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Abstract: The 7th International Conference for Design Education Researchers, Learn X Design 2023, was convened as a call for papers and publication of proceedings. This allowed an extended review and development period for authors to develop submissions. The process ran from January to December 2023. A 135-member international scientific panel undertook double-blind peer reviews, and the Academic Committee, comprising the seven members of the Design Research Society EdSIG Convening Group, monitored reviews and carried out additional reviews where needed. 236 authors affiliated to institutions in 31 countries, contributed 106 submissions. Submission types included research papers, case studies, conversations, and visual papers. In addition, this year saw the introduction of conversations, letters and statements of pedagogy. The overall acceptance rate across all submission categories was 60%. The Learn X Design conferences are organised by the DRS Special Interest Group in Design Education (EdSIG).
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Introduction

Welcome to the Proceedings of the DRS Learn X Design 2023, 7th International Conference for Design Education Researchers!

This year, the Learn X Design 2023 event was hosted as a call for submissions to the proceedings instead of a traditional conference event. Judging by the number of submissions, the online-only format didn’t put anyone off.

The DRS Special Interest Group in Design Education (EdSIG) made the call for contributions at the beginning of 2023. We saw this call as an opportunity to reflect on and sum up the developments and experiences in the design education research community and extend this into discussions on the Futures of Design Education. We hoped that focusing on producing submissions for the proceedings would encourage anyone involved in design education, especially early career researchers and new authors, to share their work and develop their academic writing and peer-reviewing capabilities.

We received almost 200 papers in the first submission pass – well over even our highest estimates. This shows the enduring popularity of an event that attracts and showcases design education research and scholarship. As with all DRS and Learn X Design events, all papers were fully double-blind peer-reviewed. We encouraged our authors to join in the reviewing process, regardless of their level of experience, believing that peer review is a culture of academic solidarity that needs to be strengthened. The DRS EdSIG Convening Group provided oversight for reviewing and editing.

For the Learn X Design 2023 call, we continued the outstanding work of the Programme Committee from Learn X Design 2021. We invited submissions in a variety of formats, including full papers, case studies, and visual submissions. This year, we added three further types: conversations, letters, and statements of pedagogy. The motivation behind this was to respond to the types of submissions that we usually receive and more accurately reflect the kinds of scholarship the design education community is producing.

DrS Learn X Design 2023—24

Submissions by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Papers</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of Pedagogy</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Papers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resulting proceedings (see Figure 1) include 35 full papers and 34 case studies. Out of the new submission types, statements of pedagogy were the most popular, with 15 of these finally accepted. This may suggest that a format somewhere between case study and reflective account is a format that better supports contributions from design educators, given the constraints and challenges they face in trying to conduct teaching and scholarship. This challenge is recognised in the literature (Lyon, 2010). Conversations were the next most popular new format, with 11 accepted...
submissions, followed by letters, with eight accepted submissions. On the other hand, we were surprised to end up with only three visual submissions in the final proceedings. It remains a strange and fascinating fact that, in a subject area often dominated by spatial and visual literacies, such knowledge is rarely considered academic knowledge.

Of course, establishing what is 'valid', allowable, or even codifiable knowledge is an increasingly problematic task and – arguably – flawed in many ways. So, one of the highlights of the event and these proceedings is that we have many submissions that take alternative and different positions to knowledge itself and even the process (this very process) of presenting and gatekeeping knowledge.

On that note, we would like to thank all our contributors for their hard work, which made it a pleasure to read their submissions and our reviewers for their time and efforts in raising the quality of the submissions and supporting the realisation of the proceedings. We hope you read on and enjoy some (in fact, all!) of the submissions to the DRS Learn X Design 2023 Proceedings of the 7th International Conference for Design Education Researchers.

Submissions, authors, affiliations and locations
We identified eight thematic strands in our original call for contributions:

- Approaches, processes, methods and tools in design education
- Justice and equity
- Making visible underrepresented peoples, places, and practices of design education
- Other
- Philosophies of design education and/or purpose(s) of design education
- Plural modes of knowledge and knowing
- Pluriversal futures
- Things, objects, materials, spaces and everything in between

We asked authors to align their submissions to one of seven themes. Table 2 shows the number of submissions for each theme. Although the themes were created with a purpose, they were not strictly followed during the review process. There were some overlaps between themes, meaning that a submission could easily fit into multiple categories. One could easily imagine a submission sitting equally well in Pluriversal futures, Philosophies of design education and/or purpose(s) of design education or Justice and Equity. Over half of the submissions aligned to Approaches, processes, methods and tools in design education (see Figure 2). This indicates a continued preoccupation in the design education research community with practical accounts, case studies, and explorations of how design education is conducted.

Figure 2. Breakdown of LxD 2023 submissions by theme
Figure 3—the number of authors per submission—provides an interesting snapshot of the levels of collaboration among design education researchers. Just over a third of submissions came from single authors. It would be interesting to compare this with previous LXD proceedings. The majority of submissions had more than one author. Although we did not cross-check whether submissions with multiple authors came from the same institutions or different institutions and countries, we believe that expanding the submission types (as shown in Table 1) could result in higher levels of collaboration among authors. This potential for increased collaboration, as evidenced by the conversation papers often having five or more authors, brings a sense of optimism for the future of design education research. While multi-authored and alternative research formats bring some challenges to institutional research metrics, encouraging multiple authorships represents an opportunity to include more voices and more educators in the design education research community.

Figure 3. Breakdown of the numbers of authors per submission for LxD 2023

**Number of authors per submission**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Author</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Authors</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Authors</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Authors</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Authors</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Authors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Authors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 shows a fairly even distribution of authors across North America (18%), Asia (19%), and Oceania (13%). The high number of European affiliations (44%) may be due to the DRS origins and the fact that five members of the organising committee are affiliated with European institutions, one with institutions in Asia, and one with a North American institution. However, this figure also highlights the failure to connect with scholars and researchers from institutions in Africa (0.4%) and, to a lesser extent, South America (4%). It is worth noting that some of the most interesting design education research has emerged from South Africa, where scholars have grappled with the country’s complicated apartheid history and the implications of colonialism and racism in classrooms, universities, and disciplinary knowledge practices.
Caution is required when interpreting Figures 4 and 5, as these data are based on the authors' institutional affiliations. This method of accounting will not represent the true diversity of author nationalities; some authors will be affiliated with institutions outside their countries of origin. But it is useful to note that the international community of authors comes from 31 countries. This also presents an opportunity to identify where new connections need to be made and possibly suggest directions to improve representation and plurality in our community.
Paper Types

Full Papers

As with past Learn X Design events, full papers make up most accepted submissions. Most papers report findings in methods in, or approaches to, design education or curriculum design. Some of these report on contemporary and relevant issues, such as the ongoing effects of the pandemic, or emerging issues around technology, AI and the ongoing impacts on design education are also emerging themes.

The next largest grouping of papers explored themes around representation, inclusion, and power. These included pluriversal approaches, de- post-colonial logics, and intersectional perspectives. There is a real sense that design education researchers are at the forefront of this type of research and inquiry, bringing wider work to bear on design education settings and debate. That said, Pownall in *Considering the role of Higher Education in the success of women in Design*, offers a salient reminder that, despite decades of scholarship and action, there remain fundamentally structural issues around sex/gender in design.

The themes of design expertise and the skills and competencies designers will require to face contemporary challenges are featured in many papers. You will also find an exciting step forward in old-school design thinking in Sosa et al.’s paper, *Advanced Design Thinking (ADT): A Pathway to Deschooling Design*, a great reminder that we can still move past fashionable appropriations of ideas and continue to construct knowledge by ignoring some of the ‘noise’ and focusing on what matters in design.

Interestingly, there is an increase in the number of papers that explicitly consider aspects of wellbeing and care in design education, a theme emerging in other areas of scholarship and long overdue in design education. Finally, it was interesting that some papers discussed us – design educators and scholars. Notably, in *Blood, Sweat and Tears: A Design Education Research Publication Story*, Börekçi presents a rare and frank glimpse into the process of contemporary academic writing from the perspective of a design educator and scholar. This is a controversial work, as it was treated as a particular type of knowledge during the peer-review process; hence, it was judged naive and poorly informed. Indeed, the work candidly illustrates the challenging task of publishing research in the field of design education by an individual trained in design but unfamiliar with conducting and publishing research on design education. Design and design education are different, and the research methods in one area do not directly transfer to the other. This may be a common oversight among educators in higher education with research experience in their respective fields, presuming they possess the requisite knowledge to conduct research in education within their domain.

However, conducting research in education, like any other discipline, involves distinct paradigms and methodologies rooted in well-defined epistemological and ontological principles. Despite rejection by at least one reviewer, the decision to publish this work arose from a clear recognition that the community, particularly young researchers, must acknowledge these challenges and shortcomings and be willing to confront them with resilience and a readiness to learn.

Case Studies

The DRS Learn X Design 2023 proceedings comprise 34 case studies by academics and researchers from programmes in the fields of industrial design, graphic design, visual communication design, interior design, and architecture. The submissions present research on the conduct of educational projects carried out on product design, interior design, architectural design, packaging design, service design, installation design, exhibition design, multimedia design, interface design, and interaction design. These case studies report research at undergraduate and graduate levels, with a lesser number of experiences reported from design and technology education (secondary school level) and collaborative projects between K-12 and higher education students.

The case studies present approaches, methods and tools followed in the educational settings for studio course, theoretical course, and project process conduct, as well as project outcome evaluations, syllabus revisions and curriculum refinement. The cases also include a significant number of workshops carried out for research purposes in developing methods and tools in design education. The aims that stand out from these studies are enhancing designerly skills particularly for the novice, generating valid design outcomes related to the brief, and building stronger ties among community members through co-creation.
The case studies use qualitative, quantitative and mixed-method research, including action research, collaborative ethnography, design sprints, design charrettes, non-participant observations, surveys, semi-structured interviews, retrospective reflection and auto-confrontation, supported with various methods and tools such as storytelling, scenario building, parametric design methods, data-driven teaching methods, AR tools, AI tools, design thinking tools, card sets, mobile applications, and the co-design canvas. The educational settings covered in the case studies are face-to-face, remote (online), hybrid, and flipped classroom formats. This suggests that the studio’s transformation during the Covid-19 pandemic of 2020–2021 continues to provide new opportunities in design education, which are still being explored. The context of education presented in the case studies range from studio practice to education and co-creation in local communities.

Four main themes emerge from the issues addressed in these cases.

**Enhancing learning experiences for students and teaching experiences for academics:** defining learning objectives; measuring students’ self-efficacy; detecting stress and areas of struggle; increasing academic performance; student-centeredness; conveying theoretical perspectives through new approaches; competency acquisition; mastering usage of methods, tools and templates; refining the course syllabus; generating course content; teachers and students co-designing the course.

**Understanding user perspectives:** embracing diversity; empathy building; collaboration and co-designing; transgenerational knowledge transfer; children; older adults with dementia; people living in long-term care; individuals with specific requirements; user engagement.

**Strategies for self-discovery and development of designerly skills:** developing reflexive practices; reflection in and on action; reflection on design outcomes; design iteration; creativity; exploration for design opportunities; assessment for quality; performance in individual work; performance in teamwork; cross-cultural working; multidisciplinary groups; overcoming challenges that arise with multi-stakeholders.

**Raising awareness of higher values and setting principles:** design for sustainability, reuse, recycling; product longevity; circular economy; viability of solutions for social impact; design for social innovation; responsible design; social justice; community building; building the blocks of a national design education strategy; increasing the impact of design research through graduate programs.

The case studies represent what is important in the design education researchers’ educational and societal context, explored through a wide range of research methods, topics and approaches. We find this overview a good representation for the plurality and diversity of the positive impacts of design education.

**Statements of Pedagogy or Practice**

A significant number of Statements of Pedagogy or Practice explore how design curricula should evolve to address emerging demands for sustainability, diversity, and the integration of new technologies. Topics such as the internalisation of the design curriculum, awareness of living and acting within the Earth’s limits in the context of transitioning from modernism to planetary modes of existence for designers, and the importance of collaboration and dialogue, particularly in cross-cultural teams amid diverse cultures and languages, are thoroughly examined. The competencies and skills that future designers need to acquire are also addressed, encompassing algorithmic thinking, writing, creative thinking and self-reflection. Additional works share insights from pedagogical experiences, whether through the medium of film Padman or Urdu typography. Several statements offer more personalised viewpoints, such as the benefits of reflective teaching practices and creating inclusive learning environments, design as a fundamental human right, or offering a vivid scenario depicting a day in the life of a design educator in Nigeria’s pluriversal future.

One important and engaging theme that emerges is around the nature and types of knowledge within design education and research addressed in several Statements of Pedagogy. In particular, some of these focused on language itself. For instance, in *Teaching Writing in Industrial Design Schools: Defending an Undervalued Tool for Design Practice*, Paul Laborde delves into the specific expectations various disciplines hold regarding the type of knowledge their discourse aims to convey. He poses critical questions: Are our expectations clear? What kind of knowledge do we expect designers to produce? Identifying the essence of a “designer's discourse” poses a significant challenge, highlighting the difficulty of defining what writing as a designer entails. Laborde explores whether teaching writing in design schools is possible without a clear definition of this concept. He questions what aspects of writing could be deemed useful for designers, suggesting that the form of writing is as critical as the content itself. This
approach shifts the focus from the topics of writing to the manner of expression, advocating for the identification of a "regime of signs" that aligns with the discipline’s goals.

Anwer Ali’s experience, detailed in *Urdu Expressive Lettering: an Exploratory Case*, showcases how students discovered the beauty of expressive typography, which transcends linguistic barriers and challenges established typographic conventions. Ali concludes that providing students with opportunities to challenge established typographic norms empowers them to showcase their abilities, experiences, knowledge, and emotions in a unique and expressive manner.

Finally, and taking a more provocative and disruptive stance, Victor Udoewa in *The Decision*, questions writing itself and introduces a futuristic scenario in which the conventional prioritisation of written communication is questioned. When a "professor of health and nutrition" requests a report from students, the main character and teacher, Edidiong, responds: “Oh, no, we don’t prioritise the written word. We do write things down, it’s just not the primary or only way of communicating or storing knowledge. Instead we have aural and arts-based ways of reporting our findings.”

**Conversations**

The conversation was a new format introduced in LxD2023. This format was conducive to presenting emergent ideas, showing their evolution as the conversation took place. There were 11 accepted conversations.

The conversations engaged diverse groups, including design researchers, design educators, health educators, and other health stakeholders and design students from diverse parts of the world. The conversation formats included email exchanges, asynchronous writing in shared online documents, panel discussions, and other formats. Many conversations posed new questions and shared discussions in progress rather than presenting resolved conclusions.

Two key themes emerged.

**The future is diverse, decolonial, and pluriversal.** The woven threads of conversation seemed conducive to conversations about plurality and decoloniality. Three of the conversations addressed this theme. In one conversation on this theme, a group of design educators from the Asia-Pacific region attempted to unpack the intersections between pluriversality, decoloniality, and intersectionality within their teaching practices. Through the conversation, they could acknowledge their lived experiences while expressing and addressing their concerns. They aimed to encourage other educators to seek diverse futures for design education. In a second conversation focused on decoloniality, the product design department of a university invited industry and academia to come together to commit to a future of decolonial praxis in design. They conclude that decoloniality is a shared process over an extended period of time that requires participation from many stakeholders and commitment from institutions through curricula and practices. In the third conversation on plurality, seven design educators recognise the dramatically changing landscape in design and explore temporality and pluriversality, examining whether the search for the pluriverse is a longing for the past, an emerging present, or a possible future.

**The future of design education is reflexive.** Reflective practice was a recurring theme in many of the conversations. The conversation format facilitated questioning and reflecting on a wide range of themes such as the pedagogical implications of generative AI, equitable recruitment for clinical trials in healthcare, reflective learning to promote student-centredness, cohesive curricula, experimental teaching formats, resistance to design approaches, and articulating design research.

**Letters**

An analysis of the eight accepted letters reveals profoundly personal and impassioned positions. The authors advocate for changes that we, collectively and individually as design educators, should make to equip future designers with the capacity to lead change. One letter deals with a design-infused theory of change, focusing on critical design’s impact in the real world. The other letters call for change in three broad themes by 1) embracing plurality and inclusivity, 2) the integration of emerging technologies, and 3) sustainability and ecological awareness.

**Plurality and inclusivity.** Three letters bring radically different positions to this theme which is united by the idea of fluidity. While one letter reports on rules and exceptions for a temporary design school called ‘Patadesign School’ and then immediately disassembles the school, another letter highlights the centricities of an Integrative Indigenous Framework for design education that does not define “what design education should teach, but describ[es] how it should let go and move forward”. The third letter celebrates their opportunity to transcend “ageism-induced
Intergenerational digital divide” through design education. The author writes a letter to their older self to challenge them to examine whether or not they have achieved what they set out to do.

Integration of emerging technologies. One letter connects to the inclusivity theme with the role emerging technologies play in design education. It suggests that design educators take ownership of the narrative around the use of AI to tackle anxieties and existential threats that may arise from its increasing use. In contrast, the second letter presents a position of technology-driven product design futures. They called for a collaborative roadmap to embed emergent technologies in design education.

Sustainability and ecological awareness. While one letter asks us to unlearn unsustainability, breaking up with deep-held attitudes about what design education is and what it should do, the other letter suggests a small tweak introducing cleanability as a critical design criteria in design curricula. Both letters complement each other, offering a broad strategy to avoid sustainability delay and suggesting a tangible and immediate change for design-led sustainability.

These letters stand out for their future-oriented visions. Instead of amplifying current practices, they take a more daring stance, and suggest exceptional, unproven and bold approaches for the future of design education.

Visual Submissions

Being Design a field deeply entrenched in visual communication, it is remarkable that of around 200 works submitted to this call, only five were entered under the Visual Submission category, with only three accepted for publication within this classification. This discrepancy may suggest that despite the increasing demand for visual-oriented conference presentations, traditional forms of communication relying on written language remain entrenched as the academic standard, perhaps perceived as more rigorous and valuable (Howell et. al, 2021). Alternatively, the academic community is still learning to fully embrace and leverage this 'new' mode of research communication. Ultimately, it prompts reflection on what truly defines Visual Communication: Is it written papers enhanced with a well-curated multitude of imagery, or is it papers where written content is distilled to its bare essentials, relying predominantly on figures, maps, and other visual elements?

Given the significant role of visual representation in cognitive processes, researchers have historically utilised visuals to amplify their ability to convey and disseminate their findings (Howell et al., 2021). By portraying what may elude explicit language, pictorial representation facilitates public engagement, accessing emotions beyond mere cognition and thus fostering more interactive and conscious communication (Jonsson & Grafström 2021). That being said, papers where imagery adds information that words cannot fully convey clearly qualify as visual communications.

But to what extent can images, apart from written information, effectively communicate research while adhering to the five conditions of "good research" outlined by Cross (2007)? These conditions stipulate that research should be purposive, inquisitive, informed, methodical, and communicable. In essence, research should be purposeful, seeking to address significant issues or problems and capable of investigation; curious, aiming to acquire new knowledge; well-informed, drawing upon awareness of previous related research; methodically planned and executed in a disciplined manner; and communicable, generating results that are testable and accessible to others. But, ultimately, does all academic communication necessarily have the role of solely reporting information as accurately as possible? Or is it the case that visual communications prompt our community to welcome additional functions of knowledge?

Two of the three visual submissions in this series position themselves exactly at the two extremes of the spectrum described, while the third occupies a position closer to the centre. On one side, one paper reports a pedagogical approach, relying heavily on complementary photographs, diagrams, and other visual aids for full comprehension. Conversely, another visual submission deviates from traditional academic writing norms by minimising written text to its essential minimum. Instead of simply transferring knowledge, this work prompts readers to use visuals as a catalyst for constructing their own perspectives on the issue. This approach underscores the significance of interpretation, analysis, and creativity in the process of generating knowledge. Positioned closer to the centre, the third visual submission is supported almost entirely by images, but in this case, the text plays a complementary role, adding meaning to the visuals.

While the three works notably adopt somewhat different approaches, it is intriguing to discover a common thread, which intertwines curiosity, imagination, multi-sensory perception, metaphorical thinking, and a generally nonconformist attitude towards the status quo. Moreover, all works exhibit a willingness to challenge established
What the Submissions Tell Us About Design Education

Design Education Futures
The future of design education implies the development of new designer identities equipped with appropriate attitudes, behaviours, and mindsets – knowing the right time and medium, which of the multiple skills, abilities, and knowledge that they possess are required in addressing the problems hierarchy that comes forth. The future of design education holds many new concerns regarding professional practices; the nature of design outcomes is changing, with more digitally oriented service-based products.

This implies a degree of uncertainty and ambiguity, just as it does in the process of design and education itself. The plurality of futures that EdSIG have tried to promote in recent years attempts to speak to uncertainties like this by offering approaches instead of solutions. Importantly, these come from a far broader range of positions and the plurality they offer is now more often seen as integral to sustainable futures, as opposed to an idea at the periphery of discourse. Take, for example, the idea of differential consciousness in Perera’s paper, Learning About Design’s Colonial Pasts and Narrative Games. What is incredible about this, and many other critical works exploring anti- and post-colonial positions, is that the critique still turns towards something new and positive using design education as the vehicle to achieve this. All too often, criticism ends without any pragmatic way forward and, whilst this is sometimes important in establishing spaces of critique, it’s also great to see design education research offer a space where possible next steps can be explored. In some of the work presented, there is a real sense of the possibility of change (or actively resisting change) arising from non-centrist positions.

New Formats Offer New Representations
There was also an open-endedness which some of the new formats were more conducive to than a traditional paper that demands a particular form of conclusion. Prioritising only specific forms of knowledge may be important for a particular reason but the effect is to invalidate contributions from some. Similarly, if only a privileged few can present thinking, ideas and knowledge then, as history clearly shows, singular and isolated views of knowledge emerge, limiting creativity, imagination and, at worst, suppressing identities and cultures. Lodaya (2020) called for “unlocking the gates of the design community and allowing a lot more diversity to flow in and enrich the discourse”. We attempted to create many different forms of participation in this call for papers to meet Lodaya’s challenge of opening up design discourse. We hoped that the variety of formats might open up those who believe they can contribute to design knowledge and that more design educators will add their voices to discussions on the futures of design education.

Hence, it was great to see the response to some of the new formats and the continuing popularity of previously introduced formats. The Statements of Pedagogy and Letters formats offer new ways for design educators to begin scholarship and for experienced researchers to show work in progress or experiment with modes of knowledge (see Boling and Smith for an example). For example, the authors of Minutes of the Inaugural Disassembly Disassembly – Patadesign School 1: Ethernity, Day 4 on Absolute 13, 149 PE. (Sep 20, 2021 vulg.) take a tremendous creative and academic risk by presenting a paper in the format of the minutes of a meeting. This paper generated much discussion among the reviewers and the committee. It is worth mentioning as it explores alternative formats to presenting ideas and embraces a form of creativity that the committee sought to encourage by introducing alternative formats.

Of course, the English language still dominates the research world. One impressive example of integrating another language into a publication is Mātauranga Moana: uplifting Māori and Pacific values of conceptualisation over western co-design constructs by Withers and Stokes. Language is not only a medium for communication, it is a medium that shapes thoughts and thinking, and with this it shapes our values and beliefs. This paper honours the values and beliefs of Māori and Pacific people with respect to co-designing and research communication by using key terms from the Te reo Māori - Māori language - throughout their paper to criticise Western co-design methodologies and show the importance of Whakawhānaungatanga - a process of establishing meaningful relationships - in design education.

In doing so, it is also a reminder that a dominant language also controls aspects of knowledge. This is both a good and bad thing: it may be useful to share concepts and create homogenous definitions that can be applied generally; but it
can also ignore the richness of plural concepts and the utility and benefit these also have in shared and distributed knowledges.

Knowledge and Knowing
We have deliberately retained several examples of papers that could be considered controversial regarding how they differ from accepted and centric forms of knowledge. We have done this to offer others the chance to ask questions similar to those we asked ourselves: Is this knowledge? Is it research?

These debates are critical to our discipline because we cross two territories of exceptionally difficult exploration: design and education, both domains that depend on the messy interaction of people and things (Koskinen et al., 2011). As pointed out above concerning Börekcî’s paper, there are critical differences between design research and design education - not least in the applicability of theories, methods, or analysis. These differences are not always obvious and, as many of us will be aware, even when they are visible they are not necessarily taken seriously or treated as artefacts of knowledge. This is perhaps another lesson for EdSIG to take from the event: that more work is required to advance and promote the importance, differences and growing body of work that makes up contemporary design education research.

Of course, developing new knowledge is also about developing the next generation of knowledge producers. Several contributors to this proceedings are PhD and Master’s degree researchers, and supervisors and we have, where possible, tried to support these submissions as much as possible. Raising independent researchers is important for increasing the impact of design research on society, and strengthening/building on/contributing to the design discipline. But there is undoubtedly a lot more we could do in this space. Design education researchers often feel isolated in their sub-disciplines, and being part of the wider, global community can reduce that isolation.

Summary
Design educators and researchers want to share their teaching practices, and often have much to contribute with their insights; design education research always has room for new approaches conveyed through new methodologies and approaches.

Our aim in organising the Learn X Design series is to provide a medium of academic interaction for design education researchers to share work, exchange knowledge and establish a common progressive understanding on how to raise designers with vision who can shape the world for a better future.

But it should also be acknowledged that this only happens with effort. The scale of submissions this year took us by surprise, requiring significant time and energy that was rarely supported institutionally. Like all DRS SIGs, EdSIG is run entirely voluntarily, and our work is in addition to our normal workloads and day jobs. This applies to the huge number of reviewers, too. Learn X Design 2023 was only possible with the whole community. So, thank you all for your help, support, and contributions!

References


Learn X Design Academic Committee

Derek Jones, The Open University, UK
Violeta Clemente, University of Aveiro, Portugal
James Corazzo, Sheffield Hallam University, UK
Nicole Lotz, The Open University, UK
Liv Merete Nielsen, Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway
Lesley-Ann Noel, North Carolina State University, College of Design
Naz A.G.Z. Börekçi, Middle East Technical University, Turkey

Learn X Design Academic Reviewers

Md Haseen Akhtar, IIT Kanpur
Ali Cankat Alan, Istanbul Technical University
Luca Alessandrini, Politecnico di Milano
Anwer Ali, COMSATS University Islamabad
Margarida Azevedo, ESAD College of Arts and Design — ESAD—IDEA Research in Design and Art
Nur Hidayah Bakar, LASALLE College of the Arts
Cristina Beraldo Barbosa, Designer
Nadia Beyzaei, Health Design Lab, Emily Carr University of Art + Design
Amos Blanton, Aarhus University
Isabel Bo-Linn, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
Joanna Boehnert, Bath Spa University
Elizabeth Boling, Indiana University Bloomington
Naz A.G.Z. Börekçi, Middle East Technical Univ.
Isabella Brandalise, Patadesign School
Benedita Camacho, Lusíada University
Stephanie Carleklev, Linnaeus university
Abdullah Tarık Çelik, Istanbul Technical University
Camilo Cerro, American University of Sharjah
Yoon Jung Choi, Virginia Tech
Sonny Yip Hong Choy, Technological and Higher Education Institute of Hong Kong
Ellen Christensen, San Francisco State University School of Design
Violeta Clemente, Universidade de Aveiro
James Corazzo, Sheffield Hallam University
Aykut Coşkun, Koç University
Beatriz Itzel Cruz Megchun, University of Portland
Linh Dao, California Polytechnic State University
Cecilia De Marinis, BAU College of Arts & Design of Barcelona
Angeliki Dimaki-Adolfsen, University of Gothenburg, HDK-Valand
Nijoo Dubey, National Institute Of Design
Pelin Efıltı, Istanbul Technical University
Çișem Ercömert Görgün, Gazi University
Eva Eriksson, Aarhus University
Guim Espelt Estopà, Elisava, Barcelona School of Design and Engineering (UVic-UCC)
Steven Faerm, Parsons School of Design
Joao Ferreira, IADE
Rute Fiadeiro, Royal College of Art
Katja Fleischmann, Griffith University
Wendy Fountain, The Open University
Francesco Gaili, IULM University
Tomás García Ferrari, University of Waikato
Andrea Gasparini, University of Oslo
İrem Genç, İstanbul Technical University
Dimitrios Gkouskos, Halmstad University
Gloria Gomez, OceanBrowser Ltd
Ian Gonsher, Brown University
Aslı Günay, Koç University
Serkan Güneş, Gazi University
Simge Günsöz, Istanbul Technical University
Sara Hafezi, NTNU
Miray Hamarat Dundar, Istanbul Technical University; Bahcesehir University
Yaqing Han, York University
Christopher Hanley, NTU
Immanuel Hendra, Singapore University of Technology and Design
Emma Hogan, ATU
Katy Humberstone, University of Exeter
Sana Hussaini, San Francisco State University
Alis Iacob, Loughborough University
Alberto Iberbuden, Anhalt University of Applied Sciences
Kel Jackson, Royal College of Art
Ayushi Jain, The New School
Krid Jinklub, Tongji University
Derek Jones, The Open University
Brook Kennedy, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Sumbul Khan, Singapore University of Technology and Design
Rajeev Kumar, ISDI, Atlas Skilltech University
Amit Kundal, FLAME University
Masayuki Kurosawa, Musashino Art University,
Paul Laborde, Strate
Marco Lampugnani, tecmilenio
Andreas Lanig, DIPLOMA University
Sheng-Hung Lee, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Nicholas Lewis, Sunderland University
Wan Zi Lin, National Cheng Kung University
Xiaozhu Lin, Politecnico di Milano
Zhengping Liow, Singapore Polytechnic
Rui Alexandre Lopes de Sousa, Universidade Lusíada / CITAD
Ricardo Lopez-Leon, Aguascalientes University
Nicole Lotz, The Open University
Yao Lu, Tongji University
Iris Luo, Cornell University
Valerie Mace, University of the Arts London
Tamas Makany, Singapore Management University
Lisa Marks, Georgia Institute of Technology
Francesca Mattioli, Politecnico di Milano
Claudia Mayer, Inholland University of Applied Sciences
Bree McMahon, University of Arkansas
Kimberly Mitchell, University of Tennessee Knoxville
Joaquin Montes, Universidad Nacional de Colombia
Najla Mouchrek, Northeastern University
Nanki Nath, University School Of Design And Innovation (Usdi), East Delhi Campus, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University (Ggsip University)
Cassini Nazir, UNT
Phuong Nguyen, Van Lang University
Liv Merete Nielsen, Oslo Metropolitan University
Guillermina Noel, Lucerne University of Applied Sciences and Arts Lucerne School of Art and Design
Lesley-Ann Noel, North Carolina State University, College of Design
Christian Nold, The Open University
Cat Normoyle, East Carolina University
Viviane Nunes, Federal University of Uberlandia
Ioana Ocarescu, Strate School of Design
David Oh, NC State University, College of Design
Melis Örneköglü Selçuk, Ghent University
Laura Pagani, Università degli Studi di Genova
Rowan Page, Monash University
Rachael Paine, Virginia Tech
Giulia Panadisi, Università degli studi G.d'Annunzio di Chieti Pescara
Eujin Pei, Brunel University London
Dulmini Perera, Bauhaus University Weimar
Annemarie Piscera, Avans
Konnor Plymire, Arizona State University
Alexis Polanco, North Carolina State University
Max Pownall, NTU
Gheysa Prado, Universidade Federal do Paraná
Harshit Rao, Studio Paperheads
Tore Andre Ringvold, Oslo Metropolitan University
Valentina Rognoli, Politecnico di Milano
Noemi Sadowska, London College of Communication, University of the Arts London
Betul Sahin, Loughborough University
Carmem Saito, Royal College of Art
Janset Shawash, Tampere University
Bhavin Shukla, Karnavati University
Pradeep Singh, Pradeep
Nidhi Singh Rathore, Independent
Shanna Soh, Royal Academy of Art, The Hague
Ricardo Sosa, Monash University
Nicola St John, RMIT
Dagmar Steffen, Lucerne University of Applied Sciences and Arts
Mila Stepanovic, Independent designer and researcher
Ruth Stevens, Hasselt University
Ashley Stewart, University Of Port Harcourt
Georgina Stokes, Massey University
Johnathon Strube, East Tennessee State University
An Yu Su, National Cheng Kung University
Fanny Suhendra, Swinburne University of Technology
Sedef Sünner-Pla-Cerdà, TED University
Linus Tan, School of Design + Architecture, Swinburne University of Technology
Nekita Thomas, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign
Jesse Thompson, Nanyang Technological University
Noopur Tiwari, Unitedworld Institute of Design Karnavati University Gandhinagar
Aysel Merve Topaloğlu, Istanbul Technical University
Francesca Toso, University of Twente
Victor Udoewa, NASA
Helle Vest, Aalborg University
Karina Vissonova, Institute of Advanced Design Studies nonprofit Kft.
Trudy Watt, University of Wisconsin - Madison
Natalie Weinmann, University of Applied Science Coburg
Gizem Yazıcı, İYTE
Derya Yorgancıoğlu, Özyeğin University
Cláudia Zacar, Universidade Federal do Paraná
Aleksandra Zamarajeva Fischer, The Oslo School of Architecture and Design
Ladislava Zbiejczuk Suchá, Masaryk university
Yanfang Zhang, Kyushu University