

# P / REFERENCES OF DESIGN

## IM/POSSIBILITIES FOR PLURIVERSAL DESIGN EDUCATION: A FIELD GUIDE FOR NOTICING INSTITUTIONAL LIFE.

**Andrew Whitcomb<sup>\*a</sup>**

a Arizona State University, USA

\* [andrew.whitcomb@asu.edu](mailto:andrew.whitcomb@asu.edu)

**DOI: 10.63442/LWDU3330**

**KEYWORDS | DESIGN EDUCATION, PLURIVERSAL DESIGN, ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS, HIGHER-EDUCATION, FIELD GUIDE**

**ABSTRACT** | A growing body of scholarship supports the development of pluriversal curricula towards healthier ways of being, knowing, and designing. At the same time, the notion of the pluriverse raises thorny questions for the dominant university-based model of design education. Pluriversality challenges us to consider how institutional arrangements, disciplinary habits, and cultural norms privilege certain ways of learning over others and then begin reworking—or making new—ways to practice design education. Yet, despite growing interest in pluriversal design education, we lack references of how people grapple with practicing design education differently on the ground. As an invitation to enrich conversations that transform design education, this exploratory paper sketches a variety of components at play in the institutional machinations and day-to-day experiences of educators and students. The sketch is presented in the form of an ecological field guide to institutions. The field guide aims to support educators in noticing how the interconnectedness among the day-to-day tasks, positions, relationships, agreements, infrastructures, and risks of a particular context can constrain and expand possibilities for transforming institutions of design education toward pluriversality. By making public the everyday practices of educators, we can keep critical reflection on design education futures grounded—resisting the pull to standardize while informing local, pluriversal, action toward healthier ways of knowing and being.

## 1. Introduction

*“Are you excited by budgeting? Do you love scheduling courses? What about caring for your favorite learning management system? For many design educators, such activities represent what it means to work with an institution. But what if, rather than approaching our institutions as bureaucratic task masters, we engaged them as living ecologies, full of change and possibility?”*

*In this field guide, we invite you to explore the rich institutional life you take part in as a design educator. By taking more notice of our institutions, we believe you’ll find new and unexpected possibilities to practice education that are in tune with the myriad ways of living, being, and knowing in the world. Perhaps there are events or projects already happening that—when noticed differently or more fully—hold potential for fostering pluriversality wherever you practice design education.*

*As you go about noticing, you will likely realize that the various features of institutions do not have distinct boundaries. We agree! Nothing in our institutions exists in isolation. As such, we encourage readers to pay particular attention to the relations among the things you notice and what nourishes, sustains, and interrupts them.”*

— Draft Introduction to A Field Guide for Noticing Institutional Life

Take a moment to consider the faculty meeting. At first, the event seems relatively mundane: a routine occurrence where you and your colleagues walk through a list of administrative updates, committee reports, and new issues affecting your design department. Pay more attention, however, and you might discover that these meetings play a vital role in how education happens. Colleagues engage in chit-chat that builds bonds or reveals unexpected insights about why things in the school work the way they do. Ideas emerge for new initiatives. People nominate each other for task forces to set standards or review applications of incoming faculty and students. A volunteer records meeting notes and sends them out afterwards, turning the conversation into a textual object that contributes to further meaning-making and action. All of this plays out in an hour, maybe two, once a month over the course of the semester.

The future of design education is a perennial topic in design academia, but discussions of it rarely delve into things like faculty meetings. Yet, such moments can have a profound effect on the way we educate designers. And, of course, meetings represent just one aspect of the rich ecology of institutional life where so much formal design education takes place. There are also scheduling calls, cloud-storage platforms, learning outcomes, contractual obligations, accreditation reviews, and mandatory trainings—the list goes on. For those of us in the thick of it, it can be difficult to step back and identify just what we have to work with as we participate in designing our institutions. However, as we confront strong arguments that our dominant model of design education falls short in its ability to prepare students to engage with on complex socioecological issues (Davis & Dubberly, 2023), we need to question not just what we teach design students, but how we conduct design education itself.

Questioning the institution of design education may feel like a daunting task. How many times have we expressed resignation over the stifling bureaucracy of our universities and colleges? Despite the situation, design educators may still find ways to operate at different speeds, engaging values that seem to run counter to the prevailing winds of their institutions. These small instances of educators working “otherwise” (Nicholls et al., 2021) within the system offer hope for transitioning to a model of design education that honors the diverse ways of living and being necessary for shared flourishing. The educators who figure out how to support pluriversal education from an insider position have noticed potentialities in the life of their institutions; they connect, leverage, or reconfigure practices to make space and time for pluriverse-supporting activities that do not fit dominant standards.

This article seeks to expand and enhance how design educators notice institutional life. Presented as an ecological field guide to institutions, the content serves as an invitation to examine how we can work within academic institutions to put pluriversality into practice. This sketch of the field guide is partial, developed largely from the position and perspective of an early stage faculty member at a large public research university in the USA. As such, publishing this sketch of the field guide to the wider academic community is an effort to subject it to critique and dialogue as a tool and orientation to change. Inspired by work such as Rob Walker’s *The Art of Noticing* (Walker, 2019) and the popular genre of environmental field guides (Izaguirre, 2021), the guide provides a variety of prompts meant to hone the reader’s attention to easily overlooked things around us. In the following pages, we provide a brief rationale for why it is worth considering institutions when exploring potential to make pluriversity happen in design education. After that, we move on to present the initial fragments of a “field guide” that explore a few propositional features of institutions to notice, and how, through attending to them in our everyday practices as educators, we might find possibilities—and likely impossibilities—for pluriversality.

## 2. Why Does (Not) Noticing Institutions Matter?

The ways we practice design education are not merely a matter of leadership decision-making or organizational designing. The practice of education is entangled with complex economic, political, and technological developments (Berman & Paradeise, 2016; Perkin, 2007). Even the ambitious projects of design education, such as the Bauhaus and The New Bauhaus were products of their time (Cross, 1983; Findeli, 2001; Findeli & Benton, 1991), and through various social practices—for instance, replicating curricula—such projects continue to exert influence on our time (Davis & Dubberly, 2023). As such, it behooves us as educators to focus not only on the content we teach, but also the social forces that affect the shape and focus of our activities. Yet, to look at design education through institutional and organizational lenses, it helps to clarify just what we mean by those terms and how they might be helpful in exploring potentials for pluriversality.

Institutional Theory has a rich history of scholarship, albeit potentially too rich. As Alvesson and his colleagues point out, the concept of institutions has become so expansive that it can be hard to identify what it cannot explain (Alvesson & Spicer, 2019). Not only that, scholars have discussed institutions and organizations using overlapping or conflicting concepts. We follow Charlotte Linde’s (2008) distinction of “institution” as a broader category identified primarily through established and recognizable practices, while organizations represent primarily formal and legal structures. For the purposes of the field guide, we consider “design education” as an institution and specific “design programs”—whether embedded in universities or colleges—as distinct organizations. The institutional lens on design education highlights practices that commonly extend across design programs, such as project-based learning, studios, and critiques. Yet, despite sharing many characteristics, these practices play out differently depending on the particular organization of a design program. Class sizes, content, and number of faculty per section may be different from program to program. With this in mind, we see the potential for both lenses to orient our attention to aspects of design education that extend beyond—but are also enacted in—pedagogy and curricula.

### 2.1 Institutional Influences and Design Education

To understand the relationship between institutional forces and design education, we can consider an example related to design-at-large. For the past century, design has had an intimate relationship with modernity and capitalism. Design researcher Yoko Akama presents the notion of “Dominant Design” and argues that it “has accompanied modern world-making practices to be useful, effective, functional, durable, seductive, convenient, original and innovative, and has been used to solve problems for others, grow market share and increase customer satisfaction” (Akama, 2021, p. 107). In many ways, Dominant Design represents a powerful institution, one that is instilled and reinforced in practice. Frameworks such as IDEO’s Feasibility, Desirability, and Viability position design’s value firmly in service to solving problems and contributing to success in the marketplace. Following this logic, many design professionals have adopted design

ethnography and user research as ways to identify “unmet” needs and problems for (potential) customer segments. With the problems of others found and framed, Dominant Design practice moves on to prototyping to arrive at an optimally pleasing final product. This approach, Akama highlights, has deep connections to European philosophical traditions of the 20th century that privilege rationality (ibid). Indeed, prevailing conceptions of who designs, what gets designed, how we determine value in design, come from a legacy of the “one-world” reality from the global North (Law, 2015) that has overpowered so many other ways of being, knowing, and valuing—many of which are more in tune with the health of the planet.

The relationship among modernity, capitalism, and design, highlights the importance of attending to ourselves, our practices and the worlds we create or deny through design. This is no easy task. It requires confronting our personal habits and our relations with institutions. When it comes to education, we see the power of these institutional forces first hand. Wrapped up in the relationship between design and marketplace success, many design programs have launched initiatives that position design in service to this dominant paradigm. In such cases, educators gain recognition for working with industry. Students feel engaged by working on “real world” projects. The program positions itself as innovative. Industry partners feel invigorated by the breadth of new ideas generated in just a few weeks or months. These institutional forces work together, play out in practices—full of embodied understandings, habits, rules, and material arrangements—that make certain activities for educating easier, or even possible, while constraining or inhibiting others (Schatzki, 2019). This becomes especially important to recognize for design educators seeking to work with pluriversality.

Drawing on the work of anthropologist Arturo Escobar, Lesley-Ann Noel and colleagues —writing for The Future of Design Education working group on pluriversal design—advocate for a richer framework for design education based on the recognition that diverse worlds can—and should—fit. In support of this effort, they recommend focusing on relationality in design education, which “values trust-building, long-term commitments, and dedication to understanding constituents and their future prosperity” (Noel et al., 2023, p.183). The authors also highlight the importance of approaching design education through locally rooted knowledge and radical participation with, through, and by people affected by design. Yet, how do design educators proceed in fulfilling these aspirations when our daily practices are wrapped up in institutional life that pulls our actions toward productivity, universalization, and return-on-investment?

The pervasiveness of dominant institutional forces makes it daunting to imagine alternatives. To support pluriversality design educators need to face our institutional entanglements, recognizing that our universities and colleges enable and restrict certain courses of action. Additionally, as individuals often trained via the dominant system that limits pluriversality, there is undoubtedly a fair bit of “unlearning” (Akama, 2017) for us to undertake ourselves. We find hope for alternatives by approaching institutions on the ground, where everyday actions afford opportunities for creative maneuvers that redirect and resist dominant forces to support pluriversality. Our lives are full of potential ways for acting otherwise, but sometimes we could use a little help finding them.

### 3. Ways of Noticing Institutional Life

Our attempt with the field guide is to offer a humble starting point for our work toward pluriversity in design education. To some, noticing may seem like just another way to say “ethnographic research,” however, our proposition is much less formal. Our field guide is informed by an ethnographic attitude, but we do not suggest that design educators conduct ethnographies of their programs. The intention of this field guide is not to analyze design education as an institutional phenomenon. That said, our orientation shares much in common with what Sara Ahmed describes as a “phenomenological approach” to studying institutions (Ahmed, 2012): the field guide suggests a “thick” approach to institutions in an effort to “attend to what is looked over, to allow what is “overed” to surface” (ibid). Importantly, this perspective invites us to look at how everyday practice—activities, affectations, agencies, materials, norms, and understandings—create a sense of stability that we recognize as an institutional force, as well as “generative potentials” (Simpson & den Hond, 2022) for change.

To enrich our guide to noticing institutions, we find inspiration in theories of practice (Reckwitz, 2002; Schatzki, 2021; Shove, 2016). The power of looking at worlds through practices “lies in its capacity to describe important features of the world we inhabit as something that is routinely made and re-made in practice using tools, discourse, and our bodies” (Nicolini, 2012, p. 2). Institutions, according to this view, are not static, deterministic, entities, but “combinations and configurations that are regularly *reproduced* [emphasis added]” (Blue, 2019, p. 931). Looking closely at how people’s actions are bound up with institutional life through everyday material engagements has led scholars to identify how such things as commitments (Kanter, 1968), rhythms (Blue, 2019), narratives (Linde, 2008), and infrastructures (Star, 1999) play a role in how work and change happen. This is the orientation we aim to support with our field guide: a search for relations among the everyday stuff of muddling through our work as educators and the pathways, ruts, openings, and dead-ends of institutional life.

### 3.1 A Caveat About Field Guides

Presenting this sketch in the genre of the field guide might imply a certain amount of stability and objectivity to institutions. Indeed, popular field guides for birds or plants may communicate about the world through matter-of-fact descriptions associated with the natural sciences. As Izaguirre highlights, even field guides to birds have presented different orientations and expressions of “nature” over the years (Izaguirre, 2021). Our articulations of nature are tied to countless everyday cultural practices—there are many modes of naturing (Swanson et al., 2018). As such, what readers are invited to “see” via natural field guides depends on the context, and thereby perspective, from which the guide was written. Just as the articulation of nature used in field guides and policies depends on sociotechnical traditions, our field guide frames design education in a particular way, namely in terms of institutional life.

As such, this field guide relies on a sociomaterial understanding of institutions, where elements are not fixed, but are dynamic and context-specific. There are many modes of institutioning (Huybrechts et al., 2017). Thus, we do not provide a list of places to look or things to look for, where one can consistently expect to find specific things that support pluriversality. Just like the ways in which practice theory seeks to stimulate “research capable of rendering visible phenomena and contexts that were previously off the radar” (Reckwitz, 2016, p. 115), this field guide aims to prompt design educators to attend to their practices in hopes of discovering opportunities for pluriversality in their particular contexts. As such, readers of the field guide will not find an exhaustive list of aspects of an institution. Instead, the guide calls each reader’s attention to characteristics that appear relatively common to institutional life in design education.

## 4. Sketching a Guide to Institutional Life

*Our field guide introduces four features of institutions for design educators to explore and make discoveries: Accessing, Evaluating, Planning, and Knowing. Bound up in these features you’ll likely find all sorts of bodies, feelings, materials, processes, tools, rules, spaces, and values. Working together, these common, everyday aspects of our lives carry potential for courses of action that can support or suppress the various realities we touch through design education.*

This brief overview frames the orientation of the field guide. As presented in the introduction, the four features are not meant to classify separate aspects within an institution. Rather, they are connected, overlapping, and entangled. Articulating these four features is a way to provide starting points for noticing. From these starting points we invite noticers to explore the rich complexity of connections that make up the practices of design education. In the following paragraph, we provide a brief description and an example exercise for each of the four features, Accessing, Evaluating, Planning, and Knowing. The examples are provisional, meant to show how the field guide might support design educators in paying attention to their everyday sociomaterial practices and discover potentials for pluriversality. Even in taken-for-granted, background activities, like preparing for a critique or structuring class time we act in ways that make some realities im/possible for design education.

## Accessing

*Many design programs have dedicated teams, or at least work streams in the administrative team, focused on admissions. However, if we start attending to the entrances and exits of our programs, we confront the realities of access: certain things—credentials, metrics, evidence—restrict or grant passage; rules make it easier for some people to fit than others; pathways are more or less visible depending on your location.*

### An Exercise to Notice Accessing: Doors

*Take a moment to consider, perhaps, the simplest starting point for attending to access: doors. Who walks through the doors of our institutions of design education? Do different people walk through physical doors compared to virtual ones? How do people find their way to our doors? When do doorways begin and end? When are doors locked or open? Who (or what) opens and locks our doors? What is allowed to come in, or out of, doorways? How do we feel as we approach the doors of a particular building or room?*

*By noticing doors, we might also attend to the spaces and locations where they exist. The doors we notice might lead into buildings just off a pristine courtyard on a college campus or from a bustling urban sidewalk. Doors also invite us to notice how we relate to others through control of spaces. We tell students we have an “open door” policy for our office hours or to “lock the studio door” to protect their projects and things. Take a moment to map out the “doors” of your program, where they’re positioned, and how they shape access to design education.*

When we attend to the humble door as an entry point for noticing access, we may start noticing the positions and attitudes that our sites of design education present towards others. When it comes to pluriversality, we can identify how the position of doors imply who design education is for, under what terms, and in what capacity. Primarily, the doors of design education reside in schools, places for formally approved students and faculty. At the same time, design programs are rarely confined to a single building. Studios, galleries, and classrooms often extend out into our surrounding neighborhoods. These extensions may afford different forms of access at different times. What made these extensions possible? How are they related to the communities in which they are embedded? Reflecting on the power of doors to include and exclude, Carol A. Taylor invites us to image, “What possibilities grow out of doors left ajar, doors unhinged, doors kept open by door wedges, softly closing doors” (Taylor et al., 2024, p. 17) This example exercise shows just one prompt of how to explore access from the relatively mundane starting point of an everyday object.

## Evaluating

*Design educators thrive on judging quality. Whether through design contests or final reviews that feature industry professionals we engage any number of practices that assess the aesthetic, functional, and economic value of design work. We rely on all manner of tools and materials for making these judgments, many of which themselves are wrapped up in systems of economics and politics. Our evaluation practices influence what counts as positive impact, for whom, and with what consequences.*

### An Exercise to Notice Evaluating: Critiques

*Let’s see what we can notice about evaluating through the example of a classroom critique. On the day of a critique, pause for a moment and sense the atmosphere of the room. How is the room arranged and how did it get that way? Where are you positioned in relation to the others in the room? Are there guests in the space? If so, who invited them and how did they get there? What about non-human guests, such as video cameras and microphones? In what format is work being shown? How long will this assembly last?*

*For many design educators, critique plays a central role in our practice, but there are different flavors; they vary in scale, pressure, orientation. Critiques are events where we bring to bear and reinforce expectations of what constitutes “good work” in design. They also put on display certain roles or positions for the participants. If we shift attention away from the work, and the student presenting it, we can notice the factors shaping the judgment of value in critiques. Approaching critique as an event in time, we find that our evaluations do not have a clear beginning and end; histories and habits infuse the evaluating that happens in the moment.*

As one example of the evaluating—or “valuation”—that happens in design, critique can tell us much about potentials for pluriversality in design education. On a very basic level, the evaluating that happens in a critique is wrapped up in norms of communication (Coughlan, 2023). Critiques set expectations for quality not just through execution of craft, but also through their use of language (García-Sánchez, 2015). Students exercise storytelling, articulateness, and verve as they take their turn in the spotlight, developing the type of communication they need to succeed in the professional community. Critique can easily turn evaluation into a means of narrowing what we celebrate and promote as good design. When it comes to pluriversality, therefore, we might challenge ourselves to notice how critique values and devalues aspects of design. Rather than focusing on the relative loudness of style and utility (Ober, 2022), what about the subtler expressions of solidarity, way-finding, curiosity, and personality? Upon noticing these expressions we might look for the aspects of our practice that elevate them. Do they come forward in certain formats more than others? How does location, tone, or time influence the potential for other—typically marginalized or even erased—values to enter our evaluation of good design?

### **Planning**

*Design education is a social affair. As educators, we come together in various constellations and tempos to discuss how things are going and what, if anything, we might want to do differently. Visions and performance indicators come from within our department and also beyond it, handed down (notice direction and the power it implies) from the office of a Dean or Provost. From a Planning perspective, it is tempting to see pluriversality as a desired outcome. However, the very organization of Planning activities makes certain realities more possible than others. Let’s tune in to investigate how.*

#### **An Exercise to Notice Planning: Faculty Meetings**

*Take a moment to list out the things that make up a faculty meeting. What technologies participate in the meeting? What tools are people using? What about spaces? What impact do those tools have on the way people interact? What items are on the agenda and how did they get there? Where do the items direct the energy of the meeting? Where do agenda items travel after the meeting? What role do they play in your future activities and engagements?*

*Among other various administrative activities, faculty meetings represent events for coordination, dialogue, and keeping track. Tools and technologies undoubtedly play a role. We glance at clocks to stay on schedule because we have classes to teach or other meetings to attend. We type up “action items,” or materialize documents to bear on the conversation. At the same time, these meetings present moments to express care for each other, to be together in a particular place, nurture and relationships. Attending to the subtleties of faculty meetings can surface possibilities for acting in congruence with, or in resistance to, the gravitational pull of our institutions.*

The mass of institutional things creates gravity that pulls activity to not only maintain the current institution, but also make progress according to the dominant narratives of our programs. Through the above example exercise, we invite readers to focus on how routine events like faculty meetings can reinforce prevailing activities or plant seeds for potential disruption. Rather than fixed instances of going through the motions to support institutional order, these organizational routines exist as fluid moments full of change in the interplay of habit, thought, and emotion (Simpson & den Hond, 2022). Faculty

meetings represent moments where dominant institutional forces can pull our attention to things like competing for funding, meeting enrollment objectives, or defining measurable outcomes. At the same time, they hold opportunities for bringing other things into the mix: concerns for each other, for our place, and those who reside there with us. As a step toward supporting pluriversality we notice how, within our existing efforts at Planning, there are spaces for relating otherwise, which may be strengthened through the materials, tools, arrangements, etc. at play in our matters of care (de la Bellacasa, 2011).

### **Knowing**

*As educators, we work with knowledge. Over the years, we learn through making, reading, modeling, imitating, and discussing various aspects of designing. We leverage that expertise in our classes. During these interactions, it's easy to slip into a sense that we are guides: we have the knowledge of how to design and we lead students to it. In such cases, we adopt a position and attitude that perpetuates certain expectations of design education, many of which promote a narrow range of ways to know, be, and make worlds.*

#### An Exercise to Notice Knowing: The Project

*When was the last time you didn't structure a design studio around projects? We often default to the project as our go-to format for teaching design. But how does engaging with the world through a project lens influence what students learn? Look carefully at the tools and approaches that emerge alongside projects. How do these frame possible ways of knowing compared to times when you didn't work with a project? What do the artifacts that are produced from projects say about the student's relationship with different worlds?*

*The "project" is one of the defining characteristics of design education. Wrapped up in institutional life, we find ourselves shaping design education around predetermined quantities of time (semesters, credit hours, four-year degrees). To fit these constraints, we also begin packaging knowledge. The objectives of this project are to deliver X, Y, and Z. The project format also nudges us toward a problem-solving approach. We ask students to identify user pain points to address or to design an objective that is effective. The project is just one way of organizing design. Things move in and out of projects, extending before, during and after. Take time to notice these flows and you might also find ways of knowing that projects obscure or render insignificant.*

In this example, noticing "The Project" is a way to explore how design education knows and relates to issues that are complex and evolving. Design is infused with social, technological, political, and environmental factors that projects need to "freeze" in order to manage. This freezing-based approach lends itself to conceptualizing knowledge as something out there that we can gather, compartmentalize, and bestow (Freire, 2000). Common design tools and activities also contribute to this understanding. Problem statements, system maps, user personas are inherently reductive. And while we might recognize their limitations and myths, their connection with other institutional forces often lends itself to educational practices that privilege rational, exclusionary engagement with worlds. The power in taking notice of Knowing lies in our orientation to change. By attending to those moments when our programs support knowing as open-ended, emergent, and embodied, we might find how they relate to our attachments or commitments to each other and the local sites where we practice design education.

## **5. Conclusion and Invitation**

Today, most formal design education happens in programs of higher education. Whether private or public universities, the dominant model of design education—faculty, organized by discipline, teaching cohorts of students according to explicitly defined curricula—is entangled in all manner of systems that influence what counts as knowledge, quality, and impact for students and faculty. It is also in these contexts that many design educators find themselves striving to respond to theoretical developments that emphasize

the importance of diverse ways of knowing and being for design. Indeed, design education must confront the “information revolution,” and adjust perspective from a focus on discrete artifacts to complex evolving, interconnected systems (Davis & Dubberly, 2023).

Unfortunately, shifting vantage points can reveal things you might rather not see. Looking at design in relation to systems highlights the dangerous relationship that our practices have with unsustainable and unjust economic and ontological models. In response, scholars have recommended the development of curricula to move design education “toward a relational, ontological, and pluralistic perspective” (Noel et al., 2023, p. 182). Despite the orientation toward systems in the development of curricula and pedagogies, design educators have little to go on if they want to act on the implications of pluriversality, especially when it comes to the ways we organize and manage our programs. With this initial sketch of *The Field Guide for Noticing Institutional Life*, we hope to prompt more engagement and experimentation with the practices of organizing our design programs in specific, and design education at large.

Is it reasonable to expect design educators to engage with noticing institutional life? After all, many of us are experts in our discipline, not management or organizational studies. And as practice theorist Andreas Reckwitz reminds us, there may be little affective motivation to dedicate attention to areas outside our cultivated interests and skills (Reckwitz, 2016). Facing this situation, we have modest aspirations for the Field Guide. We do not expect the guide to unleash a sea change in the practice of design education. Rather, we see the guide as a prompt—or perhaps a probe—to generate critical discussion and reflection about the forces that shape design education and how we might find ways to start shaping it otherwise. It is our small effort to invite exploration of tools, interactions, contexts, and languages to change “the ways in which we deal with ourselves and things so that futuring is enabled” (Escobar, 2018, p. 168).

In no small part, this effort departs from our own moments feeling trapped and helpless in the face of institutional bureaucracy. At times it can feel like there are only two paths ahead: accept the institution or leave it. Indeed, we are keenly aware that the most popular tools for managing organizations evolved within a paradigm we seek to disrupt. Our aim, therefore, is to support design educators by developing alternatives to “the master’s tools” (Lorde, 2003). Yet, in confronting our entanglements with established institutions, we recognize that we need to find ways to work with new tools in relation to our everyday realities. Therefore, we close our call to notice with a reminder from Paolo Freire that education is constantly remade in praxis: “in order to be, it must become” (Freire, 2000, p. 84).

## References

- Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780822395324>
- Akama, Y. (2017). Surrendering to the ocean: Practices of mindfulness and presence in designing. In *Routledge handbook of sustainable design* (pp. 21–35). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315625508-21>
- Akama, Y. (2021). Archipelagos of designing through ko-ontological encounters. In *Arts-based methods for decolonising participatory research* (pp. 129–145). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003053408-8>
- Alvesson, M., & Spicer, A. (2019). Neo-institutional theory and organization studies: A mid-life crisis? *Organization Studies*, 40(2), 199–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840618772610>
- Berman, E. P., & Paradeise, C. (2016). Introduction: The university under pressure. In *The university under pressure* (Vol. 46, pp. 1–22). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X20160000046001>
- Blue, S. (2019). Institutional rhythms: Combining practice theory and rhythmanalysis to conceptualise processes of institutionalisation. *Time & Society*, 28(3), 922–950. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X17702165>

Coughlan, J. (2023). Design and the polysemy of value: On a problem within the language of valuation studies. *Valuation Studies*, 10(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.3384/VS.2001-5992.2023.10.1.167-197>

Cross, A. (1983). The educational background to the Bauhaus. *Design Studies*, 4(1), 43–52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X\(83\)90007-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X(83)90007-8)

Davis, M., & Dubberly, H. (2023). Rethinking design education. *She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation*, 9(2), 97–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sheji.2023.04.003>

de la Bellacasa, M. P. (2011). Matters of care in technoscience: Assembling neglected things. *Social Studies of Science*, 41(1), 85–106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306312710380301>

Escobar, A. (2018). *Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822371816>

Findeli, A. (2001). Rethinking design education for the 21st century: Theoretical, methodological, and ethical discussion. *Design Issues*, 17(1), 5–17. <https://doi.org/10.1162/07479360152103796>

Findeli, A., & Benton, C. (1991). Design education and industry: The laborious beginnings of the Institute of Design in Chicago in 1944. *Journal of Design History*, 4(2), 97–113. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jdh/4.2.97>

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.). Continuum.

García-Sánchez, I. M. (2015). Language socialization and marginalization. In *The Routledge handbook of linguistic anthropology* (pp. 415–433). Routledge.

Hui, A., Schatzki, T., & Shove, E. (Eds.). (2016). *The nexus of practices: Connections, constellations, practitioners*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315560816>

Huybrechts, L., Benesch, H., & Geib, J. (2017). Institutioning: Participatory design, co-design and the public realm. *CoDesign*, 13(3), 148–159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15710882.2017.1355006>

Izaguirre, F. (2021). Field guides, the senses, and the shaping of environmental values in America. *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, 28(4), 1354–1370. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isle/isaa142>

Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review*, 33(4), 499–517. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2092438>

Law, J. (2015). What's wrong with a one-world world? *Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory*, 16(1), 126–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1600910X.2015.1020066>

Linde, C. (2008). *Working the past: Narrative and institutional memory*. Oxford University Press.

Lorde, A. (2003). The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. In *Feminist postcolonial theory: A reader* (pp. 25–27). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781474470254-003>

Nicholls, E. J., Henry, J. V., & Dennis, F. (2021). 'Not in our name': Vexing care in the neoliberal university. *Nordic Journal of Science and Technology Studies*, 9(1), 65–76. <https://doi.org/10.5324/njsts.v9i1.3549>

Nicolini, D. (2012). *Practice theory, work, and organization: An introduction*. OUP Oxford.

- Noel, L.-A., Ruiz, A., Van Amstel, F. M. C., Udoewa, V., Verma, N., Botchway, N. K., Lodaya, A., & Agrawal, S. (2023). Pluriversal futures for design education. *She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation*, 9(2), 179–196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sheji.2023.04.002>
- Ober, M. (2022). Design is not for the weak: On the use in design education. *Arcos Design*, 15(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.12957/arcosdesign.2022.64291>
- Perkin, H. (2007). History of universities. In J. J. F. Forest & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 159–205). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-4012-2\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-4012-2_10)
- Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices: A development in culturalist theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2), 243–263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310222225432>
- Reckwitz, A. (2016). Practices and their affects. In A. Hui, T. Schatzki, & E. Shove (Eds.), *The nexus of practices* (pp. 65–79). Routledge.
- Schatzki, T. R. (2019). *Social change in a material world*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429032127>
- Schatzki, T. R. (2021). Forming alliances. In M. Lounsbury, D. A. Anderson, & P. Spee (Eds.), *On practice and institution: Theorizing the interface* (Vol. 70, pp. 119–137). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X20200000070003>
- Simpson, B., & den Hond, F. (2022). The contemporary resonances of classical pragmatism for studying organization and organizing. *Organization Studies*, 43(1), 127–146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840621991689>
- Star, S. L. (1999). The ethnography of infrastructure. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(3), 377–391. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027649921955326>
- Swanson, H., Law, J., & Lien, M. E. (2018). Modes of naturing: Or stories of salmon. In T. Marsden (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of nature* (pp. 868–888). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473983007.n46>
- Taylor, C. A., Pihkala, S., Cranham, J., & Hogarth, H. (2024). Doors: Object lessons in un/hinging university spaces. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 0(0), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2023.2299517>
- Walker, R. (2019). *The art of noticing: 131 ways to spark creativity, find inspiration, and discover joy in the everyday*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

#### About the Author:

**Andrew Whitcomb** is an Assistant Professor in The Design School at Arizona State University. His current research investigates the structure and practice of design education, particularly the relation among community issues, learner experiences, and institutional models.

# P/REFERENCES OF DESIGN

**This contribution was presented at Cumulus Budapest 2024: P/References of Design conference, hosted by the Moholy-Nagy University of Art and Design Budapest, Hungary between May 15-17, 2024.**

## **Conference Website**

[cumulusbudapest2024.mome.hu](https://cumulusbudapest2024.mome.hu)

## **Conference Tracks**

Centres and Peripheries  
Converging Bodies of Knowledge  
Redefining Data Boundaries  
Bridging Design and Economics  
Speculative Perspectives  
The Power of Immersion  
The Future of Well-being  
Taming Entropy: Systems Design for Climate and Change  
Ways of Living Together  
Cumulus PhD Network

## **Full Conference Proceedings**

<https://cumulusbudapest2024.mome.hu/proceedings>

ISBN Volume 1: 978-952-7549-02-5 (PDF)

ISBN Volume 2: 978-952-7549-03-2 (PDF)

DOI Volume 1: <https://doi.org/10.63442/IZUP8898>

DOI Volume 2: <https://doi.org/10.63442/TADX4016>

## **Conference Organisers**

Moholy-Nagy University of Art and Design Budapest (MOME)

[mome.hu](https://mome.hu)

Cumulus Association

[cumulusassociation.org](https://cumulusassociation.org)