

Study on clarification of the design evaluation criteria

Intended for Good Design Award

Ayaki Sakuma¹, Yusuke Ashizawa², Kenta Ono¹, Makoto Watanabe¹

¹*Chiba University*

²*Japan Institute of Design Promotion*

Abstract: Recently, the meaning of design is rapidly diversifying. We design for wider range of fields, which include tangible and intangible subjects, and design itself has a broader concept. Along with the globalization of society, that of design is also developing. Activities related to design are brisk all over the world, and international exchanges are also more active than before.

Those movements influence not only on the activity of designing but also on the side of evaluating them. Diversifying of designing subjects and globalization of designing activities have great influence on evaluation of designs, therefore we are strongly requested to make the criteria and certain viewpoints clearer.

The purpose of this study is to define the evaluation criteria for "Good Design Award". This award is a comprehensive program for the evaluation and encouragement of design. It has a function of promoting designing aiming industrial development through designing, therefore the accountabilities to the applicants are important for realization of the objective. As it is also promoting global activities, they are advancing activity to Asia through the system cooperation with the design organizations and the awards established in Asian countries. In order to give explanation to the applicants and to make evaluation globally with sufficient understanding, judging committee should be given an obvious criteria and viewpoints.

Based on above needs, I observed the evaluation of 2012's award and recorded what judging committee did. I wrote down committee members' speeches and behaviors from the video I recorded, and analyzed that by sorting out their notable speeches or classifying their behaviors.

Through this analyze, I found two hypotheses. The first is "existence of unchangeable criteria and changeable criteria with passage of time". There are unchangeable viewpoints which compose base of criteria from past to present, while there are changing viewpoints composed of accumulating discoveries through the annual award. The second is "subtracting criteria and adding criteria". Subtracting criteria is minimal criteria applicants must obey. Those who do not fulfill these criteria cannot pass even though some excellent points their designs have. Adding criteria is specific characters strongly appealed. Judging members select better applicants comparing these characters.

Taking these two hypotheses into account, this study can be useful as a manual of global evaluation and as a reference for newly appointed judging committee members, or as feedbacks to applicants who support industrial development.

Key words: *Design promotion, Design evaluation and viewpoints, Design criteria*

1. Introduction

The purpose of this study is to make clearer criteria and viewpoints for design evaluation. Therefore, “Good Design Award,” which is one of the design evaluations representing Japan, was chosen, and it was analyzed by investigating the judging, evaluation, and selection situations. Based on the result, the viewpoint that is needed for design evaluation is clarified, and (new) evaluation criteria are proposed.

2. Overview

2.1 Back ground

Recently, the meaning of design is rapidly diversifying. We design for wider range of fields, which include tangible and intangible subjects, and design itself has a broader concept.

By technical innovation, the places of craftsmanship increased and more diverse design was demanded.

Furthermore, according to the changes in people's lifestyle, the design of concepts, which do not have physical forms, such as experience, service, and a system, came to be valued. Based on this present condition, the field called "design" spread quickly, and it is becoming difficult to define a "good design" in general.

Along with the globalization of society, that of design is also developing. Design activities are performed with vivacity in Europe, America, and also Asia and international exchanges are also prosperous. The international exchange of designs is standard. For example, companies invest in foreign countries, and many design workshops in which multiple countries participate are held. In education fields, studying abroad is becoming active and programs such as MEDes are constructed.

Those movements influence not only on the activity of designing but also on the side of evaluating them. Diversifying of designing subjects and globalization of designing activities have great influence on evaluation of designs. Design evaluation has greatly contributed development of design activities. In order to show the future indicator of design, we are strongly requested to make the criteria and certain viewpoints clearer.

2.2 Subject of study

In order to clarify the criteria and viewpoint of design evaluation, this study inquired for “Good Design Award” in Japan. This award is a comprehensive program for the evaluation and encouragement of design organized by Japan Institute of Design Promotion. Choosing "good designs" from the phenomena developed variously, and showing it to the society, it aims to lead industry, living, and the whole society to be better.

In order to achieve this purpose, clear selection criteria are needed. And, the explanation to the applicants of the results, which acts as feedback and can achieve improvement in design, are important for realization of the objective. Moreover, Good Design Award is advancing international activities to Asia through the cooperation with the design award of Asian countries, and the design organization of each country. In Asian countries, the necessity for design is increasing as economy is remarkably growing. It has a great hope also for Good Design Award that evaluates and recommends designs. Then, in order to build a high quality life and society in each country through design and contribute to advancement of the social economy of whole Asia, international exchange and promotion activities are performed positively. In recent years, many objects not only from Japan but from overseas have applied, and evaluations are held in foreign countries including South Korea and Taiwan. To give explanation to the applicants and to make evaluation globally requires sufficient knowledge and deep

understanding.

To perform the examination, judging committee should be given an obvious criteria and viewpoints. For the screening, there are five important words summarizing the basic concept and four viewpoints to evaluate each entry. Japan Institute of Design Promotion suggests that the criteria should change with the times. But, it also presents five important words as philosophy based on humane thinking.

HUMANITY --Inspiration for products and conceptual embodiments

HONESTY --Perceptiveness toward contemporary society

INNOVATION --Concepts to pioneer the future

ESTHETICS --Imagination for prosperous lifestyle culture

ETHICS --Reflecting on society and environment

These are considered as the definition of good design. With these as the central idea, they have established four viewpoints while placing importance on "thinking from various points of view," in order to induce the ability to understand the proposal during the screening.

Viewpoint for human body

Viewpoint for lifestyle

Viewpoint for Industry

Viewpoint for society and the environment

These are prepared not as the criteria of single focus thinking but as language to support the thinking required for screening. However, as mentioned above, the objects, which are applied these days, are diversified and complicated. From the idea and viewpoint which were set up now, discussions and judgments can be made, feedback which leads to improvement in the society after giving concrete explanation are not done sufficiently. Moreover, examination developed abroad is performed with local judging committee. For promotion of understandings of judging committee who newly joined, Good design award needs viewpoints refined more than the present.

2.3 Study flow

As study investigation, I observed the evaluation of 2012's award. While recording two or more judging committee member by using video, the situation of screening was recorded asking questions occasionally. I wrote down committee members' speeches and behaviors from the video, and analyzed that by sorting out their notable speeches or classifying their behaviors. Consideration is performed from this analysis and assumption was found out based on the background of the criteria and the viewpoint of examinations. Through the past examples, the viewpoint and concept required in future design evaluation were arranged, and a possibility of making criteria establishment is searched for.

3. Investigations and Analysis

3.1 Investigation overview

I requested cooperation with five good design award judge committee and I made them the universe. I observed the secondary screening in front of the actual products themselves, and investigated focusing on video

3.4 Analysis

Out of the arranged word and action, the keyword about evaluation was extracted and the classification division was performed. 149 keywords were checked out of the 118 for all examination proposals. They were as follows when they were classified. The keywords were classified into six larger classifications, and were further classified into the category of 17 as small classifications.

(1) Evaluation viewpoint

The point, which can be the target of discussions. Deviation appeared also in the viewpoint.

Evaluation item -- Simple item. Reference was not made deeply.

Regard-- Items which should be observed, such as safety and danger, were discussed.

Usability -- Evaluation by the viewpoint of users was increased.

Expression of a proposal -- Many words about impressions or appearances were observed.

Technical matter -- It was discussed also as the argument and addition item as design.

Combination -- It was discussed about matching of evaluation viewpoints.

Cost -- The cost that product takes.

Accuracy -- It was discussed most. It became a final judgment element in many proposals, and it was spoken in high and low evaluation.

(2) About companies

There are many discussions evaluating about the company that proposed.

Attitude of companies -- discussions are held to evaluate the attitude of companies, such as a measure and efforts.

Comprehension of a company -- They referred to the difference in what they requested and comprehensions of companies.

(3) The method of proposals

They discussed the "methods of proposals" which is not restricted to items that are applied.

Intention of a proposal -- They evaluated to not products but the backgrounds such as Intentional precision and fun.

Expressing powers of proposals -- It becomes of the evaluation criteria whether the proposals are fully transmitted to the judge committee in many cases, i.e. the exhibition method, how to show data, etc.

(4) The judge committee opinion

Evaluation was judged synthetically and the intention and hope were discussed.

Evaluating points -- They discussed the number of the items and synthetic judgment instead of individual evaluations.

Evaluation possibilities -- When proposals cannot be discussed and evaluations as design were not done, they were discussed in many cases with argument of technical requirements.

Judges' Hope -- They referred to development of the future of proposals as the judge committee.

(5) Change with passage of time

It is the almost same item as the novelty that is the criteria. However, many arguments related to anteroposterior relation that is not made to the same kind as one criteria, the history of companies, and the history of design were performed.

(6) Category

The scene of discussing beforehand not the criteria but the category that judges proposals was observed.

Table 1. Evaluation viewpoint

Evaluation Item	Regard	Usability	Expression of a proposal	Technical matter	Combination	Accuracy
	Risk to user		Awkward	Forming	Matching	Forming
Beauty	Risk to product	Feeling	Cheap	New Tec	Conception	New Tec
Charm	Regard for	Usability	Flashy	How to use	Use material	How to use
Interaction	safety	Comfort	Expression	Accuracy of Technic	Combination	Accuracy of Technic
Invention	Consideration	Sense of	Extravagant	Technic and Economic	Cost	Technic and Economic
Necessity	Regard for	use	Rough	Function		Function
	trouble	Visibility	Dynamic	Improvement	Reasonable price	Improvement
	Fine regard				Fearing cost	
	Sureness		Simply	Add point		Add point

Table 2. About companies and The method of proposals

Attitude of companies	Comprehension of a company	Intention of a proposal	Expressing powers of proposals
Sticking to the basis	Poor understanding	Existence of basis	Understanding degree of intentions
Sincerity	Misunderstanding	Clear improving point	Articulateness of product's claims
confidence	Mature consideration	Not moving	Existence of document
Expression of efforts	Accuracy of directions	Concreteness	Clarity of visions
Lack of efforts	Mistake and Correct answer	How to catch meanings	Having question or not
Skinmping works		How to convey will	Plainness
A lot of guts		Pellucidity of reasons	Visualized situation
Good ways of thinkings		Satisfaction	Partial expression
Excuse		Fun of intentions	Abstract
Viewpoint		Clarity of approaches	
Prize for efforts		Relations of intentions and results	
Company's moving		Articulateness of reasons	

Table 3. The judge committee opinion, Change with passage of time and Category

Evaluating points	Evaluation possibilities	Judges' Hope	Change with passage of time	Category
Not unique	Unevaluable in industrial viewpoints	Desiring expansion into the world	Improved	Business
Few evaluation points	Receipt impossibility as proposals	Difference with expectations	Invention not to be connected next	Universal

Much deduction	Inappropriate as good design	More than imaginations	evolving	Solution to the problem
Little deduction	Unevaluable by design	Want to support	Outdatedness	
Not bad	Not design properly	Threatened domain	Like the initial design	
No evaluation point	Unevaluable	In face of the development to the foreign countries	Not found development	
Outstanding refinement	Impossible of judgment as design	Thinking that I want	Supersession	
	Work of the craftsman	Not ashamed to be chosen	Orthodox	
		De facto standard	Old-fashioned	
		Standard in industry	Deteriorating	
			Having the history	
			Past results	
			Maturity	
			Novelty	
			New development	
			Commonplace	

4. Consideration

4.1 User's viewpoint and Industrial viewpoint

The direction of how the judges evaluate was roughly divided into two.

The first is the direction that discerns the object which should be recommended with a user's viewpoint. The other is direction that discerns the object which should be recommended with the viewpoint of the whole industry.

In order to elect "good design" and to evaluate the element which the object itself has, it naturally judges with a user's viewpoint about a fixed valuation basis. And if the Good Design Award aims at industrial development at all, in order to evaluate "the use of the design to society", it can be said that industrial viewpoints are indispensable evaluation criteria." Evaluation criteria", "Consideration", "Usability" which carried out the classification division are the evaluations which originated in the user. Moreover, the evaluations such as "The posture of a company," "The comprehension of a company to design," which evaluate the company itself and helps manufacture a better product, is an examination aiming at industrial development. The utterance of "A view to overseas" as a judge's hope and "Liking to aid" is also evaluation based on the promotion purpose peculiar to Good Design Award that is not looked at by other design awards. By having a user viewpoint, which a universal design award has, and a viewpoint of industrial development, the evaluation serves more as promotion of the improvement in design of companies.

Therefore, it has a possibility of growing the field as feedback by leaps and bounds. It can be said that it is possible to play a role of not mere feedback but a design consultant.

4.2 Safety and Accuracy

Also in evaluation criteria, "Safety" was extracted specially and taken up because a different field in basis from other evaluation criteria existed. Other evaluation criteria judge right and wrong as an argument, unite other arguments with the result, and consider them in combination.

However, if it results in safety, when the item is not fulfilled, the proposal is not passed even if it has the characteristic which was excellent in others. Although this was not able to be checked by this investigation, it can say the same thing even in fields, such as "Social order" and "Morality."

It is necessary to classify the minimum standard with other evaluation criteria. The "accuracy" discussed this time most was taken up specially. After finishing many arguments, the case where it finally became a standard of judgment was observed by many proposals. "Accuracy," which was discussed the most, was taken up specially. After finishing many arguments, the case where it finally became a standard of judgment was observed by many proposals. These evaluations have played a role of an additional element, and these are in the state where it separated from the center of the argument.

Although the evaluation criteria which take the lead in an argument, of course could also become an addition-of-points element, "Accuracy" was additionally discussed by many scenes. Thus, when there was also a standard which success or failure influences by one of the items, existence of the standard additionally added as the last judgment has been checked.

4.3 Evaluation possibility

There are some evaluations in which, "could not be evaluated". As the background also described, the concept of the diversified design may ask examination for the proposal sometimes beyond the domain. In this investigation, it had a lot of discussions about technical requirements. Of course, technical requirements are also one of the important elements of a design.

However, when the opinions of the proposal which should be evaluated are only technical requirements, it is a fact that it is also impossible to make a judgment as a design. Thus, argument about whether it is possible to be evaluated, or how the proposal should be categorized beforehand, or the correspondence to a complicated examination is performed flexibly. First, discerning well the base of the evaluation criteria which judge whether it can evaluate or not is in demand. It should put, whenever it examines the element which constitutes the base, and the element used as a new base.

4.4 Changeable criteria with passage of time

It classified in distinction from the "Novelty" which is one of evaluation criteria.

Although the meaning as a standard newly evaluated is contained in evaluation criteria "Novelty", in many cases, the meaning "It is a forefront" is pointed out. While changeable with passage of time also has implications called the standard as new entry, it is the feature to also mention the standard evaluated no longer.

Even if evaluated to some extent the case where it is no longer evaluated with changes of a time even if it is the object evaluated in the past, and now, future development may be unable to expect. It was confirmed that there was a standard which changes and goes by passing through time from the past to the future. Moreover, although it is a rare case, also when the standard which was not evaluated in the past changes so that it may be evaluated with changes of time, reference can be made from an award example.

5. Hypotheses

5.1 Unchangeable criteria and Changeable criteria with passage of time

As consideration described, the changeable criteria with passage of time has a meaning important for design examination complicated in recent years. Moreover, it is necessary to take in the change as structure as it says also in the text published at the idea which the as Good Design Award of 2012 has held up, "The standard should change with times." Then, existence of an unchangeable standard and the changeable criteria with passage of time is mentioned as a base of a valuation basis. There is no less than 55 years of history in Good Design Award, the viewpoint which always serves as a criterion of judgment in the history exists, and the viewpoint from which a sense of values changes and combines and a valuation basis also changes with changes and the social trends of the times exists. The changeable criteria with passage of time to the big base of an unchangeable standard is accumulated in an annual examination. It becomes a base which change takes place to the screening criterion after a degree next year, and stacks new discovery by repeating the new discovery and technical innovation of sense of values.

There is an LED light as an example for the changeable criteria with passage of time. The LED lighting with which commercial production was advanced by invention of the blue LED in 1996 was evaluated quickly -- the candidate for an award in the 2003 fiscal year will be 3 or more times than the 2002 fiscal year. However, the quality for which an LED light is asked increases now, and the product evaluated in the past and a product when progress of technology is little are no longer evaluated. It came to carry out evaluation which gazed at the past -- there is neither an initial design nor a future view -- and the future simultaneously. On the other hand, the example evaluated when the technology by which it was not evaluated in the past, catches change of a sense of values also exists.

"eneloop" was evaluated by first in a roll in 2007, from the communication power and the construction power of a brand of expressing ecology thought based on the battery charger which was the existing technology. Then, evaluation as ecology thought is made natural and the product has evolved as promotion of change to a new life style as of 2012. Thus, the past novelty may be estimated to be natural now and the past technology may be evaluated with a sense of values. However, although the influence which the standard which ages has on an annual examination is great, don't forget that the eternal standard used as a base occupies most as an evaluation viewpoint.

5.2 Subtracting criteria and Adding criteria.

As "the safety and accuracy" of consideration described, both the standard which success or failure influences by one of the items, and the standard additionally added as the last judgment exist. Thus, evaluating all the standards by the same layer has inconsistency. Then, the former should be made into a subtracting criteria, the latter should be made into an adding criteria, and a valuation method different, respectively should be developed. A subtracting criteria is a minimum standard which an object should observe. What proposal does not fill this is not passed even if it has the characteristic which was excellent in others however. For example, it is asked whether

ethical fields, such as safety and morality, are kept or social order is not disturbed. An adding criteria is the characteristic against which an object appeals strongly.

6. Conclusion

Evaluation of design became more important because the places of craftsmanship increased in number quickly in postwar Japan.

Good design award has pursued and recorded design with changes with the ages over a long period of time.

Complication of the design field of these days is a big turning point and reviewing of the evaluation criteria and the viewpoint will affect future design fields. More concrete and clearer viewpoints give better explanations to the applicants. The improvement in design of companies is promoted by returning explanations as feedbacks. As consideration also described, the applications as not only feedbacks but design consultants can be expected, and the further development potential exists.

Moreover, by checking the criteria, the viewpoint which the judge committee has can be identified once again. Furthermore, it enables new judge committees to promote understandings and to activate overseas examinations and more development of design evaluation is also expected.

Although the criteria and viewpoint of design evaluation were considered in this paper based on two assumptions, About the usefulness or rationality, I have not come to specify a basis scientifically. Moreover, new consideration may be found from the recorded survey content.

It is necessary to continue the consideration and examination in the future.

Acknowledgment : Cooperation of this subject graduate school was received when investigating this study.

I appreciate the direction of all that cooperated with a Japanese design promotion meeting and the staffs of Chiba University in writing.