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Your paper: 
fixed format, fixed size, anonymous for fair review

get it right in time...
Structure of an empirical paper

INTRODUCTION

The introduction section provides background information and sets the stage for the research. It typically includes:

- A brief overview of the topic
- A statement of the research problem
- A review of the existing literature
- A clear statement of the research question or hypothesis
- A description of the research methods

METHOD

The method section describes the research methods used in the study. This includes:

- A detailed explanation of the research design
- The selection and description of the participants or sample
- Information on data collection and analysis techniques
- Discussion of ethical considerations

RESULTS

The results section presents the findings of the research. This may include:

- Tables and figures to illustrate data
- Statistical analyses and interpretations
- Discussion of the significance of the findings

DISCUSSION

The discussion section interprets the results and their implications. It may include:

- Comparison with previous research
- Limitations of the study
- Implications for future research
- Theoretical or practical implications

CONCLUSION

The conclusion section summarizes the main findings and their significance. It may include:

- A restatement of the research question or hypothesis
- A discussion of the implications of the findings
- Suggestions for future research

REFERENCES

The references section lists all the sources cited in the paper. It follows a specific citation style.
A better world with digital flowers

To improve life for people, many things were tried. A new idea is that giving them hi-tech flowers can make them more happy. We tried and found a small, but promising, effect.

Ways of making people happy have been giving them money, food, health, peace.

Send them digital flowers, which speak their name. We expect this makes them terribly happy.

We made flowers, gave them to 12 randomly selected Dutch people on TU Delft campus, asked them to rate their happiness.

Average happiness was 5.3 for those who got flowers, a control group rated 4.0. Variance is 0.5

The increase is significant, suggesting it works. But it was less large than expected. Testing on campus and only Dutch participants is an important limitation.

Talking flowers may be a hopeful direction. But more research is needed before we can apply it to global sales.


References:
Warning! Competing Genres

Article
I think it is so because... and because...

Diary
And then I did this, And then I did that, And then, ...

Tutorial
You must do this, And you must do that, And...

Detective
Keep on reading, you will find out at the end...
Reading orders

title
authors
abstract
keywords
introduction
review
new idea
method
results
discussion
conclusion
references
I don’t know why I am reading this. Let’s see what they wrote.
Do I know them?

Do they know what I know?

Do they know who I know?
Can I learn what I am looking for? Or should I throw this away (!)?

I don’t believe it

I don’t understand it enough

I want to learn more about it
The locomotive **pulls the train**

Chapter 1, 
Paragraph 1, 
Sentence 1, 
chapter 2, ...
paragraph 2, ...
sentence 2, ...

The locomotive **motivates** and **promises**, 
the rest of the train **delivers** the promise. 
(e.g., the introduction)
Tip! bad, good, and better captions

Figure 23

Figure 36 Senseo coffee maker

Figure 46 Picture of a bicycle

Figure 87 The two-part grille is BMW’s visual signature
Tip! Use your visual skills in planning

Make thumbnails of your paper. In different parts, typically forms of visuals are used for different purposes. Plan them early.
Your annoyances as a reader...

Did you ever think the following when reading a paper:

“where is this going? What will be next?”

“what does this mean? I read it three times and don’t understand.”

“hey! Suddenly a new subject is introduced, and I am not told why!”

“Hey! I don’t just believe that! Give me some proof!”

“He writes he did this, and that, and that, but why (should I know)”
Writing process:
empathize with the reviewer
Clear

New

True

Relevant

Like

That’s where it all starts

Here’s where communities have their specific rules, demands, and expectations

And yes, there’s more than just the above rules
Clear

- Can I see what the author wants to say?
- Is the whole thing a puzzle for me?
- Can I see the 30 second message

New

- Do I learn anything I didn’t know yet?
- Did the author add value?
- Is it more than a summary?

True

- Am I convinced?
- Is evidence given?
- Is the claim proven?
- Do I trust the reasoning?
- (not: Is it my opinion too?)

Relevant

- Can I use this?
- Will it help me do *my* job?
- Does it connect to the theme?

Like

- Does it excite me?
- Is there a spark
- Something special that don’t fit under the CNTR criteria?
- (feel free to be subjective here)
Use the CoNTRoL reference card

The table on this page explains each of the criteria. On the flip side, example sentences from reviews are put together, both positive and negative comments (note that sometimes positive and negative occur in a single statement). Although these were cut away from their context, they give a taste for the type of things that reviewers (and authors) pick up.

In the 2015 and 2017 editions of the CIC conference exercise, each author received three reviews. First a peer review of the paper by two fellow CIC students, last a final review of the improved paper by staff researchers. Because some of the work handled in peer review was not mature, sloppy, or even pro forma, we ignore the papers for which one of the peer reviewers indicated it was "not a serious effort" (4 peer reviews of 48 authors). This leaves us with a set of 357 peer reviews of 194 papers, and 188 staff reviews of final papers on which the data shown here is based.

The abstract gives strong, clear, message. The Introduction clearly states purpose of the paper. The Introduction announces setup of paper, The Introduction positions the research question, There is a clear definition and discussion of key terms (biography, semantics, self-actualization, self), Good use of illustrations, but place them closer to the relevant text. Good use of examples makes content easy to grasp and fun to read (examples in displaying the framework), They can help to give overview of many types of projects that you mentioned (up), The role of rotation pops up suddenly in the discussion, I particularly liked the user-reel to phone example because it illustrated the nature of the useful, meaning Your... easy to catch in rules. It functions as an outlet for reviewers to express their enthusiasm, and give other comments.

All reviews used the CoNTRoL criteria, ratings were given as a series of stars from 0 (in serious need of improvement) to 5 (excellent). The criteria fall apart in three groups.

The top group centers on CLEAR. This is the basic which has to be sufficient, or none of the other criteria can be judged, and the reviewer will not LIKE it either.

The second group centers NEW, TRUE, and RELEVANT, and for each there are clear guidelines and key questions, which to some extent depend on the community to which the reviewers belong (e.g., scientists may put more emphasis on TRUE, practitioners more on RELEVANT).

Finally, LIKE is a category for the things that are not so easy to catch in rules. It functions as an outlet for reviewers to express their enthusiasm, and give other comments.

Contributes to the debate. Others Insights to designers and design research.

The author sometimes jumps to conclusions. The relationships between inspiration and intuition are implied but not articulated, position of meaning within DIT is not clarified. It is not shown how the data was analyzed, whether figures 1 and 4 were based on studies or anecdotal reports.

The author sometimes jumps to conclusions. The relationships between inspiration and intuition are implied but not articulated, position of meaning within DIT is not clarified. It is not shown how the data was analyzed, whether figures 1 and 4 were based on studies or anecdotal reports.

The author sometimes jumps to conclusions. The relationships between inspiration and intuition are implied but not articulated, position of meaning within DIT is not clarified. It is not shown how the data was analyzed, whether figures 1 and 4 were based on studies or anecdotal reports.

The author sometimes jumps to conclusions. The relationships between inspiration and intuition are implied but not articulated, position of meaning within DIT is not clarified. It is not shown how the data was analyzed, whether figures 1 and 4 were based on studies or anecdotal reports.
Tip! Say what you mean
Give a definition where needed

---

**THE WORD DESIGN CONSIDERED HARMFUL**

Discussions about design can easily get confusing because the noun *design* is loaded with different meanings and connotations. Here are a few of its definitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning...</th>
<th>As in...</th>
<th>Such as...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The result</td>
<td>Design expo</td>
<td>That which is realized in the world, e.g., product, service, experience, system, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing (as an activity)</td>
<td>Design process</td>
<td>Activities of creation, exploration, development, performed by an increasingly diverse range of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designers (design professionals)</td>
<td>Design should lead innovation</td>
<td>Designer often refers either to professionals (possibly with a specific education and/or work experience) or to people who perform specific roles in the design activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design community</td>
<td>Design changes the world</td>
<td>A phenomenon of many stakeholders, notably designers but also policymakers, interacting in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design intention</td>
<td>Done by design</td>
<td>Common usage, indicating there is an intention rather than a haphazard result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styling</td>
<td>Designer jeans</td>
<td>Aesthetic qualities typically added to distinguish a product from the competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ In this article we use the term *design* to denote the activity of doing design.
Writing process (suggested)

1. Determine your contribution
2. See how it fits into what is known
3. Make your claim, and argue it
Writing process (easy bits)

1. Determine your contribution
2. See how it fits into what is known
3. Make your claim, and argue it
4. Fill in the factual bits
Writing process (improve clarity)

1. Determine your contribution
2. See how it fits into what is known
3. Make your claim, and argue it
4. Fill in the factual bits
5. Write the introduction
6. Write the abstract and improve title
7. Improve your visuals, and write clear caption
Writing process (improve appeal)

1. Determine your contribution
2. See how it fits into what is known
3. Make your claim, and argue it
4. Fill in the factual bits
5. Write the introduction
6. Write the abstract and improve title
7. Improve your visuals, and write clear caption
8. Review and rework, and again...
Writing process (main advice)

Don’t let the tips keep you from writing!

*Do it!*  
Get it out quickly, then rework.
Argumentation = reasoning + evidence
Convincing readers

Value statements
Author writes: “designers should do this”
  Reader asks: “Why should they? Give me reasons!”
Author writes: “A is better than B”
  Reader asks: “what is your criterium for calling something ‘better’?”

Statements and claims
Author writes: “Without petrol, cars won’t run”.
  Reader asks: “Convince me... Prove it...”

Argumentation can have the form of:
  a logical argument: cars use petrol engines, Malcolm (1848) explains how a petrol engine needs petrol;
  evidence: I did the following experiment which proves this;
  citation: Jones (2007) did an experiment which proved this;
So what?!
Evidence does not speak for itself

“Mean length is 6.5 meter”.

Figures and tables should always be referred to in the running text (before the figure appears)

Point it out!
The caption or the running text should tell the reader what he or she should see in the picture or table, or what the interpretation of a measurement it.
Tips per section

**title**

The title is the first thing people will see: make it appealing and informative (AIDA).

Tip: People will see your title in a table of contents, imagine how your title looks in a list.

**abstract**

Many readers read the abstract instead of the paper

The abstract summarizes not only the introduction and main idea, but also what was done and what was found

**introduction**

The introduction leads the reader into the problem field where the paper is situated; it starts in general terms, and explains the focus of the paper, the question addressed. It may flow directly into state of the art and new idea.

In writing the introduction, do not assume that the reader has read the abstract!

**review & new idea**

When you have indicated your question/focus/problem, you should explain what is already known about this (literature, existing products, etc).

It often works best to do that first, then explain your new idea, and then compare your new idea to what was known earlier.

Review and new idea may well be one section.

**method**

The method section describes what you did with enough detail for the reader to
• understand where your results came from
• repeat the essence of your method and find results that can be compared to yours
Don’t give too much or too little...

**results**

The results section describes what you found on a DATA level, with no interpretations given yet.

E.g., “with the walking aid, patients could walk 500 meters unaided”

**discussion**

The discussion section interprets of the results presented, e.g.

“with the walking aid, patients will be able to travel from home to work independently”

The discussion connects back to the state of the art and your new idea, and discusses if your new idea succeeded.

**conclusion**

The conclusion is the last section of text. In it, you move back to the level of abstraction of the introduction, explain what the importance is of what you found, and indicate broader impact of the work, and possible future steps for research or application.
### Papers sorted by title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full papers</th>
<th>Short papers</th>
<th>Design Cases</th>
<th>Workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Design Evaluation Method based on Emotional Reactions and Buying Intentions; A Case Study: a Lifting Storage System Designed for Small-space Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Good Design = A Good Mate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Kansei study of the sounds of different bottom area of heeled shoes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Perspective to Understand Emotional Design: Extending of Design Methods with Inherent Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Study on Emotional Changes by Visual Movements and Sounds in the Virtual Space -Focused on Cases of Producing Digital Wind-bell Applications-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Sustainable Product Design Model: Inspired by Studies on Everyday Chinese Objects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As light as a leaf: Product Metaphor Generation for Experience-Driven Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autobiographical memories with emotional significance in architectural design conjecturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Simple Nostalgia: Nostalgic Design on the Stage of Modern Chinese Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond the Switch: can lighting control provide more than illumination?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Electric: human powered electronic garments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q: Must the sections be exactly: ‘introduction, question, state of the art, new idea, method, results, discussion, conclusion, references’?
   A: No, there is room for variation. What I showed is only the ‘standard’ structure people write often and read easily.

Q: Must the section headings be called ‘introduction, question, state of the art, new idea, method, results, discussion, conclusion, references’?
   A: No, you can use the heading to give information. But don’t vary it for fun. If you have a section with ‘method’, don’t call it ‘what I did’, because expert readers will look for ‘method’ or ‘discussion’.

Q: Must I use the prescribed layout and typefaces? I can make much prettier ones?
   A: Yes, you must use the prescribed format. This is required to make the work of different authors comparable, and allow reviewers to concentrate on the content of the writing.
The ‘I’ word – a matter of style

Q: when can I use ‘I’ or ‘we’ in a scientific paper? I heard that this should never be done.

A: opinions differ. Traditionally this is discouraged, because the truth of the observations should not depend on who thought/said/did it. These days, especially in design and the social sciences, there is more room.

This is what we do:
Use ‘I’ or ‘we’ only where it matters to the reader and the message that it is you personally.

Examples:

*I calculated the mean value of the responses.*  
NO (that should not matter)

*I handed out the workbooks to participants in person the week before the interview.*  
YES (it matters who did it)

*I think that plastics don’t rust.*  
NO (there is objective evidence)
Q: Why cite and refer

A: You cite in the text to
• **point to evidence** (that you don’t provide yourself)
• **indicate where more information can be found** on a theory, product, method that is important for your argument.
• **give credit to the author** that ‘invented’ it.

Every work explicitly cited must be in the reference list. No other works should be in the reference list (a reference list is not a list of suggested readings, or ‘other things I read’).
Types of citations per section

- **Title**: general papers, overviews, examples from the media, ...
- **Abstract**: Theories, important cases
- **Introduction**: Work that is similar or ‘outside work’ that you build on.
- **Review & New Idea**: Justification of why you used a method, or places where those methods are explained in detail
- **Method**: (When a new perspective emerged in the discussion) Work that has similar or different findings
- **Results**: Work that is similar or ‘outside work’ that you build on.
- **Discussion**: Work that has similar or different findings
- **Conclusion**: Work that is similar or ‘outside work’ that you build on.
Q: How to cite and refer

A: In the running text, point to the reference list, so the reader can find the reference. There are two main systems to give a citation:

• With numbers, e.g.,
  “We use the definition of affordance given by Gibson[3]”
• With authors and year of publication, e.g.
  “Gibson (1979) defined ‘affordances’ as ...”

The reference list then shows


In the references section, provide all information needed to locate the cited source. This includes: authors, title and year of publication, title of journal or conference, volume, page numbers. Again, there are many styles of doing this, ‘APA style’ is very commonly used.

In the format for the C&C conference: you can choose a style (but one which is complete), but stick to one style.

Tip: use one of the styles that Google Scholar can produce for you.
Use the CoNTRoL reference card

**CoNTRoL REFERENCE CARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLEAR</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>RELEVANT</th>
<th>LIKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your message has to arrive. Think of readability of task and choice of font, correct grammar and style, using definitions of specialist terms, selecting things in the right order, indicating what is important, clarifying complex structure with diagrams.</td>
<td>You must make clear what your contribution is (switch out for plagiarism). Journals often state that they want original (i.e., not yet published) work.</td>
<td>Your helps convince your audience of the claims you make, present evidence and credible reasoning. (reader: convincing to a better word than “true,” but less easy to remember)</td>
<td>Your reader wants something that he or she can put to use, e.g., actionable, interesting.</td>
<td>Various things make readers happy or frustrated. It can be your posture, care or slowness, the insights you bring, particularly likely examples, and not every comment can be fit into the first fact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do I understand what the author wants to say? Is the whole thing a puzzle for me? Can I see the 3D second message?</td>
<td>Do I learn anything I didn’t know yet? Does the author add value? Is it more than just a summary?</td>
<td>Am I convinced? Is evidence given? Is the claim proven? Do I trust the reasoning? (not: Is it my opinion too?)</td>
<td>Can we use this? Will it help me do my job? Does it fit the call?</td>
<td>Does it excite me? Is there a spark? Any comments that don’t fit under CoNTR on the one hand? (Feel free to be subjective here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, visuals, melodies, errors, sentences, words, terms, tables, plots, spelling, underling, easy, long structures, centing, improved, tone, pictures, graphs, supportive, competitor, definitions, translations, illustrations, pages, bullet, picture, quote, punctuation, conflict, jump, press, writing.</td>
<td>Combination, offer, novel, wants, combined long, currently, propose, appropriate, new, field, perspective, text, context, attempt, successful, solve, referencing.</td>
<td>Reliable, evidence, stating, impressive, assumptions, argumentation, critical, contradicting, citations, forget, usher, summarized, truth, assertions, tasks, connections, credible, evaluate, grounds, argumentations, references.</td>
<td>Audience, interest, guide, researchers, relevant, reference, architects, possibilities, suggestive, teachers, insights, facilitating, igneous, fits, interesting.</td>
<td>Words, sections, written, description, visual, clear, helpful, practical, understood, resonances, figure, hypothesis, research, examples, clarity, class, structure, rule, understand, explained, understanding, abstraction, overview, intention, needs, reading, background, improve, section, theoretical, difficulty, check, review, coming, good, fine, ideas, now, combined, view, creative, designer, sure, offer, statement, complexity, repeat, cannot, contribution, given, insight.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table on this page explains each of the criteria. On the right side, example sentences from reviews are put together, both positive and negative comments (note that sometimes positive and negative occur in a single statement). Although these were cut away from their context, they give a taste for the topic of facts that reviewers (and authors) pick up on.

In the 2015 and 2016 versions of the CoNTRoL conference exercise, each author received three reviews. First, a peer review of the paper by two follow CbC students. Last, a final review of the improved paper by staff reviewers. Because some of the work handed in for peer review was not mature, sloppy, or even pro forma, we ignore the papers for which one of the peer reviewers indicated it was “not a serious effort” (4 peer reviews of 48 authors). This leaves us with a set of 357 peer reviews of 164 papers, and 18 staff reviews of final papers on which the data shown here is based.

All reviews used the CoNTRoL criteria, ratings were given as a series of stars from 1 (in serious need of improvement) to 5 (excellent). The criteria fall apart in three groups. The first group centers on CLEAR. This is the basic which has to be sufficient, or none of the other criteria can be judged, and the reviewer will not strike it. The second group centers on NEW, TRUE, and RELEVANT, and for each there are clear guidelines and key questions, which to some extent depend on the community to which the reviewers belong (e.g., scientists may put more emphasis on NEW, practitioners more on RELEVANT). Finally, LIKE is a category for the things that are not so easy to catch in rules. It functions as an outlet for reviewers to express their enthusiasm, and give other comments.

![Graph](image-url)
That’s it for now...