speaking and existing subject is instantiated in its very selfhood through the act of experiencing an object. Bauman introduces the main foundation of his critique of consumption: human society is a construct upon the relationships between different people, each a subject for themselves and an object for others (in a phenomenological sense). When this phenomenological relationship between subject and object is pure (that is, related to contemplation and action) so must the cascade of other subject-object relationships be similarly pure. The problem arises when such purity is sullied. When consumption is the primary relationship between subject and object, then any other relationship that follows will be consumptive in its very essence. For Bauman, this principle of phenomenological consumption builds not only a "distorted" or "perverse" subject, but "distorted" or "perverse" (Bauman 2007: 11) societies too:

...the existential setting that came to be known as the ‘society of consumers’ is distinguished by a remaking of interhuman relations on the pattern, and in the likeness, of the relations between consumers and the objects of their consumption. This remarkable feat has been achieved through the annexation and colonization by consumer markets of the space stretching between human individuals; that space in which the strings that tie humans together are plaited, and the fences that separate them are built (Bauman 2007: 11).

This contemporary version of Kant’s ‘Refutation of Idealism’ (“consciousness of my existence is at the same time an immediate consciousness of the existence of other things outside me” (B276)) leads not to the (hoped for) solidification of a subject position within the certainties of the material, but its “dissolution into the sea of commodities” (12). The phenomenological certainty of real things and real selves mutually building each other becomes overtaken, in effect, *colonized*, by relations of consumption. To reinforce this notion, Bauman states:

‘Subjectivity’ in the society of consumers, just as ‘commodity’ in the society of producers, is (to use Bruno Latour’s felicitous concept) a *faitishe*—a thoroughly human product elevated to the rank of superhuman authority through forgetting or rendering irrelevant its human, all too human origins, together with the string of human actions that led to its appearance. ... Consumers’ ‘subjectivity’ is made out of shopping choices—choices made by the subject and the subject’s prospective purchasers; its description takes the form of the shopping list. What is assumed to be the *materialization* of the inner truth of the self is in fact an *idealization* of the material—objectified—traces of consumer choices (Bauman 2007: 14-5).

This is, of course, what happens when the phenomenological ideal of a pure, unsullied subject-object relation is taken as the foundation for the theory. In emphasizing this, and re-working Descartes’s dictum along Barbara Kruger’s lines “I shop therefore I am”, Bauman relegates the rest of the experience of the object to an abject purgatory of nothingness: “the joy is all in the shopping that gratifies, while the acquisition itself, with the vision of being burdened with its possible clumsy and awkward effects and side effects, portends a high likelihood of frustration, sorrow and regret” (Bauman 2007: 18). For Bauman objects are consumed in their moment of purchase, allowing for a magnesium flare of subjective consciousness, and the rest is fading away and loss.

The argument against Bauman here exists only in terms of the reductive nature of his phenomenology. While the subject is illusory, the subject positions *are* materialized through engagement with real designed objects that last longer than the reduction to consumption allows, and that this engagement has more going for it than “frustration, sorrow and regret.” These subjectivities can be made real not through an evanescent dialectical or fetishistic reification, but through concrete connections with real things. This produces an amplification and resonance of subjectivities through material connection, rather than a reduction or negative reification.

Focusing again on the metaphor on which all of this theory is built, may offer some opportunities not only for the reworking of such discussions, but also to lead to a new way of bringing objects into the world. As mentioned previously, consumption has focused on only one aspect of its meaning: the taste full moment of eating. Perhaps this is a legacy of the last few hundred years of aesthetic theory. Or perhaps it is a consequence of social and cultural realities of modernity and its multiplicity of related foundational concepts, such as commodity fetishism. Nevertheless, this tasty moment has been stretched beyond itself, synecdochally standing for most aspects of the digestive process. In many ways the moment of purchase has been made to stand for the entire time of living with an object. We use our taste in purchasing and our purchase shows that we have taste, until we wish to reorient these identifying actions. Then new consumptions are demanded, while old ones become waste. It is little wonder then, that Bauman is concerned, as this is a very shallow existence. Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood (1996) advance this aspect further, arguing that the economic definition of consumption refines the anthropologic definition. They write: “the essence of the economist’s concept of the individual consumer is that he exerts a sovereign choice” (Douglas and Isherwood 1996: 36); adding: “What happened to material objects once they have left the retail outlet and reached the hands of the final purchasers is part of the consumption process” (Douglas and Isherwood 1996: 36). The emphasis here is on the front-end: on choice and taste; and that this front-end notion stretches far beyond the act of exercising choice. These concepts are used in the understanding of purchasing employed by Procter and Gamble. A shopper being caught by an object’s shelf-presence is termed the “first moment of truth” and the initial engagement with that object post-purchase (the opening of a jar or packet, the first wearing of a new pair of shoes, or stretching out on a new sofa for the first time) is termed the “second moment of truth” (see Blackshaw 2006 for an expansion on these ideas from a Marketing perspective). At this point Procter and Gamble

remove their attention from people's engagement with their products. This point will be returned to later, as it will become key in discussing the possibilities for innovation that design digestion will afford.

Douglas and Isherwood then jump from these first and second moments, into a post-shopping, everyday notion of use—"So if we define consumption as a *use of material possessions that is beyond commerce* and free within the law, we have a concept that travels extremely well" (Douglas and Isherwood 1996: 37; our emphasis)—such that the definition of consumption is not clear, even if all the aspects make perfect sense. Taking the concept of consumption on a journey from the pre-shopping ruminations, to the immediate shopping and post-shopping experiences, into a world beyond the commercial act (and all its related activities) gives to the concept a world of meanings. This, however, is a stretch too far for this particular metaphor. Taste and consumption should be used to describe the moment surrounding the act of purchase (wherein we can still discuss taste cultures, consumption patterns, moments of truth and so on) while the rest of time spent with the object (prior to it becoming waste) should be termed *digestion*. Rather than bending one aspect of the metaphor to the point where it reaches breaking point, it is time to invigorate some of the other concepts that are related to this metaphor. The alimentary process of designed objects must be opened up to all their possibilities.

### Digesting and Design

The human body's engagement with food goes through many different steps: mouth, pharynx, esophagus, stomach, small intestine, large intestine and anus. We have seen that much contemporary discourse about consumption discusses what happens in the mouth, extends this across the whole of the rest of the bodily function, before being concerned with waste. The major part of the process of digestion is ignored. Digestion is, very simply, the process by which food (and liquids) is processed into forms that can be absorbed into the bloodstream while what is left over is evacuated. This is done in order to provide fuel for different organs of the body. Separate from the purely biological description, is the notion that the act of consumption (of food) is not performed for functional/fuelling reasons alone, but also—as Don Slater (1997), among others (most notably see Ashley *et al* 2004), has shown very well—it is a purely cultural act. Nevertheless, there are those for whom this act is performed with their *nutritional* needs paramount. Though this is still a cultural discourse, it is one in which (as with many things these days) the concerns of the organic well-being are valorized over others. In this respect, it

seems fair to ask: what is the *nutritional* function of the digestion of designed objects?

To a great extent this relates to some of the existential concerns previously mentioned. There is a sense in which the consumption, digestion and ejection of our designed objects fuels us in three ways. First, functionally: we use an object to take advantage of its functional capabilities that are often extensions of basic human attributes. This is probably the most straightforward definition of the term 'function'. Yet when digestion is added into the mix, some interesting nuances can be found. As mentioned, many designed objects have ostensible functions: chairs are to be sat on, suitcases carry clothes, light switches turn lights on and off, and so on. In the psychological term made popular in design theory by Donald Norman (1990), such functions are *afforded* by the way the objects are designed. The digestion of such objects can bring out other, latent functions: a suitcase can be sat upon, becoming a chair if needed; a light switch can serve as a space for leaving messages to housemates or family members; a sofa becomes a bed if one stretches out on it; the underneath of a table becomes a fantasy land for children. Through misuse, subversion of use, repurposing, abuse, different ways of digesting designed objects can unfold a whole host of opportunities undreamt of in their original design intent. (Some good examples of these are seen in Fulton Suri 2005 and Arkhipov 2006.)

Second, symbolically: the values encoded in objects are allowed to communicate for us, to stand in as shorthand, or as a particular translation, for our own values: "And meanings go somewhere. They end up in the life of the consumer. ... This is, in part, why the consumer is buying the product or service—to obtain the meaning contained in it" (McCracken 2005: 178; see also Trentmann 2006). Increasingly in contemporary design practice there is a recognition that the designing of objects comes from a process which includes an engagement with, an understanding of and a participation within social, cultural and other processes that provide the wider context within which designed objects exist. Sometimes designers call such an engagement, understanding, analysis and decoding 'research' and this element of the design process appears to be occupying a prominent part of activity within many contemporary design practices. Such research is different from that understood and practiced by academics however, for it is necessarily bound-up with taking the fruits of its activity and encoding them into objects which re-enter as constituent elements of the social, cultural etc. realms that have helped give them birth. As may be expected this 'research' has many different aspects and moments about which it articulates. Nevertheless, an important consequence of this research activity as undertaken by designers is the identifica-

tion of certain social, cultural (and so on) values that can be encoded into particular designed outcomes. It would seem, therefore, unremarkable that one of the outcomes of digestion is the removal of these values from designed objects and their absorption into the human system. That objects have values that go beyond the utilitarian, pragmatic or functional (in the traditional sense) is, of course, one of the purposes of design. The most obvious example of such digestive practices is when the values and meanings encoded into designed objects can be used to stand for, represent or express our identities. Brands do this as a matter of course. A huge sweep of paint like the childish cypher of a bird in flight, adorns the back pockets of Evisu jeans, and speaks to western audiences of retro chic, exoticness and—for a moment—a certain difficulty in obtaining. These are values that are understood pre-, during and immediately post-consumption, but which also evolve during the process of digestion. The change in patina, in the tactile qualities of the materials, even the meanings of the brands can make the values consumed of a pair of jeans and those digested utterly different. Another example regards the meaning of guns. In some places in the world, this object has values beyond the functional, such that its ownership and display demonstrate a whole raft of specific political and cultural values (see the ‘Armed America’ website for some photographs attesting to this). In this second example, the values digested though individually nourishing, are more conferred by social and cultural forms than found in the designs. Nevertheless, it would be a poor designer who failed to design such objects without taking into account the values that societies and cultures give to them. To these examples, we might add collectors, fans and so on.

Third, culturally: wherein the uses and misuses of objects’ functions and values can display a particular cultural belonging. Though there are conceptual crossovers, this idea differs from the previous one in that rather than looking at the personal meanings of symbolic values of designed objects, it deals with the culturally meaningful rituals of the use of designed objects (for a detailed description of how design and culture relate and how this relation feeds into the design process see Julier 2000 and 2007, and Brassett 2007 and 2009). Douglas and Isherwood explain that: “It is standard ethnographic practice to assume that all material possessions carry social meanings and to concentrate a main part of cultural analysis upon their use as communicators” (Douglas and Isherwood 1996: 38). Bringing these first two notions together under the auspices of social and cultural meaning is rather obvious. Where cultural values have been digested for individual nourishment, or functional affordances digested to offer ‘underground’ opportunities, patterns exist in all of

these digestions (both functional and valuable) that display supra-individual meanings. Grinding skateboards on the steps of a monument to Lenin—as happens in some ex-Soviet bloc cities—allows not only for a subversion of function and a range of values, but also links our cultural selves with similar groupings seen around the world (Procter and Gamble, among others, find such cultural realities useful, see Hymowitz 2007). However, probably the best examples in this area come from the vast literature that forms the branch of anthropology known as Material Culture. While an overview of this discipline is not needed here, there are a couple of its concepts that may prove fruitful to an account of designed objects digested for cultural purposes. One is the notion that—in contradistinction to the skater example mentioned above, wherein global tribal belongings take precedence over local cultural ones—as Judy Attfield says in her *Wild Things. A Material Culture of Everyday Life* (2000), “[Daniel] Miller’s localised anthropological analysis of material culture identifies consumption as a form of ‘creative appropriation’ that enables the preservation of cultural specificity in contradiction to theories of globalisation” (94). It could be added that the act of digestion, in taking us out of the magnesium flash of exercising taste into the longer-term nature of lived(-in) experience, could act to entrench these singularities further. One way in which this is made manifest, is in the current exhortation by some political groups or interested individuals that we should consume only (or at least mainly) local produce; that there is a social and cultural *nutritional value* in the digestion of products and produce that haven’t travelled too far (see Thackara 2005 for an example of this discourse in design). This advocates a sort of nouveau, retro-vernacular life. In contrast, there is a notion that begins in the anthropological work of Arjun Appadurai which has a number of useful material culture and digestive applications, “object biographies/narratives”: every object, no matter how similar, will have a narrative, or biography, that differentiates it from others (see particularly Appadurai 1986). A Toyota pick-up truck used on a farm in Tuscany will have a different biography to one used on a farm in Zimbabwe, though the specifications (even colour) may be identical. Its birth and early years, who and how many people use it, what it transports, how it is disposed of...these aspects of the pick-up’s biography will be different depending on the contexts of use. It can be stated that the issues surrounding the *consumption* of this truck may be similar in these different contexts (functionality, ubiquity, reputation, economic value and so on); the differences in narrative will come from digestion. An eye on the cultural digestion of designed objects, therefore, offers much.

Unlike Bauman's bemoaning of the "distortion" of the existential by practices that prioritize consumption, such that the material becomes the ideal while they promised to do the opposite (Bauman 2007: 12), thinking of such practices in terms of digestion, we can say that digestive practices *really do* materialize the ideal. Values *are* translated into shapes or materials—as we have mentioned above, this marks one of the important aspects of what designers do. Objects' narratives *do* speak subjects' narratives—again, a designer needs to have an understanding of the actual or aspirational narratives of both clients and market. And cultural materiality *is* displayed through the uses to which objects are put—upon this both anthropology and sociology invest much of their analytical significance. Maybe Bauman's pique would be less aroused had he a concept of digestion to work with? We hope to have identified what such a discourse involves; as mentioned before, this is the beginning of the process, not its last words.

### Conclusion—Possibilities for Designing and Innovating

It would be easy to keep this piece in the rarefied world of academic debate about the merits, and otherwise, of the theory of consumption. This would ignore the fact that we represent a collaboration between the worlds of theory and practice. There are two points that should be made regarding the ways that the theorizing we have done here can produce real changes in design practice.

On the one hand, the principles that are being outlined can do this in a very simple way. Designing is a teleological process; starting with a brief from a client the aim is to end up with a response which meets the requirements set. There are a number of stages to move through—research, concept generation and development, design refinement and so on—in the search for a creative outcome. Within this process there are opportunities for iterative folding back, so that particular results can go to reform earlier choices; nevertheless these iterative moments always lead to the production of the best possible outcome. Could an understanding of digestive practices of real people disrupt such a teleology? Speeding the design process up would offer opportunities for real creative outcomes to be sent into the world for proper digestion to take place. This is more than the user-testing or focus groups that are currently used. As it stands such testing is still under the control of the client or, even, of the designer(s). Letting designed objects undergo digestion displaces control over the design of things to the people for whom these objects are meant. These digested objects would then be re-inserted into the design process

leading in a direction that may never have been conceived either by the client or the designer(s). A nonlinear spread of designing-digesting-redesigning-redigesting and so on, replaces the formerly teleological movement. Ideas similar to this are already in circulation. Elizabeth Shove, Matthew Watson, Mark Hand and Jack Ingram have all been working on a project called 'Designing and Consuming: objects, practices and processes' (2005-7) with outcomes such as the 'POPD [Practice Oriented Product Design] Manifesto' (2006) and the recently published *The Design of Everyday Life* (2008). For these thinkers, the term 'practice' designates a whole range of people's engagements with objects, especially the everyday rituals, and their objective was therefore to investigate "the relation between a range of everyday artifacts and the practices of those who use them", in order to "open up new intellectual ground between consumption studies, design research and the field of material culture" (Shove, Watson and Ingram 2007: 1). POPD allows them to posit a way of designing that recognizes that users—or 'practitioners' as they prefer (Shove, Watson and Ingram 2006)—through the different practices and rituals that coalesce around objects, take part in a redesigning of these things. However, beyond the manifesto asserting a design methodology, this project remains largely analytic and gestural. In taking digestion seriously, design should then be conducted in a different way.

This leads to the other point: what is the benefit, in design, of pursuing the alimentary? It is clear that design digestion will be truly innovative. Companies in the Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) area are most comfortable innovating evolutionarily, where any designed changes in their products (regarding brand positioning in the market, the experience of their products on the shelves and in the shops, and the initial experiences that *consumers* have with their products) have to operate within heavily constrained strictures. Such innovation, also called "sustainable innovation" (Christensen 1997), is particularly easy for FMCG companies to perform as it puts the locus of control firmly in their hands. Consequently these companies find disruptive innovation (Christensen 1997) not only difficult to achieve but difficult even to contemplate, as the opportunities for failure can appear to outweigh the benefits of success, and control slips away. Typically, FMCG companies have a "hopper" metaphor for doing innovation: from a wide opening the process moves through increasingly smaller stages before reaching a point at which it is deemed safe to go forward. So they would first decide on a roughly defined business objective, map the territory, determine and agree what can be done in this area (thereby producing an innovation brief), ideate the opportunities, before creating a design



brief. Then the teleological design process described above kicks-in. The focus gets tighter and tighter, opportunities reduce rather than amplify, and innovation is strangled. It is no wonder that anything truly innovative, gets rejected along the way. Design digestion as posed is a more nonlinear approach to innovation. Taking products out of the constraints of their design is an everyday occurrence in people's lives. This is occurring in the digestion and subversion of functions, of values and in cultural contexts. Each of these, if considered with digestive acuity, will offer a company, a designer, a field of opportunity in which design can amplify and disrupt. Opportunities due to digestion abound. All that remains is for the locus of control to reposition with people and for this to be accepted into the designing of things. This is why the entire methodology of innovation needs to be reconsidered, along with the design process. An alimentary, digestive process will allow companies to see if the promise that they offer to people has been redeemed—in this respect, it seems a waste for a company *not* to take account of the digestion of its

products. The future challenge is to see the metabolic rate of the design process upgraded, thus folding back digestion, and innovating along the way.

### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank: Tamsyn Gilbert and the reviewers for their valuable comments on earlier drafts of this paper; Professor Martin Woolley, Head of Research at Central Saint Martins College of Art and Design, for support and Central Saint Martins College of Art and Design for the research funding (2007-8) that is helping this whole project come together; Tin Horse Design for time and resources; Professor Guy Julier, Leeds Metropolitan University, for allowing us to see some of his work in progress; colleagues on BA (Hons.) Product Design at Central Saint Martins College of Art and Design for comments on these ideas; and Joanna Brassett, Senior Design Researcher at Seymourpowell Foresight, for insights, recommendations and comments on this paper itself.

### References

- Appadurai, A. (Ed.). 1986. *The Social Life of Things. Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Arkipov, V. 2006. *Home Made: Contemporary Russian Folk Artifacts*. London: FUEL Publishing 'Armed America: Portraits of Gun Owners in Their Homes' (consulted 05.Feb.08.) <http://www.armedamerica.org/>
- Ashley, B. et al. 2004. *Food and Cultural Studies*. London and New York: Routledge
- Attfield, J. 2000. *Wild Things. The Material Culture of Everyday Life*. Oxford and New York: Berg
- Bauman, Z. 2007. *Consuming Life*. Cambridge and Malden MA: Polity Press
- Blackshaw, P. 'The Third Moment of Truth' (consulted 05.Feb.08.) <http://www.clickz.com/showPage.html?page=3623701>
- Brassett, J. 2007. 'Affecting Bodies Affecting Design'. Presentation at "Design/Body/Sense" Design History Society's Annual Conference, Kingston University, London.
- 2009 forthcoming. 'Design Collisions'.
- Buchli, V. (Ed.). 2002. *The Material Culture Reader*. Oxford: Berg
- Busch, A. 2004. *The Uncommon Life of Common Objects*. New York: Metropolis Books
- Christensen, C. M. 1997. *The Innovator's Dilemma*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press
- Douglas, M. and B. Isherwood. 1996. *The World of Goods. Towards an anthropology of consumption*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Abingdon, Oxon. and New York: Routledge
- Fulton Suri, J. IDEO. 2005. *Thoughtless Acts?* San Francisco: Chronicle Books.
- Hymowitz, Carol. 2007. 'Marketers Focus More On Global "Tribes" Than on Nationalities', *Wall Street Journal* (10.Dec.07). B1
- Julier, G. 2000. *The Culture of Design*. London: Sage
- 2007. 'Design Practice within a Theory of Practice', *Design Principles and Practices: An International Journal*. 1(2). 43-50
- Kant, I. 1929. *The Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. Norman Kemp Smith. London: Macmillan
- McCracken, G. 2005. *Culture and Consumption II®. Markets, Meaning and Brand Management*. Bloomington IN and Indianapolis IN: Indiana U.P.
- Miller, D. 1987. *Material Culture and Mass Consumption*. Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- (Ed.). 2005. *Materiality*. Durham and London: Duke U.P.
- Norman, D. 1990. *The Design of Everyday Things*. New York: Basic Books
- Papanek, V. 1984. *Design for the Real World*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, London: Thames and Hudson
- 1995. *The Green Imperative*. London: Thames and Hudson
- Shove, E. 2003. *Comfort, Cleanliness and Convenience. The Social Organization of Normality*. Oxford and New York: Berg
- Shove, Elizabeth, Matthew Watson and Jack Ingram. 2006. 'The Product Orientated Product Design Manifesto' (consulted 15 July 2007) <http://www.dur.ac.uk/designing.consuming/wkshpjul06/popd%20manifesto.pdf>
- 2007. 'Designing and Consuming: Objects, Practices and Processes. End of Award Report.' (consulted 15 July 2007) <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/projects/dnc/papers/eos.pdf>
- Shove, E. et al. 2008. *The Design of Everyday Life*. Oxford and New York: Berg
- Slater, D. 1997. *Consumer Culture and Modernity*. Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press

- Thackara, J. 2005. *In the Bubble: Designing a Complex World*. London & Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Trentmann, Frank. 2006. 'Knowing Consumers—Histories, Identities, Practices. An Introduction.' In Frank Trentmann (Ed.) *The Making of the Consumer. Knowledge, power and identity in the modern world*. Oxford and New York: Berg. 2-27.

## About the Authors

### *Dr Jamie Brassett*

Currently Programme Leader for Contextual Studies on BA (Hons.) Product Design, Central Saint Martins College of Art & Design, University of the Arts, London. Teaching in Art & Design since 1995. MA Philosophy & Literature (Warwick 1989) & PhD Philosophy (Warwick 1993). PhD Thesis titled 'Cartographies of Subjectification' examined the materiality of spaced subjectivity using concepts from Immanuel Kant, Gaston Bachelard, Gilles Deleuze & Félix Guattari. Most of my work in the 1990s centred on the philosophical consequences for subjectivity of practices of body modification. The elements of this discourse that take in concepts of the cyborg & design practice form the basis of the book that I'm writing called 'CyberDesire'. More recent work focuses on the relations between design theory & practice, especially the use of philosophical concepts to drive design practice. Writing in this area includes work on emergence & fashion design, relating Spinoza's body to designing things and looking at philosophy of science & literature to produce models for relating design & culture. Working as design & education consultant for the last ten years. Fellow of the Royal Society for the Arts since 2000.

### *Peter Booth*

Tin Horse Design Ltd., Marlborough, UNITED KINGDOM



# DESIGN PRINCIPLES & PRACTICES

*An International Journal*

## EDITORS

**Peter Burrows**, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.

**Daria Loi**, Intel, USA.

**Bill Cope**, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA.

## EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

**Genevieve Bell**, Intel Corporation, USA

**Michael Biggs**, University of Hertfordshire, UK

**Thomas Binder**, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Denmark

**Jeanette Blomberg**, IBM Almaden Research Center, USA

**Eva Brandt**, Danmark Designskole, Denmark

**Monika Büscher**, Lancaster University, UK

**Patrick Dillon**, Exeter University, UK

**Kees Dorst**, TUE, The Netherlands and UTS, Australia

**Ken Friedman**, Norway and Danmark Designskole, Denmark

**Bill Gaver**, Goldsmiths University of London, UK

**Michael Gibson**, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas, USA

**Judith Gregory**, Institute of Design, USA and University of Oslo, Norway

**Clive Holtham**, City of London University, UK

**Hiroshi Ishii**, MIT Media Lab, USA

**Gianni Jacucci**, University of Trento, Italy

**Mary Kalantzis**, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA

**Terence Love**, Curtin University, Australia

**Bill Lucas**, MAYA Design, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA

**Ezio Manzini**, Politecnico of Milano, Italy

**Julian Orr**, Work Practice & Technology Associates, USA

**Mahendra Patel**, Leaf Design, India

**Toni Robertson**, University of Technology Sydney, Australia

**Terry Rosenberg**, Goldsmiths University of London, UK

**Keith Russell**, University of Newcastle, Australia

**Liz Sanders**, Make Tools, USA

**Maria Cecilia Loschiavo dos Santos**, University of São Paulo, Brazil

**Lucy Suchman**, Lancaster University, UK

**Ina Wagner**, Technical University of Vienna, Austria

**Dvora Yanow**, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Please visit the Journal website at <http://www.Design-Journal.com>  
for further information about the Journal or to subscribe.

## THE UNIVERSITY PRESS JOURNALS

### **International Journal of the Arts in Society**

Creates a space for dialogue on innovative theories and practices in the arts, and their inter-relationships with society.

ISSN: 1833-1866

<http://www.Arts-Journal.com>

### **International Journal of the Book**

Explores the past, present and future of books, publishing, libraries, information, literacy and learning in the information society. ISSN: 1447-9567

<http://www.Book-Journal.com>

### **Design Principles and Practices: An International Journal**

Examines the meaning and purpose of 'design' while also speaking in grounded ways about the task of design and the use of designed artefacts and processes. ISSN: 1833-1874

<http://www.Design-Journal.com>

### **International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations**

Provides a forum for discussion and builds a body of knowledge on the forms and dynamics of difference and diversity.

ISSN: 1447-9583

<http://www.Diversity-Journal.com>

### **International Journal of Environmental, Cultural, Economic and Social Sustainability**

Draws from the various fields and perspectives through which we can address fundamental questions of sustainability.

ISSN: 1832-2077

<http://www.Sustainability-Journal.com>

### **Global Studies Journal**

Maps and interprets new trends and patterns in globalization. ISSN 1835-4432

<http://www.GlobalStudiesJournal.com>

### **International Journal of the Humanities**

Discusses the role of the humanities in contemplating the future and the human, in an era otherwise dominated by scientific, technical and economic rationalisms. ISSN: 1447-9559

<http://www.Humanities-Journal.com>

### **International Journal of the Inclusive Museum**

Addresses the key question: How can the institution of the museum become more inclusive? ISSN 1835-2014

<http://www.Museum-Journal.com>

### **International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences**

Discusses disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge creation within and across the various social sciences and between the social, natural and applied sciences.

ISSN: 1833-1882

<http://www.Socialsciences-Journal.com>

### **International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management**

Creates a space for discussion of the nature and future of organisations, in all their forms and manifestations.

ISSN: 1447-9575

<http://www.Management-Journal.com>

### **International Journal of Learning**

Sets out to foster inquiry, invite dialogue and build a body of knowledge on the nature and future of learning.

ISSN: 1447-9540

<http://www.Learning-Journal.com>

### **International Journal of Technology, Knowledge and Society**

Focuses on a range of critically important themes in the various fields that address the complex and subtle relationships between technology, knowledge and society. ISSN: 1832-3669

<http://www.Technology-Journal.com>

### **Journal of the World Universities Forum**

Explores the meaning and purpose of the academy in times of striking social transformation.

ISSN 1835-2030

<http://www.Universities-Journal.com>

**FOR SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT**  
[subscriptions@commonground.com.au](mailto:subscriptions@commonground.com.au)