DESIGN ANTHROPOLOGY

THEORY AND PRACTICE

Edited by
Wendy Gunn, Ton Otto and
Rachel Charlotte Smith

BLOOMSBURY

−13−

Decolonizing Design Innovation: Design Anthropology, Critical Anthropology, and Indigenous Knowledge

Elizabeth (Dori) Tunstall

This chapter proposes the methodology of design anthropology as an answer to how one might create decolonized processes of design and anthropological engagement. I first set out the contexts for the need for decolonized anthropology and design innovation (for instance, the use of design principles and frameworks to generate new or improved business outcomes). I then go on to explore what design anthropology is, its intellectual foundations and its principles, and to describe the first phase of the Aboriginal Smart Art project as a case study of its principles in practice.

THE CONTEXT FOR DECOLONIZATION

In 1991, Faye Harrison published the edited volume, *Decolonizing Anthropology*, in which she and a group of "Third World peoples and their allies" sought: "To encourage more anthropologists to accept the challenge of working to free the study of humankind from the prevailing forces of global inequality and dehumanization and to locate it firmly in the complex struggle for genuine transformation" (Harrison 2010: 10).

In 1991, I had taken my first anthropology course at Bryn Mawr College in the United States. There I learned that the founding fathers of physical anthropology did not think I had the cranial capacity to even be in my class because I was an African American and thus of low intelligence. In spite of that first encounter with anthropology, I stuck with it because there was something powerful about a field devoted to investigating the expanding notions of what it means to be human. But the classical anthropological framing of my peoples, Africans and African Americans, as objects of anthropological inquiry required that I take seriously anthropology's role in the project of colonialism, and also the role of design innovation in continuing projects of neocolonialism and imperialism.

The phrase "handmaiden of colonialism" to describe anthropology is attributed to anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss (Asad 1973). The *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Kohn 2011) defines *colonialism* as "a broad concept that refers to the project of European political domination from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries that ended with the national liberation movements of the 1960s." It distinguishes colonialism from imperialism: with colonialism theoretically aligned with settlement and direct control and imperialism aligned with economic exploitation and indirect control. A wide range of anthropologists in the 1960s and 1970s began to directly address anthropology's implication in colonialism and imperialism. While review of this literature is outside the scope of my chapter (see Uddin 2005 and Restrepo and Escobar 2005 for two exhaustive accounts), the points of criticism leveled against anthropology can be summarized as:

- classification of peoples, such that it overdetermined their characters and undermined their own self-definitions (Deloria Jr. 1988 [1969]; Hall 1992; Said 1978; Smith 1999);
- framing or representation of peoples as reduced "others" and outside the pale of time, civilization, and rationality (Fabian 1983; Smith 1999; Wolf 1982);
- evaluation of peoples in a hierarchy with European Caucasians in the top position of humanity and others ranked at various levels of subhumanness (Blakey 2010; Smith 1999); and
- lack of utility of its outputs, in the form of text-based ethnographies or films, for improving the quality of life of the peoples engaged as its anthropological objects/subjects (Deloria Jr. 1988 [1969]; Smith 1999, Tax 1975).

These four kinds of critique represent the hallmarks of colonial, imperialist, and neocolonial anthropology for many indigenous, minority, migrant, and other marginalized communities who have been "coded into the Western system of knowledge" (Smith 1999: 43). What does this have to do with design innovation and design anthropology? As I stated earlier, my personal engagement with the field of anthropology has been about trying to create a space for a decolonized anthropology in light of the discipline's history. It has now also become about securing a space for decolonized design innovation practices.

The Oslo Manual defines *innovation* as "the implementation of a new or significantly improved product (good or service) or process, a new marketing method, or a new organizational method in business practices, workplace organization, or external relations" (OECD 2005: 6). Embedded in this definition of innovation, which I argue is hegemonic in the field, are three assumptive paradigms as it relates to culture. First, individual elites or companies generate innovation (Brown and Ulijn 2004; Jostingmeier and Boeddrich 2005; Light 2008). There is a growing discussion of grassroots innovation that links sustainable consumption with community action (Seyfang and Smith 2007),

but it represents only an emergent thread in the innovation discourse. Second, innovation promotes modernist values. Spanish philosopher Rosa Maria Rodriguez Magda (2004) states how innovation was "the very driving force of modernity," which sought to replace old ways of knowing. Third, innovation benefits individual companies, individual entrepreneurs and inventors, or the undifferentiated masses of society. Design innovation, even within the social sector, reflects the modernist agenda of OECD definitions of innovation.

In 2010, on his *Fast Company* blog, Bruce Nussbaum posed a question to the design community that had never been broached so directly: "Is humanitarian design the new imperialism?" The article raised provocative questions about the ethics of humanitarian design projects such as Project H, Acumen Fund's Water Project in India, and One Laptop Per Child: "Are designers the new anthropologists or missionaries, come to poke into village life, *understand* it and make it better—their *modern* way?" (Nussbaum 2010a: 1). The response from diverse sectors of the design community was swift as those such as Emily Pilloton of Project H (2010) dismissed Nussbaum's article as a gross oversimplification of their on-the-ground-work with communities. Niti Bhan, the only commentator whose non-Western voice in the debate was promoted in the *Design Observer* round up (Editors 2010), reminded people *from the OECD world* that, to paraphrase, mutual respect, reciprocity, and political history and reality were not acknowledged in the issues raised. How could it be otherwise? Who are the generators, what are the underlying values, and who are the beneficiaries of innovation remain the issues for design innovation as a subset of the innovation discourse. Nussbaum's two follow-up articles partly opened up these issues. The first one raised the specter of the "unintended consequences" of humanitarian design by probing the underlying values and the true beneficiaries of design innovations in the social sector (Nussbaum 2010b). The second one provocatively opened the issue of the origins of innovation by showing how humanitarian designers forge relationships with local elites (Nussbaum 2010c). This focus on local elites is important because it is they who determine, not those from the OECD world, whether design innovation is the handmaiden of colonialism or imperialism today. What is it that they say? What might be their critiques of design innovation?

Surprising, in the major academic journals on design (for example *Design Issues* and *Design Studies*), there is limited discussion by Asian, African, Middle Eastern, or Latin American scholars of design and imperialism or colonialism. Main critiques of imperialism and colonialism are written by Caucasian scholars in ex-colonial peripheries of Australia (Fry 1989) and South Africa (Van Eaden 2004). Exceptions are found in the 1989 *Design Issues* special issue on "Design in Asia and Australia" with the contributions of Shou Zhi Wang (1989) on modern Chinese design and Rajeshwari Ghose (1989) on design and development in Asia, with a focus on India. Ghose's article in particular outlines a critique of design and development's ideological biases

in how it classifies, represents, models, and evaluates the Indian nation and people. She states:

> No wonder then that neither of the terms design nor development have natural equivalents in most of the Asian linguistic traditions, for they carry with them all the ideological underpinnings of First World associations, aspirations, and debates. This realization and, more recently, the deep dissatisfaction that has followed this realization, both from an ideological/cultural as well as a pragmatic point of view, has led to some very serious soul searching among the thinking designers of Asia in recent years. (1989: 39)

Outside of academic journals, one finds strong critical voices on design and development in blogs and conference presentations by design scholars and practitioners such as Arvind Lodaya, M. P. Ranjan, and Niti Bhan of India, Ravi Naidoo of South Africa, Adelia Borges of Brazil, and Benny Ding Leong of China. Their points of critique are similar to those against anthropology in terms of how hegemonic discourses of design and innovation:

- classify traditional craft as distinct from modern design, excluding the histories and practices of design innovation among Third World peoples (and their allies especially in regards to their responses to colonialism, imperialism, and neocolonialism) (Borges 2007; Ghose 1989; Lodaya 2003; Ranjan and Ranjan 2005);
- frame design thinking as a progressive narrative of global salvation that ignores the alternative ways of thinking and knowing of Third World peoples and their allies (Leong and Clark 2003; Lodaya 2007);
- evaluate European, Euro-American, and Japanese design and innovation as the top of the design innovation hierarchy (Jepchumba 2009; Leong and Clark 2003; Lodaya 2006; Ranjan 2006); and
- utility of outputs because many design innovations are prototypes that have not been fully implemented, and thus have limited positive impact on communities.

A high-profile example of how design innovation can act in an imperialist way is the IDEO and the Rockefeller Foundation's Design for Social Impact initiative. The next section will briefly introduce the project and how it relates to the points of critique outlined previously.

THE IMPERIALISM OF DESIGN

In 2008, the Rockefeller Foundation invited IDEO, a global design consultancy, to explore how "design and how the design industry can play a larger role in the social sector" (IDEO and Rockefeller Foundation 2008a: 5). The first outcomes of this study were the *Design for Social Impact How-to Guide*

(2008a) and the *Design for Social Impact Workbook* (2008b). Both texts seek to demonstrate how design thinking as a human-centered design process can contribute to "transformation change in communities" (IDEO and Rockefeller Foundation 2008a: 2). Although the initiative is focused on communities, it follows the hegemonic paradigm of innovation in terms of its framing of who generates innovation, its underlying values, and who benefits.

In the Design for Social Impact initiative, Western design companies generate innovation, which places them at the top of the design innovation process. The texts are "intended for design companies of any size or type," to guide them so that they can sell their services to nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and start-ups that operate in the social innovation sector, mostly in India and South Africa (IDEO and Rockefeller Foundation 2008a: 4). Through a content analysis of the photographic images, illustrations, and texts of the *Design for Social Impact How-to Guide*, I found that Western design companies are represented as active agents who guide, serve, embed, build, pay, and staff (the design processes). On the other hand, Indian and African institutions are represented as those to be passively guided and directed or to serve as sabbatical hosts, sites for capacity building, philanthropic tourist destinations, and support staff for projects (IDEO and Rockefeller Foundation 2008a). Why does it matter that Indian and African (not to mention Chinese, Brazilian, Mexican, and other non-OECD nations) design companies are not also the audiences for the *How-to-Guide*? Ghose discusses how Asian design is directly tied to issues of "technology/design transfers from the First World, as well as problems associated with adapting new or changing technology to diverse economic, social, cultural, and political conditions" (1989: 32). By framing non-Western design companies outside of the discourse of *Design for Social Impact*, the IDEO document positions Western design companies in a unique hierarchical position enabling them to guide non-Western institutions on how to solve problems. This elides the history of non-Western design innovation in which designers in India and Africa have creatively responded to the challenges posed to their communities, often in connection with processes of imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism.

In the Design for Social Impact initiative, values of design thinking draw from a progressive narrative of global salvation that ignores non-Western ways of thinking rooted in craft practices that predate yet live alongside modern manufacturing techniques. The general absence of Indian, African, Asian, Middle Eastern, or any other non-Western knowledge, with the exception of C. K. Prahalad, in the over twenty bibliographic and Internet resources at the end of the *How-to Guide* reflects the disregard for local knowledge and the intention to supplant it with Western design thinking as the dominant methodology (IDEO and Rockefeller Foundation 2008a). In a World Bank Institute article entitled "Design Thinking for Social Innovation: IDE," Tim Brown and Jocelyn Wyatt describe the specific contributions of design thinking to social

challenges. "As an approach, design thinking taps into capacities we all have but that are overlooked by more conventional problem-solving practices . . . [It] relies on our ability to be intuitive, to recognize patterns, to construct ideas that have emotional meaning as well as being functional, and to express ourselves in media other than words or symbols" (2010: 30). Brown and Wyatt (2010) posit design thinking as an alternative to linear, rational, and conventional approaches to problem solving. In its human-centered approach, design thinking is said to respect local knowledge through its processes of gathering user needs and codesigning through iterative prototyping. Yet postcolonial and feminist critiques of Western models of linear and rationalist thinking have been well established since the 1960s and predate IDEO's design thinking. In fact, design thinking sounds similar to what Rajeshwari Ghose expressed in the late 1980s as the task of Asian designers: "Here too [Asian] designers have the dual task of documenting and understanding ethnicity and regional cultures, for understanding them is the essential first step to evolving a medium of visual communication and restoring local confidence in an age when traditional institutions are crumbling fast and benefits of industrialization are yet to trickle down" (1989: 40–41).

While design thinking represents an advance in Western business thought, what does it mean to bring design thinking to places that already have their own indigenous forms of thinking also critical of linear and rational models? Saki Mafundiwa raises this issue in his description of the epiphany that inspired him to create ZIVA, the Zimbabwe Institute for Vigital Arts:

> These were Afrikan-trained designers—unlike me, an Afrikan trained in the west. Soon I realized that force-feeding Afrikans design principles born in Europe, principles that were the product of the European experience, just doesn't work . . . Afrikans have their own palettes that have no kinship with the principles of color devised by such schools of thought as the Bauhaus. Why do we ignore those? The rest of the world would love to understand this Afrikan sense of color! Tapestries woven by "unschooled" craftspeople grace some of the world's major museums and private collections—stunning testimonials to the Afrikan creative genius. (Jepchumba 2009: sec. 1, par. 10)

Saki's efforts to train his Afrikan students in Afrikan ways of knowing expose how, notwithstanding the good intentions by IDEO, bringing design thinking and other nonnative principles to India, Africa, or China, for example, risks becoming another form of cultural imperialism that destabilizes and undermines indigenous approaches coming out of other creative traditions. To this last point, Rajeshwari Ghose makes an important statement: "If design is perceived as an ancient activity that has gone on for several centuries rather than as a brand new profession, then our whole perception of what constitutes Asian design begins to change and, thenceforth, issues pertaining to Asian design assume different forms" (1989: 36).

In the Design for Social Impact initiative introduced earlier, the main beneficiaries of innovation are the participating companies and individuals as well as general society, while community benefits are limited by the lack of sustainable implementation of design prototypes. As outlined in the *How-to Guide*, each strategic approach is evaluated against its "benefit to the company" and "social impact" (IDEO and Rockefeller Foundation 2008a: 41). The benefits to the company are all clearly enunciated through the listing of what happens to each strategy when it works (for the company), both pros and cons. Although they define *social impact* as the "capacity of this type of work to create positive social change on communities and individuals," it is represented only as a graphical circle without descriptions of what that social impact might be (IDEO and Rockefeller Foundation 2008a: 41). More important, the Design for Social Impact initiative explicitly seeks to transfer the resources of philanthropic foundations and local NGOs to Western design companies. The extent to which this places the initiative in direct competition with local design companies means that while its intentions may be good, it outcomes are likely imperialistic. It resembles what Linda Smith refers to as the new wave of imperialist processes that "enter with goodwill in their front pocket and patents in their back pocket" (1999: 24). Thus, IDEO's Design for Social Impact initiative demonstrates how even a design innovation project with good intentions can be implicated in continuing practices of imperialism. While IDEO is a good company representing *good* people-centered design processes, it fails to respect the value systems of those communities it seeks to help. Design anthropology is proposed as a methodology that can reframe both anthropology and design innovation as decolonized practices of cultural engagement.

DESIGN ANTHROPOLOGY: A DECOLONIZED METHODOLOGY

Over the last seven years, I have defined, promoted, and taught design anthropology as a field that seeks to understand how the processes and artifacts of design help to define what it means to be human and that focuses on how design translates values into tangible experiences (Tunstall 2006, 2007, 2008a,b). I am proposing design anthropology as a methodology rather than a method, because what is at stake for me are the principles and rules for regulating the disciplines of design and anthropology to avoid neocolonization and imperialism. By *decolonized*, I refer to the status of being "self-governing or independent" (Dictionary.com). Thus, what I mean by a *decolonized methodology* is a system of methods, principles, and rules free from the biases of the last five centuries of colonization and imperialism, and that thus contributes to the self-definition and self-determination of those formerly colonized. I seek to argue that design anthropology has great potential to become a decolonized methodology for engaging with social issues.

This, of course, is not the only definition of design anthropology. Sperschneider, Kjaersgaard, and Peterson define it as the bricolage of "making sense of what is there with remaking what is there to something new" (2001: 1). The University of Aberdeen in its Masters of Science (Design Anthropology) program defines it as "a novel and exciting interface where the speculative imagination of possible futures meets the comparative study of human ways of living and knowing" (Leach 2011: sec. 1). Joachim Halse suggests that design anthropology is a provocation "that portrays the culture of use in terms of the culture of design" (2008: 31). Paula Gray defines it as "ethnographically-informed design of new products, services and systems for consumers and businesses" (2010: 1). Two aspects of my definition of design anthropology distinguish it from others. The first is that my definition is not just about the application of anthropological theories and methods toward the better design of products, services, and systems. As I have stated elsewhere, "It allows for the possibility of saying stop to the design process" when the ethics of engagement are questioned (Tunstall 2008a: 28). The second is that "the outcomes of design anthropology include statements providing some deeper understanding of human nature as well as designed communications, products, and experiences" (Tunstall 2008b: sec. 1, par. 2). My definition of design anthropology draws from core sets of theoretical perspectives—the critical anthropology of "Third World peoples and their allies," indigenous and Scandinavian traditions of cooperative/participatory design, and indigenous, critical, feminist, ontological, and phenomenological knowledge traditions. In the following sections, I address how this particular methodological positioning impacts the principles of design anthropology.

PRINCIPLES OF DECOLONIZED UNDERSTANDINGS OF VALUE SYSTEMS AND CULTURES

In an article written for *Adobe Think Tank*, I argued that "Design anthropology does not place separate emphasis on values, or design, or experience, which are the domains of philosophy, academic design research, and psychology, respectively. Rather, design anthropology focuses on the interconnecting threads among all three, requiring hybrid practices" (Tunstall 2008b: sec. 5, par. 2). As a methodology, I propose a design anthropology that adheres to a set of seven principles regarding how one understands and positively impacts on (1) human value systems; (2) the processes and artifacts of designing in making value systems tangible; and (3) the aligning of people's experiences with the values they prefer—all under conditions of unequal power relations. Fredrik Barth has been critical of how anthropologists have used the term *values* without creating an "explicit theory and analysis of values" (1993: 31). I utilize the term *values* in my explanation of design anthropology because it

highlights the different perspective that anthropologists have brought in their engagement with the design industries (Tunstall 2006) and it states what is at stake in processes of decolonization (Smith 1999: 74). In the edited volume, *Design Anthropology: Object Culture in the 21st Century*, Maria Bezaitis and Rick Robinson (2011) of E-Lab/Sapient argue that user research needs to get back to its emphasis on values as opposed to just being seen as valuable to industry. Thus, Bezaitis and Robinson contrast two of the three ways of talking about values noted by David Graeber. They promote what Graeber describes as values in the sociological sense "of what is ultimately good, proper, or desirable in human life" (Graeber 2001: 2) as opposed to the economic sense of measurement. What I have found most powerful about the role of anthropology in design is how it reveals the struggle over value systems as people seek to create meaning in their lives and pass them on to future generations. In this I share Barth's notion that studying values in and of themselves is not "a productive strategy . . . but [as part of social action] directs our attention to an area where collective institutions and representations articulate with individual behaviours" (1993: 44). Here Ton Otto's (2006) work about values and norms is illustrative. As the struggle over values affects people's identities, it also directly affects their ability to pass on those values to future generations. The collective creation of meaning and passing on to future generations is what can be defined as *culture*. As a decolonized methodology, design anthropology draws upon the concept of value systems, which can become cultures through consensus and transmission into the future, expressed in Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz's theory of transculturation:

> I am of the opinion that the word transculturation better expresses the different phases of the process of transition from one culture to another because it does not consist merely in acquiring another culture (acculturation) . . . but the process also necessarily involves the loss or uprooting of a previous culture (deculturation) . . . and it carries the idea of new cultural phenomena (neoculturation). (1995 [1945]: 102–103)

The theory of transculturation helps to define three of eventually seven key principles I believe should guide the praxis of design anthropology when it comes to understanding and having positive impact on value systems:

- Value systems and cultures have to be accepted as dynamic, not static. Each generation goes through the process of negotiating the elements that make up its value systems and cultures.
- One needs to recognize the mutual borrowing that happens among value systems and cultures and to seek to mitigate or eliminate the unequal circumstances in which that borrowing takes place.
- One must look simultaneously at what is expressed as that to be gained, lost, and created new in the recombination of value systems and cultures by a group of people.

Adhering to these three principles addresses what Faye Harrison describes as the project of decolonizing anthropology by "demystifying hegemonic ideologies and producing/co-producing forms of knowledge that can be useful and potentially liberating for the world's dispossessed and oppressed" (2010: 8). The Aboriginal Smart Art project on which I am working provides an example of these principles in action.

THE ABORIGINAL SMART ART PROJECT

In 2011, Colin McKinnon Dodd of the Yamatji Aboriginal cultural group and the founder of the Aboriginal Artists Development Fund (AADF) asked me to conduct a project that would use technology to support Australian Aboriginal arts. The Koorie Heritage Trust, the peak Aboriginal institution in Victoria State, agreed to partner with the AADF and Swinburne University on a project focused on how indigenous knowledge belonging to Australian Aboriginal cultures can be used to create social, technological, and business innovations in the Victorian Aboriginal Art market that increase the holistic sustainability of Australian Aboriginal art-making communities. The project completed the first of three phases, focused on researching cultural values and codesigning innovation scenarios, in May 2012. This is to be followed by the implementation and then the roll-out and evaluation phases. The project's main aim embodies design anthropology's first principle by accepting the dynamic character of Australian Aboriginal culture. Lynnette Russell (2001) in her book *Savage Imaginings* discusses the way mainstream Australian society constructs Aboriginal culture as monolithic, located in the ancient past, and thus inauthentic if engaged with modernity. The Aboriginal Smart Art (ASA) project frames cultural diversity and hybridity as part of the dynamic nature of Aboriginal cultures. The contemporary living values of Australian Aboriginal storytelling and *their Dreamtime* (in other words lore guiding the interconnections between all things in the past and present) are not seen as anathema to modern technologies. The ASA project draws on the growing literature on Aboriginal communities and digital technologies that demonstrates the tremendous variability of intergenerational responses to technology in Aboriginal cultures (McCallum and Papandrea 2009; Samaras 2005; Verran and Christie 2007). As exemplified in the 2010 AIATSIS symposium on Information Technologies and Indigenous Communities, indigenous communities have been increasingly using information and communication technologies to support (1) cultural mapping, managing, and archiving; (2) cultural innovation, transmission, and communication; and (3) language revitalization (AIATSIS 2010). The Aboriginal Smart Art project extends these digital practices into the Aboriginal art market, thus also embodying the second principle of the design anthropology.

The borrowing of digital technologies by Aboriginal communities and the borrowing of indigenous visual representations by dealers, buyers, and viewers in the Aboriginal art market represents the mutual borrowing of cultures and values under unequal circumstances. For the Aboriginal Smart Art project, the main challenge is the commodification of Aboriginal artworks and exploitation of Aboriginal artists. Paraphrasing anthropologist Arjun Appadurai (2005: 34), I understand commodification as a process in which things are exchanged with minimal formation of social bonds and groups. The media's highlighting of the continued exploitation of Aboriginal artists by unscrupulous brokers, dealers, and gallery owners led to the development of the Indigenous Art Code in 2007. Yet the exploitation in the Aboriginal art market continues as manifested by the artwork being seen as objects for sale without connection to the artists, their families and communities, and the land. The Aboriginal Smart Art project seeks to eliminate the exploitation and commodification of Aboriginal artists by codesigning innovative technologies, business, and service models to embed story into Aboriginal artwork. People are less likely to exploit another person with whom they have established deep bonds through knowledge of the deeper meanings of the artwork to the artists and their communities. Artists are less likely to sell a painting on the roadside if it also carries story and ceremony for their future generations. The project seeks to use the values associated with Aboriginal storytelling to reduce the unequal circumstances of Aboriginal artists' participation in the Western art market by mainstreaming those values such that they change the business model for the market.

The Aboriginal Smart Art project embodies the third principle of design anthropology by examining what is gained, lost, and created anew by embedding story in Aboriginal art. Through the interviews with artists, art coordinators, gallery owners, wholesalers, and technical experts, the Aboriginal Smart Art team of researchers, students, and client partners learned about Aboriginal communities' loss of revenue, cultural practices including storytelling, and identity caused by the exploitation of Aboriginal artists and their communities as a continuation of imperialism. The team learned what communities felt they did or did not have to gain from using the technologies to record the story of art making and how it differed for urban and rural artists. Yet the team learned what could be created new by bringing Aboriginal storytelling values and Western technological values together, which was represented through three design concepts with related business models and technological requirements. The 1D concept (see Plate 32) demonstrates the students' understanding that communities are the first point of authenticating Aboriginal artists' use of specific motifs in the art and stories. The students explored how available technologies in Aboriginal communities such as smartphones could capture the art and story-making processes to be stored in a general database and embedded in the artwork itself through RFID chips and GPS

image tracking. At the point of sale, viewers and buyers can access the story through a smartphone application.

PRINCIPLES FOR DECOLONIZED DESIGN INNOVATION

The *design* of *design anthropology* is theoretically indebted to two areas of design theory and practice. The first is the design thinking exemplified in the works of such indigenous/Third World scholar/practitioners as Indian M. P. Ranjan, Zimbabwean Saki Mafundikwa, and Native Hawaiian Herman Pi'ikea Clark. M. P. Ranjan clearly articulates a view of designing to which design anthropology seeks to speak directly:

> Here we are proposing that the design action takes into account the structure of society along with their macro aspirations, their histories and cultural preferences as a starting point and from here build imaginative approaches for products, services and systems that would include the meta-system, the infrastructure, the hardware, the software and the processware to ensure a perfect fit to the circumstances and requirements of the particular situation. (2011: sec. 1, par. 4)

The approaches advocated by these and other Third World scholars provide alternatives to the classifications and representations that see design primarily as a modern Western phenomenon by showing the long history of making in these communities. This provides another principle for design anthropology:

> One should seek to eliminate false distinctions between art, craft, and design in order to better recognize all culturally important forms of making as a way in which people make value systems tangible to themselves and others.

The second area of design thinking and practice is the Scandinavian cooperative and participatory design (Bødker, Ehn, Sjögren, and Sundblad 2000; Buur and Bagger 1999). The results of the 1980s Utopia project as described by Bødker et al. inform design anthropology's focus on "staging active design exercises such as the organisational tool-box and use of mock-ups and prototypes as a way to involve end users in design" (2000: 3). The work of Jacob Buur's SPIRE research group has advanced these ideas to define the praxis of participatory innovation. The principle that it provides to design anthropology is:

> Researchers and designers ought to create processes that enable respectful dialogue and relational interactions such that everyone is able to contribute their expertise equally to the process of designing and those contributions are properly recognized and remunerated.

These two principles can be glossed as ensuring processes of inclusion into the formation of design concepts, prototypes, and implementation such that the benefit of designing originates and ends with the groups involved, especially the most vulnerable group members. Here the Aboriginal Smart Art project again proves illustrative.

By seeking to embed the values of Aboriginal ways of visual culture as storytelling into a design project, the Aboriginal Smart Art project collapsed the distinctions between art, design, and craft (the fourth principle of design anthropology). Herman Pi'ikea Clark states that by creating the concept of art "no other pre-industrial society or culture in the world established a disassociated category for aesthetic objects as did Western European society" (2006: 3). While still using the term *art*, the Aboriginal Smart Art project attempts to transform aesthetic objects back to what Clark describes as their preindustrial roles as repositories, transmitters, and vehicles in the exploration and construction of knowledge (2006: 4). Aligning with the fifth principle of design anthropology, the project's two presentations and scenario codesign workshop created inclusive interactive forums in which Aboriginal artists, art coordinators, art collectors, business, technology, and design experts could contribute their knowledge to inform multiple scenarios for how the Aboriginal Smart Art processes might work. For the mid-semester presentations of learning from secondary research, the team used writing on sticky notes and directly on display banner posters to facilitate discussions of further directions for research to inform scenario planning. The scenario mapping and evaluation workshop demonstrated to the student team, the participating client, and the technical experts how complex and diverse were the possible solutions to the project's challenges. In the final semester presentation, participants, including Aboriginal artists, helped select which one of the three concepts the group will continue developing in phase two of the project. This process of inclusion will continue throughout phases two and three of the project.

PRINCIPLES FOR DECOLONIZED RESPECT FOR EXPERIENCES

Design anthropology, as I define it, comes directly out of my experiences of being an African American woman who has been trained in critical anthropology and applied that knowledge to the contexts of professional design and design education. It speaks to the heart of the atrocities of Western colonialism and imperialism, mainly the disrespect and disregard for the experiences of other people. Design anthropology enacts the critique of positionality and power articulated by Third World scholars, indigenous scholars, and second and third wave feminists by reframing the problem areas of social impact as

within the value systems of imperialism. The design anthropology principle that emerges from this perspective is:

> Projects should use design processes and artifacts to work with groups to shift hegemonic value systems that are detrimental to the holistic well-being of vulnerable groups, dominant groups, and their extended environments.

Last, design anthropology requires that individuals and groups move beyond having empathy to acting with compassion. In an essay for the tenth anniversary of the ICOGRADA Design Education Manifesto, I combine Richard Sennett's (2003) definition of *respect* with Herbert Simon's (1969) definition of *design* to provide a definition of *respectful design* as "the creation of preferred courses of action based on the intrinsic worth of all human, animal, mineral, fauna and flora and the treatment of them with dignity and regard" (Tunstall 2011: 133). The acceptance of the intrinsic worth of everything and the treatment of them with dignity and regard characterizes compassion, which is a higher virtue than empathetic shared feelings advocated in design thinking. Design anthropology's final principle seeks a commitment to compassion from its students, scholars, and practitioners:

> The ultimate criteria for success of any design anthropological engagements are the recognized creation of conditions of compassion among the participants in a project and in harmony with their wider environments.

This may seem utopian, but it ensures that design anthropology understands its purpose as part of a spiritual system, not just an economic and social system. These last two principles require a longer time frame and greater scope for the praxis of design anthropology in order to build case studies. Yet at least anecdotally as I give presentations around the world, I am finding a shift already taking place in the ultimate purpose of design innovation and anthropology that closely aligns with these sentiments. Thus, I expect it will only be five years or so before we have these clear case studies.

CONCLUSION

By proposing design anthropology as a decolonized methodology, I return to where I began with Faye Harrison to advocate for design anthropology that frees its two parent fields from "the prevailing forces of global inequality and dehumanization and to locate it firmly in the complex struggle for genuine transformation" (2010: 10). Design innovation and anthropology have much that they can contribute to fighting global inequality, but first it should

adhere to clear principles of respectful engagement with people's values, the translation of them through processes of inclusive codesign, and the evaluation of their effects on people's experiences from the perspective of the most vulnerable. The seven principles of design anthropology can assist in the evaluation of one's cultural interactions to ensure that one is avoiding the four imperialistic outcomes that others have critiqued in both anthropology and design innovation theories and practices. Having established these principles, I seek to focus on the implementation of design anthropology as a decolonized methodology through my projects and those of my allies and students. For what is needed now are clear case studies that demonstrate the creation of conditions of compassion as the true goal of any design anthropology engagement.

REFERENCES

AIATSIS (2010), *Program of 2010 Information Technologies and Indigenous Communities Research Symposium*, AIATSIS, Canberra, July 13–16. Available at: www.aiatsis.gov.au/research/docs/iticPrelimProg.pdf. Accessed June 10, 2012.

Appadurai, A. (2005), "Commodities and the Politics of Value," in M. M. Ertman and J. C. Williams (eds.), *Rethinking Commodification: Cases and Readings in Law and Culture*, New York: New York University Press, 34–44.

Asad, T. (ed.) (1973), *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, Ithaca, NY: Ithaca Press.

Barth, F. (1993), "Are Values Real? The Enigma of Naturalism in the Anthropological Imputation of Values," in M. Hechter, L. Nadel, and R. Michod (eds.), *The Origin of Values*, Hawthorn, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 31–46.

Bezaitis, M., and Robinson, R. (2011), "Valuable to Values: How 'User Research' Ought to Change," in A. Clarke (ed.), *Design Anthropology: Object Culture in the 21st Century*, New York: Springer Wien, 184–201.

Blakey, M. (2010), "Man, Nature, White and Other," in F. Harrison (ed.), *Decolonizing Anthropology*, 3rd edition, Arlington, VA: Association for Black Anthropologists, American Anthropological Association, 16–24.

Bødker, S., Ehn, P., Sjögren, D., and Sundblad, Y. (2000), *Co-operative Design: Perspectives on 20 Years with 'the Scandinavian Design Model*, Stockholm, Sweden: Centre for User Oriented IT Design (CID). Available at: http://cid.nada.kth.se/pdf/cid_104.pdf. Accessed May 6, 2012.

Borges, A. (2007), *Design for a World of Solidarity*. Available at: www.adeliaborges.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/12–17–2007-forming-ideas-design-solidario1.pdf. Accessed May 10, 2012.

Brown, T., and Ulijn, J. (2004), *Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Culture: The Interaction between Technology, Progress, and Economic Growth*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Brown, T., and Wyatt, J. (2010), "Design Thinking for Social Innovation: IDE)," World Bank Institute, beta, July 12. Available at: http://wbi.worldbank.org/wbi/devoutreach/article/366/design-thinking-social-innovation-ideo. Accessed March 27, 2011.

Buur, J., and Bagger, K. (1999), "Replacing Usability with User Dialogue," *Communications of the ACM*, 42(5): 63–66.

Clark, H. P. (2006), "E Kūkulu Kauhale O Limaloa: Kanaka Maoli Education through Visual Studies," Paper presented at the Imaginative Education Research Symposium, Vancouver, BC. Available at: www.ierg.net/confs/viewabstract.php?id=254&cf=3. Accessed October 6, 2012.

Deloria Jr., V. (1988 [1969]), *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*, Oklahoma City: University of Oklahoma Press.

Editors (2010), "Humanitarian Design vs. Design Imperialism: Debate Summary," *Design Observer/Change Observer*, July 16. Available at: http://changeobserver.designobserver.com/feature/humanitarian-design-vs-design-imperialism-debate-summary/14498/. Accessed March 15, 2011.

Fabian, J. (1983), *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Fry, T. (1989), "A Geography of Power: Design History and Marginality," *Design Issues*, 6(1): 15–30.

Ghose, R. (1989), "Design, Development, Culture, and Cultural Legacies in Asia," *Design Issues*, 6(1): 31–48.

Graeber, D. (2001), *Toward an Anthropological Theory of Value*, New York: Palgrave.

Gray, P. (2010), "Business Anthropology and the Culture of Product Managers," *AIPMM Product Management Library of Knowledge*, August 8. Available at: www.aipmm.com/html/newsletter/archives/000437.php. Accessed May 6, 2012.

Hall, S. (1992), "The West and the Rest," in S. Hall and B. Gielben (eds.), *Formations of Modernity*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press and Open University, 276–320.

Halse, J. (2008), "Design Anthropology: Borderland Experiments with Participation, Performance and Situated Intervention," PhD dissertation, IT University, Copenhagen.

Harrison, F. (2010), "Anthropology as an Agent of Transformation," in F. Harrison (ed.), *Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further toward an Anthropology for Liberation*, third edition, Arlington, VA: Association of Black Anthropologists, American Anthropological Association, 1–14.

IDEO and Rockefeller Foundation (2008a), *Design for Social Impact How-to Guide*, New York, NY: IDEO and Rockefeller Foundation.

IDEO and Rockefeller Foundation (2008b), *Design for Social Impact: Workbook*, New York, NY: IDEO and Rockefeller Foundation.

Jepchumba (2009), "Saki Mafundikwa," *African Digital Art*, September. Available at: www.africandigitalart.com/2009/09/saki-mafundikwa/. Accessed October 6, 2012.

Jostingmeier, B. and Boeddrich, H. J. (eds.) (2005), *Cross-cultural Innovation: Results of the 8th European Conference on Creativity and Innovation*, Wiesbaden, Germany: DUV.

Kohn, M. (2011), "Colonialism," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Fall. Available at: http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2011/entries/colonialism/. Accessed October 6, 2012.

Leach, J. (2011), "MSc Design Anthropology," Department of Anthropology, University of Aberdeen. Available at: www.abdn.ac.uk/anthropology/postgrad/MScdesignanthropology.php. Accessed October 6, 2012.

Leong, B. D., and Clark, H. (2003), "Culture-based Knowledge towards New Design Thinking and Practice—A Dialogue," *Design Issues*, 19(3): 48–58.

Light, P. (2008), *The Search for Social Entrepreneurship*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press.

Lodaya, A. (2002), "Reality Check," *Lodaya.Webs.Com*. Available at: http://lodaya.webs.com/paper_rchk.htm. Accessed March 29, 2011.

Lodaya, A. (2003), "The Crisis of Traditional Craft in India," *Lodaya.Webs.Com*. Available at: http://lodaya.webs.com/paper_craft.htm. Accessed May 10, 2012.

Lodaya, A. (2006), "Conserving Culture as a Strategy for Sustainability," *Lodaya.Webs.Com*. Available at: http://lodaya.webs.com/paper_ccss.htm. Accessed May 10, 2012.

Lodaya, A. (2007), "Catching up; Letting Go," *Lodaya.Webs.Com*. Available at: http://lodaya.webs.com/paper_culg.htm. Accessed May 10, 2012.

Magda, R.M.R. (2004), *Transmodernidad,* Barcelona: Anthropos. Available at: http://transmoderntheory.blogspot.com/2008/12/globalization-as-transmodern-totality.html. Accessed October 15, 2010.

McCallum, K., and Papandrea, F. (2009), "Community Business: The Internet in Remote Australian Indigenous Communities," *New Media & Society*, 11(7): 1230–1251.

Nussbaum, B. (2010a), "Is Humanitarian Design the New Imperialism?" *Co.Design*, July 7. Available at: www.fastcodesign.com/1661859/is-humanitarian-design-the-new-imperialism. Accessed March 27, 2011.

Nussbaum, B. (2010b), "Do-gooder Design and Imperialism, Round 3: Nussbaum Responds," *Co.Design*, July 13. Available at: www.fastcodesign.com/1661894/do-gooder-design-and-imperialism-round-3-nussbaum-responds. Accessed March 27, 2011.

Nussbaum, B. (2010c), "Should Humanitarians Press on, If Locals Resist?" *Co.Design*, August 3. Available at: www.fastcodesign.com/1662021/nussbaum-should-humanitarians-press-on-if-locals-resist. Accessed March 27, 2011.

OECD and Eurostat (2005), *Oslo Manual: Guidelines for Collected and Interpreting Innovation Data*, 3rd edition, Oslo: OECD.

Ortiz, F. (1995 [1945]), *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Otto, T. (2006), "Concerns, Norms and Social Action," *Folk*, 46/47: 143–157.

Pilloton, E. (2010), "Are Humanitarian Designers Imperialists? Project H Responds," *Co.Design*, July 12. Available at: www.fastcodesign.com/1661885/are-humanitarian-designers-imperialists-project-h-responds. Accessed March 27, 2011.

Ranjan, A., and Ranjan, M.P. (eds.) (2005), *Handmade in India*, New Delhi: National Institute of Design (NID), Ahmedabad, Council of Handicraft Development Corporations (COHANDS), New Delhi Development Commissioner (Handicrafts), New Delhi, and Mapin Publishing Pvt. Ltd.

Ranjan, M.P. (ed.) (2006), "Giving Back to Society: Towards a Post-mining Era," *IDSA Annual Conference*, Austin, TX, September 17–20.

Ranjan, M.P. (2011), "Design for Good Governance: A Call for Change," *Design for India Blog*, August 11. Available at: http://design-for-india.blogspot.com/2011/08/design-for-good-governance-call-for.html. Accessed November 14, 2011.

Restrepo, E., and Escobar, A. (2005), "Other Anthropologies and Anthropology Otherwise: Steps to a World Anthropologies Framework," *Critique of Anthropology*, 25(2): 99–129.

Russell, L. (2001), *Savage Imaginings*, Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing.

Said, E. (1978), *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Books.

Samaras, K. (2005), "Indigenous Australians and the 'Digital Divide,'" *Libri*, 55: 84–95.

Sennett, R. (2003), *Respect: The Formation of Character in an Age of Inequality*, New York: Norton.

Seyfang, G., and Smith, A. (2007), "Grassroots Innovation for Sustainable Development," *Environmental Politics*, 16(4): 584–603.

Simon, H. (1969), *The Sciences of the Artificial*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Smith, L.T. (1999), *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, London: Zed Books and Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Sperschnieder, W., Kjaersgaard, M., and Petersen, G. (2001), "Design Anthropology—When Opposites Attract," First Danish HCI Research Symposium, PB-555, University of Aarhus, SIGCHI Denmark and Human Machine Interaction. Available at: www.daimi.au.dk/PB/555/PB-555.pdf. Accessed October 6, 2012.

Tax, S. (1975), "Action Anthropology," *Current Anthropology*, 16(4): 514–517.

Tunstall, E. (2006), "The Yin Yang of Ethnographic Praxis in Industry," in Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference Proceedings, Portland, OR: National Association for the Practice of Anthropology and Berkeley: University of California Press, 125–137.

Tunstall, E. (2007), "Yin Yang of Design and Anthropology," Unpublished paper presented at NEXT: AIGA 2007 Annual Conference, Denver, CO.

Tunstall, E. (2008a), "Design and Anthropological Theory: Trans-disciplinary Intersections in Ethical Design Praxis," in Proceedings of the 96th Annual Conference of the College Arts Association [CD], Dallas, TX: College Arts Association.

Tunstall, E. (2008b) "Design Anthropology: What Does It Mean to Your Design Practice?" Adobe Design Center Think Tank, May 13. Available at: www. adobe.com/designcenter/thinktank/tt_tunstall.html. Accessed August 5, 2008.

Tunstall, E. (2011), "Respectful Design: a Proposed Journey of Design Education" in A. Bennett and O. Vulpinari (eds.), ICOGRADA Education Manifesto 2011, Montreal: ICOGRADA.

Uddin, N. (2005), "Facts and Fantasy of Knowledge Retrospective of Ethnography for the Future of Anthropology," Pakistan Journal of Social Science, 3(7): 978–985.

Van Eeden, J. (2004), "The Colonial Gaze: Imperialism, Myths, and South African Popular Culture," Design Issues, 20(2): 18–33.

Verran, H., and Christie, M. (2007), "Using/designing Digital Technologies of Representation in Aboriginal Australian Knowledge Practices," Human Technology, 3(2): 214–227.

Wang, S.Z. (1989), "Chinese Modern Design: A Retrospective," Design Issues, 6(1): 49–78.

Wolf, E. (1982), Europe and the People without History, Berkeley: University of California Press.