

Jun 16th, 12:00 AM

Social Design Principles and Practices

Inês Veiga

Faculty of Architecture, University of Lisbon, Portugal

Rita Almendra

Faculty of Architecture, University of Lisbon, Portugal

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dl.designresearchsociety.org/drs-conference-papers>

Citation

Veiga, I., and Almendra, R. (2014) Social Design Principles and Practices, in Lim, Y., Niedderer, K., Redström, J., Stolterman, E. and Valtonen, A. (eds.), *Design's Big Debates - DRS International Conference 2014*, 16-19 June, Umeå, Sweden. <https://dl.designresearchsociety.org/drs-conference-papers/drs2014/researchpapers/42>

This Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Conference Proceedings at DRS Digital Library. It has been accepted for inclusion in DRS Biennial Conference Series by an authorized administrator of DRS Digital Library. For more information, please contact DL@designresearchsociety.org.

Social Design Principles and Practices

Inês Veiga, Faculty of Architecture, University of Lisbon, Portugal

Rita Almendra, Faculty of Architecture, University of Lisbon, Portugal

Abstract

Last century, a new design area bond with new aims and principles emerged, committed to answer more urgent and relevant needs of humanity.

Multiple terms come forward to identify it and because there isn't a unifying language among its practitioners, questions have been raised about whether they refer to a general area in design or to single design practices. This “social” vocabulary, caused so far enormous controversy and dispersion of this area in design that wants – and today it needs – to assert itself practically and theoretically.

In this paper, we propose to clarify some of these questions. By searching in written records we intend to analyse how “social” design practitioners identify and describe their work and approach, while aiming to better understand this area and discipline the existing multiplicity.

Moreover, the aim of this paper is to verify the possibility of encompassing all expressions – and practices, if demonstrated – into a single umbrella term that can include all the disparity between them and simultaneously reinforce their similarities. This will lead to a more concise and precise identification and recognition of this area and its practitioners, helping to build a stronger case for its assertion.

Keywords

Social Design Principles; Social Design Practices; Social Design Taxonomy

One should never forget the essence of design: solving human problems. This foundational aim has had along the last 60 years different materialisations and ways of action on the part of designers.

Ever since the Industrial Revolution, the dominant paradigm in design has been the economic market and the creation of products and goods for sale and consumption. But 60 years ago a series of transformations occurred in the field and scope of design that changed the nature of what design is today.

As a reaction to the established paradigm while acknowledging the share of responsibility design had so far in fairly compromising the future of both planet and humanity, designers began to search for ways through their work – problems, processes and solutions – to become more meaningful, relevant, useful and committed to society (Press & Cooper 2003). Believing design could do much more than only fulfilling market needs and could turn into a valid process or mode of action to answer more complex problems related to other needs of humanity – social, ecological, environmental, political and cultural – the act of designing gained a new meaning and a new area in design emerged (Papanek, 2005; Simon, 1996; Erlhoff & Marshall, 2008; Norman, 2010).

This new area was marked by a clear social agenda, addressing problems or issues related with human injustice, poverty, cohesion, inequality, lack of basic living conditions, health issues, marginalisation, education, etcetera, and making design closer and widely accessible to individuals and organisations who otherwise and up until that point couldn't attain or afford it (Margolin & Margolin 2002).

But this focus on social life or human experience issues did not exclude the context in which these lives and experiences happened. So in the design process of solving or answering social problems, needs or issues, all other systems – environmental, cultural, political, economical – came to be included and thought of because only this way, some authors advocate, the design actions and outputs could be socially responsible, successful and finally sustainable (Shedroff, 2009; Erlhoff & Marshall, 2008).

Due to the application of key aspects of design – disciplines, process, thinking, skills, etc. – to these new unconventional territories, the design methods and outputs were far from tradition resulting in the appearance of various practices bond with new intrinsic aims: change, transform or innovate (Cottam, Burns, Vanstone & Winhall 2006; Shedroff 2009).

However, according to some authors, only today the transition to other sectors in society is complete and we can speak concretely about designers who are actively working, proposing and testing in collaboration with all disciplines, actors, stakeholders and beneficiaries, new alternatives and solutions that effectively transform difficult, complex and critical situations into more preferred and desired ones (Simon, 1996; Sachetti, 2011; Thackara, 2005, Nussbaum 2005).

Although these alternative models and solutions are emerging everywhere at all times (Thackara, 2005), “social” design practitioners have failed to translate and articulate their process and also describe clearly what they do (Lasky, 2013). Therefore, nowadays this new area in design is shrouded in great controversy, doubt and ambiguity due to a multitude of terms and expressions that came into view to identify and describe it, such as: Social Design, Design for the Base/Bottom of the Pyramid (BoP), Humanitarian Design, Design as Development Aid, Socially Responsible Design or Socially Responsive Design, Design for Social Good, Design for Social Change, Design for Social Impact, Design for Social Innovation, Design for Social Innovation and Sustainability, Social Economic Environmental Design, Useful Design, Transformation Design, Design for Public Good, etcetera.

This abundance of expressions makes clear that there isn't a common language or unifying discourse among these practitioners (Drake & Drenttel 2011; Lasky, 2013). In fact, as some authors advocate, it's difficult to document and handle “social” projects, processes, and outputs because there is a lack of sensibility, appropriate vocabulary, a good evidence base or even a pattern of reference (Bedell, 2005; Meroni, 2007; Cottam et al., 2006; Drake & Drenttel 2011). As Bedell (2005) states: “you can photograph a new car for a magazine; you can't photograph new traffic flows through a city.”

What's interesting is that this was reported last year in the “Social Impact Design Summit” where designers stated that the lack of a clear definition and identification of this “social” design practice posed a communication barrier and instead of promoting collaboration and sharing of experiences it has been encouraging competition and dispersion (Lasky, 2013).

Moreover, questions arise about the real meaning of all these terms i.e. if they refer themselves to a general area in design or to single design practices? Assuming we are talking about single practices, what are the differences between them? Are they actually consequences and materialisations of the same foundational aim and principles? Can they be incorporated in a general area in design?

So this multiplicity needs to be better understood and disciplined.

Social Design

Social Design is the most generally and commonly used term in the discourse of designers to describe and identify this area or practice and is often used interchangeably with others. This is the term we believe has great potential to be the single umbrella term

that could serve as the “name” for this area. The reasons are that it immediately identifies the realm and scope of action of design and it is a holistic and open term.

Since designing is about solving problems and answering needs, the word “social” directly points out problems, needs or issues related with society, groups of people, communities, individuals, citizens, humans... However, these “social” problems, needs or issues are not often just “social”, they are “cultural”, “environmental”, “economical” and “political” too. Yet these are all inherent aspects of the human condition and since they are all produced by society or at least society has a responsibility upon them – environmental –, ultimately they can all be considered as a “social” matter.

Perhaps, what is missing in “Social Design” is the aspect of change or transformation, or even innovation. But design itself, is a process of changing or transforming ideas into reality and things into new, or at least different, things. Curiously, the German word for design “*Gestaltung*” is defined by Erlhoff & Marshall (2008, p.190) in their Design Dictionary as “an intervention in an environment that deliberately transforms it. The transformation can occur in concrete, perceivable objects such as spaces, objects, or processes, or in theoretical constructions such as lifestyle, or politically designed social structures.” The authors also mention that it relates both to the strategic sequence of actions (to change) and its results (the change).

Green (2008) argues that the terms “social innovation” and “sustainability” associated with design have lost their potential because they have been used in multiple contexts and domains and when we talk about “(...) new patterns of production and consumption, new social ‘industries’ such as health, care, education, new individual and collective lifestyles, new relationships with nature and new organisational and cultural models” what matters is not what distinguishes them but rather what they have in common: the vision, the purpose and the responsibility to improve the quality of life (Green, 2008).

So the term is mainly expressed by its problems and principles than its objectives – change, transformation or innovation – and defines any project, according to Cary & Meron (2013) that starts from concerns related with society and the intention to intervene for the social good, positively influencing people's lives and the human experience.

For Margolin (2008), the word “social” holds the same meaning as in “social work”, “social welfare” or “social responsibility” and represents being at society's service.

Thus, we are referring to a design practice, or area committed to solve social problems which are different from the design's “social responsibility” as a general activity or profession.

According to Cooper (2005) social responsibility in design came with the social activist movements in the 1960s and in parallel with the corporate social responsibility movement. At that time, when design became aware of its consequences and implications to society, responsibility derived on one hand from the designer's own ethical values to act on their own and build a more ecological, inclusive, responsible and sustainable society, and on the other hand it was a response to the needs of the corporate clients who were shifting perspectives (Cooper 2005). This two sides of social responsibility are defined by Erlhoff & Marshall (2008, p.337) respectively as being “reactive and demand-oriented” and “proactive and world-changing”. Whereas the first acting on the basis of economic success and the latter considering not only economic consequences but also and mainly social, environmental, political and ethical consequences in the design activity.

The decision to act on each side largely depends upon the designer's own convictions. Therefore, the distinction between social design and design's social responsibility is that you can be a socially responsible designer, taking responsibility and account for all the consequences and implications of your work, but that does not mean you are a social designer. We are considering Social Design as a discipline because it requires designers to work in a different way in the field of design as it asks for a particular approach,

principles, aims and context of application. And because it responds to social problems it's necessarily socially responsible.

One can think that the sustainability and social movements in design emerged as a reactive response whereas designers began taking responsibility to deal with what they were being held responsible for – compromising the future of the planet and generations to come. This praises Erlhoff & Marshall's (2008, p. 336) definition of “responsibility” as placing “human action in causal contexts of temporal, social, religious, and other meaning”. However, in today's time, when the movement has settle, and we see a community of “social design” practice growing and somehow established, the decision to act “proactive” or “reactive” holds different aspects to consider and we are beginning to see the blurring of their differences in the work of some social design practitioners.

Identifying and Characterising Terminology

In this section we will try to clarify some of the questions raised earlier through the analysis of the most commonly used “names” to identify the social design practice. Searching in written records, we looked through discourses of practitioners and practical examples of what these practices refer to and were able to identify for each one its main characteristics and principles. As a result, we have created a table to register and organise the findings of the analysis aiming to provide a better understanding and visualisation of the differences and similarities between the terms and the practices they refer to.

However, we have to emphasise that the present analysis does not integrate all the existing terms only the most used, and does not include also all the designers, individuals or entities working in this field. Our intention was not to map or identify all practitioners and practices but instead gather a significant sample from the social design practice and its practitioners that could serve as an initial approach to the characterisation of this field and has an indicator of its primary principles. Thus this table must be seen as an ongoing process, we will draw some conclusions from it in this initial stage.

The Table

To ensure legibility of the table, since it holds a large amount of data to start, we chose to do it as a website to be consulted online (Figure 1), and the address is: <http://home.fa.ulisboa.pt/socialdesignresearch>.

By choosing this medium, we are able to open the discussion and our findings to the design community, and also make easy to update, correct and add new information. On the other hand, we also made a print version of the table, in poster format, and included it in this article as an additional file.

Social Design Practices & Practitioners

Design for the Base/Bottom of the Pyramid (Bop)	Humanitarian Design	Design as Development Aid	Socially Responsible/Socially Responsive Design	Design for Social Good
Design for Social Change	Design for Social Impact	Design for Social Innovation	Design for Social Innovation and Sustainability	Social Economic Environmental Design
Design Útil / Useful Design	Transformation Design	Design for Public Good		

Design: Inês Veiga / Development: João Martins

FACULDADE DE ARQUITECTURA
UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA

Centro de investigação em arquitectura urbanística e Design
CIAUD
FACULDADE DE ARQUITECTURA
UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA

Fig 1: "Social Design Practices and Practitioners" Table Web Version: Home.

Design for the Base/Bottom of the Pyramid (Bop)	Use of design, human centered approach and sustainability concerns to create solutions to meet the needs and improve health, income and living conditions of individuals and communities living in absolute poverty, at the base of the (economic) pyramid – the estimated 4-billion people living on incomes less than \$4/day (Whitney & Kelkar 2004).			
	Process Design Human centered Sustainability	Purpose to create to meet to improve	Problem individuals and communities living in absolute poverty, at the base of the (economical) pyramid.	Who & Where D-REV U.S.A. ~ India, Haiti, Nepal, Ecuador, Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, Botswana, Bangladesh, Iraq Base of the Pyramid Program, Faculty of Industrial Design Engineering, TU Delft The Netherlands ~ Botswana, Brazil, Cambodia, China, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Madagascar, Tanzania, Vietnam Design for the Base of the Pyramid Research, Institute of Design ITT U.S.A. ~ India, U.S.A. D-Lab, MIT U.S.A. ~ Brazil, Cambodia, El Salvador, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Nicaragua, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia
Humanitarian Design	Design as Development Aid	Socially Responsible/Socially Responsive Design	Design for Social Good	Design for Social Change

Fig 2: "Social Design Practices and Practitioners" Table Web Version: Inside item.

The table addresses four main categories that guided the analysis: "what", "who", "where" and "examples".

We began addressing the findings for category "What" which focused on identifying the "process", "purpose" and "problem" of each term and practice. So we placed in the column of "process" the means, methods and approaches by which the "purpose" is accomplished. In the column of "purpose" we put the aims of the practice always

identifying a verb. And finally in the column of “problem” we wrote the needs, issues or concerns that are addressed by the “process” and determine the “purpose”. From this collected data, we encompassed all three aspects and formulated a description for the respective term and practice it refers to as our proposed definition to identify it, and it appears alongside the term in the website (Figure 2).

Further we organized all remaining categories – “who”, “where” and “examples” – because all three are directly related to each other. “Who” refers to who are the designers that use the term in question, in the left side of the column. These are divided into two realms: the professional, which corresponds to professional designers, individuals or entities and appear at the top of the column; and the academic, that corresponds to the bottom of the column and are separated with an icon.

We had considered to distinguish the practitioners also according to who is an individual or entity working “for profit”, “not for profit” or “volunteer based”. However, the conclusions to be achieved from this division were outside the scope of this paper. “Where”, on the right side of the column, includes where designers come from or are established, and all the countries where they work(ed). From this category we wanted to understand where the terms – or practices – come from and where they are operated or implemented. “Examples” gives respect to projects conducted by the identified designers that serve as practical examples of the term’s descriptions, and they only appear on the print version of the table. The web version, all the identified design entities and individuals have a link that directs to their respective website where the viewer can explore the examples.

The website, as the table, is currently in its initial stage of development, but in a short-run we will add research filters to help viewers scrutinise more easily the information e.g. if you want to know which practices in “process” use “Collaborative or Participative” methods and have as a “purpose” “to create”, the website will feature only these names for you to click.

Discussion of the Table

“What”

Observing the table, we can see that in every term the “process” and “purpose” are almost similar and the “problem” is the aspect that most varies.

Because we are talking about design practices and design practitioners the use of “design” is present on every description and “process” of each term. Then, “design thinking” is the second most identified approach in the “process” that designers use in this realm. Later come the human centred approach, the collaborative and participatory methods also in almost every description, and after we see “sustainability concerns, systemic and holistic views appearing.

The “purpose” always includes two levels: to “create, develop, deliver, assist, support, consolidate, replicate, achieve and/or shape” – by “meeting, tackling or addressing” the problems and “working” with all actors and stakeholders – ultimately to “improve, contribute, enable, drive, accelerate, catalyse change, impact, innovate, trigger, promote, enhance, transform, empower, activate”. Only one term – “Design for Social Impact” – continues along to a third level: to “attest, record and demonstrate”.

The “problem” is the conditional element that sets the manner on which the designer will apply the “process” and achieve the “purpose”, as happens in design in general, and so it’s likely to establish the differences between each practice and term.

The majority of the identified problems go from the specific needs of socially economically disadvantage individuals and communities to the problems concerning all individuals, organisations and sectors of society, and arrive to the complex, global, systemic social, economical, environmental, cultural and political challenges of our time.

However the “problem” is not the only distinguishing element between the terms, there is a higher purpose or aim that usually is revealed in the very name or term of the practice it refers to. This aim is the key distinguishing factor and was highlighted in each description.

Analysing the table carefully, the “problem” and key factors are similar in some groups of terms and thus they reveal a spectrum of action. This spectrum goes from “survival” and “lack of basic needs”, to “citizenship” varying from the right of every individual to change to the right to create its own change, and finally to “politics” and a more directly influence of design in the decisions and systems that build and support our societies.

The spectrum can be identified by the order of the terms, from left to right, and visualised by the colours attributed creating three groups: green represents “survival”, red brings together “citizenship” and purple identifies “politics”.

So, in the “survival” group the designers focus only on addressing urgent specific needs of socially economically disadvantage individuals and communities – from absolute poverty, lack of basic needs or rights, and emergency aid or relief caused by living conditions or catastrophes. But in the “citizenship” group the designers focus not only on specific needs, they are also concerned with tackling large-scale complex challenges and intend to create ways for people to make their own change independently. In addition there is a concern about working not only for private organizations but also for the public sector whereas designers can target particular needs and also trigger collective, large-scale widespread changes in the system. From this large group, we consequently reach the “politics” state where designers cease to work directly with individuals and start working directly with the institutions and organisations that directly influence, shape and decide the way people live, economically, socially, and environmentally.

Our analysis so far has demonstrated that all the terms are in fact practices but because they show several similarities with each other they are not single, they can be grouped. And instead of several practices we are looking at only three main practices.

These are the ones we have identified as “survival”, “citizenship” and “politics” and because they all share the same “social” principles they can be unified into a single major activity that we propose to call social design. The differences between them are practical – despite they share the same methods, approaches and views – regarding their way of solving human problems: the first deals directly with solving problems, the second aims to help and find ways to empower and activate people to solve the problems themselves, and the third prefers being where the major decisions are shaped and made, which affect not only the present but also society’s future.

“Who & Where”

When we began the analysis it was difficult to associate the practitioners – the “who” category – with the right terms. Not because we didn’t have a full closed description of each term, but because most of practitioners describe their work, practice and approach in reported speech mixing and using several terms and expressions which we aimed to analyse.

As an example, the British Design Council is associated with “Transformation Design” because it describes its mission as bringing “the transformative power of design to the things that matter” and “enable people to use design to transform business and communities for the better” (Design Council 2012). And mostly because the term “Transformation Design” came forward from one the its departments – RED – created to explore social problems and challenge the established thinking in the public and private

English sectors through design (Cottam et al., 2006). However, we encountered a reference of their work in an article written by Cooper (2005) about “Ethics and Altruism: What Constitutes Socially Responsible Design” where the author describes their work as being in the realm of “Socially Responsible Design”.

Also, the British Design Council is a co-author of the report “Design for the Public Good” written in collaboration with several other European design organisations and institutions about how design can improve public services and policy making. In fact we can see in their mission statement also that they aim to “stimulate innovation in business and public services, improving our built environment and tackling complex social issues” and “inspire new design thinking, encourage public debate and inform policy to improve everyday life and help meet tomorrow’s challenges today”(Design Council 2012).

Other example is the *Designmatters* initiative by the Art Center College of design in the U.S.A. (Pasadena, CA) where the department is called “social impact department” and the description is “*Designmatters* at Art Center is where art and design education meets social change” and a quotation from the Vice President of the department Mariana Amatullo appears saying: “(...) designer into one [role] who is a catalyst for social change and innovation” (*Designmatters*, 2005).

This is one of the reasons why there's so much confusion around this area in the design community, and another symptom of the naming/conceptualising multiplicity that is occurring in this field. Therefore, because sometimes it's not entirely clear what these social design practitioners actually do, based on their written statements, we tried to position them among the terms not has a definitive decision but in an attempt to pinpoint more precisely what their work is about.

Susana António is a Portuguese designer and she is the only designer in Portugal we know that calls herself a social designer. In fact, Susana is a social designer but, for the sake of this paper, we tried to frame her in one of the practices we analysed. According to the description of her work, which is given in the two “examples”, she fits perfectly the term proposed by the Brazilian designer Rosembaum, “Design Útil” or “Useful design”. Her work with the elders and individuals with mental disabilities is in fact “useful”, catalyses change in these people’s lives and most importantly promotes self-esteem, enhances their capabilities and craft abilities making themselves feel useful to society.

As we can see in this second part (Table 2), the majority of the European countries are located on the practices of “Transformation Design” and “Design for the Public Good” associated with changes in the public sector, policy making and governance. However, there are some exceptions which spread over the table sporadically. Some appear on “Design for the BOP”, “Design for Development Aid” and “Humanitarian Design” and are linked to humanitarian issues and address basic human needs, such as: Base of the Pyramid Program, Faculty of Industrial Design Engineering, Delft University of Technology in the Netherlands; Humanitarian Design Bureau from France and Design without Borders, Norsk Form the Foundation for Design and Architecture in Norway. Others are found between the realms of “social innovation” and “social innovation and sustainability” with Ezio Manzini in Italy and the DESIS network that includes several European universities and design schools. But the major prevalence in the terms and practices of our table comes from the U.S.A..

Although one of the challenges that “social” design faces is the scarce and weak dissemination of its work, key and successful projects, its real impact, etcetera. one of the reasons we outline for this remarkable presence of the U.S.A. is in fact the massive communication and dissemination that major companies such as IDEO and Frog Design do about their work in the social sector, which in consequence draws a major influence in the local design community and contaminates others to act accordingly.

If we ask how many of these U.S. practitioners work outside their own country, we could think beforehand it would be the majority of them, mostly in the African continent but also

in the countries of south America and/or in India, remembering the question Nussbaum (2010) made not so long ago: “why are we only doing humanitarian design in Asia and Africa and not Native American reservations or rural areas, where standards of education, water and health match the very worst overseas?”

Table 1 was built from our main table and shows that from the total of 26 U.S.A. practitioners identified, 13 work or develop projects inside their country, in the U.S.A. (in), 4 practitioners work only abroad (out) and 9 work both overseas and in the U.S.A. (both). So from this diagram, the majority of U.S. designers are working in their own country and when they work abroad they do it mostly as a combination of both outside and inside the U.S.A..

Where do U.S. designers work?

Inside their own country (in)? Abroad (out)? Or both?



Table 1: Social Design Practices & Practices Table: “Who”, “Where” and “Examples”.

When practitioners don't work solely in their original country the tendency is to work in African countries, south America and/or Asia almost exclusively in India. In these countries apparently, from the “examples” we encountered, the design challenges are related to urgent needs and fundamental human rights: food, water, light, housing, sanitation, education, health, income, etc. Therefore, these associated practitioners are located mostly in the practices ranging from the edge of the table in “Design for the BOP” until approximately “Social Economic Environmental Design”.

It is believed that because of the challenges in Europe are rather different (since the basic needs are mostly fulfilled) they are perhaps less visible and people become more demanding about the solutions and for the most part the transformations. Hence, the empowerment and activation of people's abilities to make their own change is a tendency that is rising and seen in the discourse of designers especially between the practices related with innovation – changes that break with the previously established – and related with transformation of the public services and policies. It can be said that to work with the kinds of challenges the Europeans are facing the designers believe they can be more effective in people's lives if they work directly and support public sector organisations helping to inform and shape better decisions at the level of policy making.

The differences between the professional and the academic realms are seen in the table by the position of the few academic representatives we identified among all terms. These are located in six practices: “Design for the BOP”, “Design for Social Change”, “Design for Social Impact”, “Design for Social Innovation”, Design for Social Innovation and Sustainability” and “Social Economic and Environmental Design”. But these six practices point out three main important areas: basic needs and rights; social change, impact and innovation; and finally sustainability. These three areas and concepts are fundamental for the general practice of “social” design and logically they are part of the training of “social” designers. The “basic needs” can be seen as more operational challenges with more concrete solutions, the “change” can be seen as the introduction to systemic and holistic concerns as addressing behaviours and interactions, and the last the sustainability concerns that need to be present in the whole process, solution, change, responsibility, etcetera.

Conclusions

In this paper, from the analysis conducted on Social Design principles and practices, we found that we are in fact dealing with different practices or different materialisations of the same principles and foundational aim – solving human problems.

However, many of these practices have disclosed themselves to be similar in their actions, objectives and even issues they address. This led us to conclude that these could be grouped while representing a spectrum of action on the part of designers ranging from three broad dimensions. The first would be human “survival” or “basic rights”. The second targeted more systemic human challenges and is related with “citizenship” and participation. Finally, the third would approach “politics” and represent a work that is closer to the very institutions and sectors of society that directly influence and decide the course of human life. These three dimensions also vary between the locations where they were originated and where they are implemented, revealing that discrete problems are addressed differently according to where they are globally located.

Thus, despite the differences all the terms analysed cannot really be separated. They can and are all part of the same general area that we propose to identify as Social Design. Social Design in our view is the right term that could be adopted by the design community as the umbrella term capable of encompassing all the dispersed “social” practices and practitioners while disciplining the current state of multiplicity. This way it facilitates the identification, description and mostly the understanding of this area.

What distinguishes a social designer are its ideological principles, the one's he/she is committed and implicated with as an individual. He/she is driven by a mixture of will and concern in the face of social, environmental and economic aspects of his/her time that are directly reflected in his/her professional activity or practice.

Along with providing a productive set of skills, tools, and processes, Design as a discipline can be applied to a wide range of problems according to Norman (2010) – social, economic, environmental, health, pollution, business models, interaction between people and services, between users and tools, etcetera – and entails an even more important aspect which some authors and designers call the “design mind” or “design thinking” (Darwin, 2010; Brown & Wyatt, 2010; Brown, 2009). An attitude and approach that is fundamentally positive and which does not accept a design challenge unless it really believes that “there is something to be done about a situation, a better way to serve a group of people, a way to close the gap between how things are and how we hope they could be” (Darwin, 2010, p.33). And because it's “inherently pragmatic and results-oriented, simultaneously humble and ambitious” according to Drake & Drenttel (2011) in an online article, “it can help us frame how we want to live in the future”. For Sachetti (2011) Social Design is the future and the ultimate change that happened to design to escape from capitalism and work with those who live on its margins.

All this demonstrates that Social Design can only be thought in the reciprocal and inseparable relationship of its two central aspects: its principles and its practices.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to research project “Exploring the contributions of relational space for promoting the right to the city. Experimental research at Cova da Moura, Greater Lisbon” (EXPLATP-EUR17722012) and team for funding my trip to Design Research Society's conference 2014.

References

Bedell, G. (2005, November 27). Politics of the drawing board. *The Guardian*. Retrieved September 29, 2012, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/theobserver/2005/nov/27/2>

Brown, T. (2009). *Change by Design: How Design Thinking Transforms Organizations and Inspires Innovation* (1st ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Brown, T. & Wyatt, J. (2010). Design Thinking for Social Innovation (SSIR). *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Retrieved March 13, 2013, from http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/design_thinking_for_social_innovation/

Cooper, R., 2005. Ethics and Altruism: What Constitutes Socially Responsible Design. *Design Management Review*, 10-18.

Cottam, H., Burns, C., Vanstone, C. & Winhall, J. (2006). RED PAPER 02: Transformation Design. *Design Council*. Retrieved November 22, 2011, from <http://www.designcouncil.info/mt/RED/transformationdesign/>

Darwin, T. (2010). From the Townhall into the Studio: Design, Democracy, and Community Resilience. *Journal of Design Strategies*, 4(1), 29-33.

Design Council (2012). *Our mission*. Retrieved November 1, 2013, from <http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/about-us/Our-mission/>

Designmatters (2005). *Designmatters Department*. Retrieved November 1, 2013 from <http://www.designmattersatartcenter.org/>

Drake, C. & Drenttel, W. (2011). Design and the Social Sector: An Annotated Bibliography. *Change Observer: Design Observer*. Retrieved October 19, 2012, from <http://changeobserver.designobserver.com/feature/design-and-the-social-sector-an-annotated-bibliography/30158/>

Erlhoff, M. & Marshall, T. (2008). *Design Dictionary: Perspectives on Design Terminology*. Berlin: Birkhäuser.

Lasky, J. (2013). Design and Social Impact: A Cross Sectorial Agenda for Design Education, Research and Practice. In *Social Impact Design Summit*. New York: Smithsonian Cooper-Hewitt National Design Museum, The Lemelson Foundation, National Endowment for the Arts.

Margolin, V. & Margolin, S. (2002). A "Social Model" of Design: Issues of Practice and Research. *Design Issues*, 18(4), 24-30.

Meroni, A. (Ed.) (2007). *Creative Communities. People inventing sustainable ways of living*. Retrieved March 1, 2012, from POLI.design Politecnico di Milano Web site: http://www.archive.org/details/creative_communities

Norman, D. (2010). Design Thinking: A Useful Myth. *Core77*. Retrieved February 8, 2013, from http://www.core77.com/blog/columns/design_thinking_a_useful_myth_16790.asp

Nussbaum, B. (2005). Innovation vs. Design. *Businessweek.com*. Retrieved September 28, 2012, from http://www.businessweek.com/innovate/NussbaumOnDesign/archives/2005/11/innovation_vsde.html

Nussbaum, B. (2010). Is Humanitarian Design the New Imperialism? *Co.Design*. Retrieved March 24, 2013, from <http://www.fastcodesign.com/1661859/is-humanitarian-design-the-new-imperialism>

Papanek, V. (2005). *Design For The Real World: Human Ecology and Social Change*, (2nd ed.), London: Thames & Hudson.

Press, M. & Cooper, R. (2003). *The Design Experience: The Role of Design and Designers in the 21st Century*. Bodmin: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

Sachetti, V. (2011). *Design Crusades: A Critical Reflection on Social Design*. New York. Retrieved February 8, 2013, from <http://vimeo.com/23599044>

Shedroff, N. (2009). *Design Is the Problem: The Future of Design Must be Sustainable*, (1st ed.). New York: Rosenfeld Media.

Simon, H. (1996). *The Sciences of the Artificial* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: MIT Press

Thackara, J. (2005). *In the bubble: designing in a complex world*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Whitney, P. & Kelkar, A. (2004). Designing for the Base of the Pyramid. *Design Management Journal*, 15(4), 41–47.