ITU A|Z • Vol 15 No 3 • November 2018 • 13-27

Different goals, different criteria: Perspectives of jury members in industrial design competitions in Turkey

İrem DİLEK[1], Pınar KAYGAN[2]
[1] iremd@metu.edu.tr • Department of Industrial Design, Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey
[2] pkaygan@metu.edu.tr • Department of Industrial Design, Faculty of Architecture, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey

Received: October 2017 • Final Acceptance: September 2018

Abstract
In the last decade, popularity of industrial design competitions organized in Turkey has increased significantly. The increase in their number, and the educational scholarships offered to the winner design students and young designers as a prize, led industrial design competitions to become prominent among design promotion activities in Turkey. Industrial design competitions also carry importance in terms of bringing professionals from different fields of expertise together in their evaluation juries. Considering the increased importance of industrial design competitions, this article explores the perspectives of jury members from various fields of expertise in jury evaluations of industrial design competitions in Turkey. The fieldwork consists of observations in the evaluation juries of five design competitions and interviews with 15 jury members from different fields of expertise. Based on the findings obtained from the fieldwork, the study shows that the relationship between jury members are patterned by their different, in some situations even conflicting, perspectives on both the goals to be achieved with these competitions, and the priorities that shape their evaluation criteria.

Keywords
Design competitions, Design juries, Design evaluation, Collaboration in design.

doi: 10.5505/itujfa.2018.45477

1. Introduction

Today, design and product development are no more an individual activity of industrial designers. Integration of different perspectives is considered to be essential for the future of design (Erlhoff and Marshall, 2008; Torrisi and Hall, 2013). The increase in competitive pressure and product complexity that results from ever-developing technologies requires experts with diverse backgrounds to work together in product development processes (Dykes et al., 2009; Steinheider, 2000). Design collaboration between different fields of expertise, however, should not be considered a merely technical issue. Instead, studies that focus on interdisciplinary design collaboration have shown that developing a shared understanding and a common goal between team members through social interactions plays an important role on the extent to which collaboration is achieved (Feast, 2012; Kaygan and Demir, 2017).

Existing studies on collaboration of different fields of experts for design and innovation have mainly focused on two contexts. Examining interdisciplinary collaboration in educational contexts, researchers have identified the problems encountered and developed strategies to enhance the collaboration between students (see for example Busseri and Palmer 2000; Eppinger and Kressy 2002; Fixson 2009; Richter and Paretti 2009, Yim et al., 2014). Another body of work has addressed professional contexts looking at the relations between the members of interdisciplinary product design and development teams (Pei et al., 2010; Rasolifuar, 2014). This article aims to contribute to the latter, by investigating a previously unexplored context, which is the jury evaluations of industrial design competitions. Design competitions in Turkey offer a fruitful context where experts from different fields come together to evaluate a number of design projects by foregrounding their own perspectives. In Turkey, in research and development and design development departments of leading producing companies, and in SMEs which invest in design development facilities, industrial designers work with experts from different disciplines; especially engineering and business administration; they also work with interior designers, architects, and graphic designers (Düzakın Yolsever, 2000). An overview of the existing competitions suggests that juries of industrial design competitions in Turkey are formed in respect to this. Currently, evaluation juries of industrial design competitions consist of professionals from different fields of expertise. Industrial, graphic and interior designers; architects; mechanical, electrical and electronics, computer, food and marine engineers; marketers and journalists are the most common examples of members of design juries (Design Competitions, 2016). In addition, in each competition jury, there are also jury members who represent the organization that host the competition, manufacturers, managers of manufacturing companies or company owners who are not classified under a particular profession or discipline.

Drawing on the systematic observation of jury evaluations of five competitions and interviews with 15 jury members, this article seeks to understand to what extent and in what ways design competitions can be understood as an opportunity to create a collaborative dialogue between jury members from different fields of expertise in the evaluation of design projects in Turkey. The article begins with a literature review that provides contextual information regarding the recent popularity of design competitions and their link to the increasing recognition of industrial design profession. It then goes on by explaining research design, which is followed by the presentation of the findings. The article ends with the discussion of, first, how the perspectives of jury members differ and in what ways expertise-based differences among jury members influence the evaluation process, and second, the implications of design competitions for the status of industrial design profession in Turkey.

2. Design competitions in Turkey

The emergence of industrial design competitions in Turkey dates back to 1970s. Organized by Eczacıbaşı Vitra in collaboration with Or-An Collective Housing Project, Ceramic Sanitary Ware Design Competition can be re-

garded as the first design competition in Turkey (Düzakın Yolsever, 2000). This competition was organized in accordance with the competitions in architecture discipline, since on that date, in Turkey, industrial design was not regarded as a separate discipline and there was not any institution giving industrial design education.

Until the early 2000s, the number of design competitions organized in Turkey remained limited (Hasdoğan, 2016). They were primarily organized by either manufacturing companies such as Vestel Industrial Design Competition in 1990, Scrikks Pen Design Competition in 1990, Çanakkale Seramik Floor Tile and Sanitary Ware Design Competition in 1977; or by industrial design departments of universities in collaboration with manufacturing companies such as Toilet Bowl Design Competitions in 1993 and 1995 by Mimar Sinan University and Istanbul Water and Sewerage Administration, Jean Caravan Design Competition in 1996 by Mimar Sinan University and Levi's (Düzakın Yolsever, 2000).

After 2005, when the integration of industrial design within Turkish industry development programs became permanent in state strategies, industrial design competitions in Turkey gained popularity and increased in number (Tezel, 2011). Design events and design promotion programs started to be financed by governmental institutions such as the Turkish Exporters Assembly (TİM), which operates under the Ministry of Economy and represents more than 10 exporters' associations in and outside of Turkey (TİM, 2011). As well as contributions of TİM, the efforts of Industrial Designers Society of Turkey (ETMK) within that period raised the awareness of industrial design in Turkish industry and society (Tezel, 2011).

Working in the field of design and representing industrial design and designers in Turkey, Industrial Designers Society of Turkey (ETMK) was founded in 1988 as a non-governmental organization (Hasdoğan, 2012; ETMK, 2016). To show the potential of industrial design to industry and the Turkish society, in 1994, ETMK organized the first design promotion activity which is called Designers' Odyssey (Hasdoğan, 2009a). Design promotion activities with the efforts of ETMK continued until the new millennium, when ETMK started searching for sponsorship and possible commercial partners for design promotion activities. This is when ETMK got into contact with Turkish Exporters Assembly (TİM) and their collaboration started (Hasdoğan, 2009a). With the experiences gained since 1994 and a wish for a nationwide event, in 2006, ETMK started to work for forming a good design evaluation system that will create good design standards for the different fields of the industry. In order to create a system, an advisory committee consisted of design professionals, design academics and interdisciplinary experts was formed and their opinions on the topic had been taken until 2008 (Hasdoğan, 2009b). After the first Design Turkey Industrial Design Awards in 2008, some changes were made in the criteria set, categorization and grading in order to simplify the scheme and the latest version was shaped (Hasdoğan, 2012).

Reviewing the current literature, it can be suggested that Good Design Criteria which were created in and have been improved since 2008 were instrumental in the creation and development of current industrial design competitions' list of conditions and evaluation criteria. Moreover, this formation and the contributions of ETMK underlie the evolution of industrial design competitions in Turkey; the increase in their number and popularity.

In the absence of any published document giving detailed information about industrial design competitions in Turkey, we prepared the Table 1 in order to demonstrate the current situation regarding the increasing popularity of design competitions. It presents the number of industrial design competitions in the last six years by making use of a website called Design Competitions. Design Competitions is an interactive information network on different fields of design including industrial, graphic, fashion and architecture. It announces national design competitions and their results to a wide crowd of students and professionals.

The table demonstrates the significant increase in the number of industrial design competitions organized in Turkey since 2011. As the table shows, currently, industrial design competitions organized in Turkey seem to fall into three categories. These are, (1) competitions annually organized by unions under Turkish Exporters Assembly (TİM) with the support of Turkish Ministry of Economy, (2) competitions annually organized by industrial associations without any support from the Ministry of Economy or TİM, and (3) competitions organized by the Turkish corporate companies, some municipalities and local development agencies in relation to their specific agendas such as corporate identity.

The aims of the competitions under these three categories seem to be different. For the first and the second types, the sustainability of these competitions is essential. They primarily aim at developing original, designed products with high-added value. They also focus on bringing industrial design students and professionals together with different sectors in the Turkish industry (IMMIB, 2016; MOSDER, 2016). However, the competitions within the first category are more export-oriented compared to those within the second, which plan to contribute to the related sectors at national level by generating original and feasible design ideas (IMMIB, 2016). On the other hand, looking at the information on the websites of the competitions in the last category, we can say that, the aim is to capture design ideas which are original, applicable and compatible with their corporate identities.

Majority of these competitions are open to both industrial design students and young professionals. While the first two types are organized annually and provide the winners with monetary awards as well as scholarships to continue their postgraduate studies abroad, the last type is generally organized for once and offers cash or internship in the company as a prize. According to Erhan (2015), along with the opportunities provided to winners with prizes, industrial design competitions in Turkey provide design students and professionals with additional opportunities such as testing their skills at the national level, meeting the sectors in the industry and being employed in the industry.

Table 1. *Number of national industrial design competitions in the last six years.*

Years	Unions under TİM	Other Unions	Development Agencies, Municipalities, Companies	Total Number
2011	8	6	9	23
2012	6	14	8	28
2013	15	12	9	36
2014	4	8	8	20
2015	17	15	6	38
2016	20	13	10	43

The Turkish Design Advisory Council (2014) indicates that, beyond increasing the awareness of industrial design in Turkish society and the industry, design support programs also carry importance in terms of strengthening communication and cooperation between different actors in relation to design; such as industrialists, educators, professional organizations and public cooperation. Being one of the most important design promotion activities since the mid of the first decade of 2000s, industrial design competitions are a growing area where people from various fields of expertise come together to formulate competitions and to evaluate design projects to award.

3. Research design

In order to generate rich and intense empirical data, we designed a two-stage data collection process. Since this study is concerned with the relationship between jury members from different fields of expertise during the evaluation of design projects, it was important to capture the interaction between all jury members. To achieve this, participant observation was adopted as the primary method that enables us to gain an insider perspective in the exploration of what happens and how it happens in the real jury settings (Emerson et al., 2001; Glesne, 2011).

Table 2. *Areas of expertise and the numbers of interviewed jury members.*

Area of Expertise	Number
Design Academic	6
Design Practitioner	4
Engineer (one mechanical, one electrical and electronics, one chemical engineer)	3
An Academic from the Field of Fine Arts	1
An Academic from the Field of Administrative Sciences	1

Following the juries, observation data was complemented with semi-structured interviews, which were carried out with jury members to investigate how they make sense of their experiences in jury evaluations. In our research design, we were informed by the argument that once observations allow the researcher to have an opinion on the researched group, interviews have the potential to add a deeper understanding (Eder and Fingerson, 2001). Developing this methodological framework, our aim is not to draw generalizable inferences, but to develop a rich and in-depth understanding of the relations between actors in evaluation jury settings as common in qualitative research methods (Flyvbjerg, 2004).

In the selection of the evaluation juries of competitions to observe, two criteria were identified. First, the juries which include online evaluation phases were eliminated, and the ones carrying out the evaluations together with all jury members in real physical settings were considered. Second, since the aim of this study is to investigate the jury evaluations of industrial design competitions by experts from different fields, juries consisting of members from diverse fields of expertise and backgrounds were selected.

The selection process took almost five months, during when the calls for industrial design competitions in Turkey were regularly followed. In order to ask permission for the attendance of this article's first author at the jury evaluation meetings as observing researcher, we chose to send e-mails to the various actors of the competitions. These actors included organizers of the competitions and jury members as long as the names of the jury members of the competitions were announced in advance. Overall, we carried out systematic observations of the evaluation juries of five design competitions, which took place in three different cities, between December 2015 and September 2016. Each jury evaluation meeting was scheduled for one full day, but the duration of the juries varied depending on the number of the projects and categories evaluated, the number of the stages of the evaluation processes, and the time spent by the jury members to make the final decisions regarding the award winners. As a result, observations lasted between four to nine hours. During observations in design juries, audio or video was not recorded. All the observations were recorded as hand-notes considering the confidentially of both jury members and the jury evaluation.

The selected five competitions addressed product design in different industrial sectors. In total, there were 48 jury members participated in the jury evaluation meetings of these five juries. In every jury, there were at least one design academic, one design practitioner, one engineer and one representative from the organization that hosts the competition. In addition to these, depending on the topic of the competition, juries could also have members from other related fields of expertise, such as graphic design, interior design, architecture, fine arts, communication, and social and administrative sciences.

In the selection of the interviewees, we ensured obtaining diversity by inviting jury members who are design academics, design practitioners, engineers and organization representatives. Overall, 15 out of 48 jury members volunteered to take part in the second stage of the research. Areas of expertise and the numbers of interviewed jury members are presented in the Table 2.

The interviews covered questions regarding (1) working together with people from diverse fields of expertise in the field of industrial design, (2) advantages and disadvantages of working with people from other fields of expertise, (3) role distribution in juries, (4)

motivation in participating in design juries, and (5) different perspectives of jury members regarding how they evaluate design projects. Interviews lasted between 30 to 50 minutes. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed for the analysis.

For the two types of data collected through observations and interviews, two analysis methods were employed. Observational data were analyzed with a thematic conversational approach. Conversational analysis has served as a useful method for design researchers who accept design as a social process, and explore how designers understand and negotiate their own perspectives and others' within design-based settings (Oak, 2010). Since in conversational approach to analysis attention is directed to the data of naturally occurring talk and how words are interpreted and responded in design-based setting, it is used to analyze the observation data in this study.

Data collected through interviews, on the other hand, was analyzed with thematic template analysis method (King, 2012). The initial template was formed using the analysis of observations. Some of the codes emerged from the data obtained from observations also showed up in the analysis of interviews. In addition to these codes in the initial template, from the interview data new codes also emerged. The initial template was revised as the new codes appeared.

During the data analysis process, for the initial coding process, 85 pages of transcriptions of field notes and 150 pages of transcriptions of interview data were coded. During the first round of coding, we went through each sentence and assigned one or more codes to the sentences. Until no new or similar data was encountered, initial coding was repeated. In the end of the first round, relevant codes were grouped with each other and the codes were put in order.

In the second round of coding, in respect to most relevant and frequent themes, coding was carried to spreadsheets in MS Excel to organize codes. Although Excel is considered as a "number cruncher" that is more applicable to the analysis of quantitative data, its structure, data manipulation and display features make the researcher enable to utilize it for qualitative analysis as well (Meyer & Avery, 2008, p.91). Once the initial codes were defined and the most relevant and frequent codes were put in order; modifications on codes were made. Some of the codes were merged, some of them were removed. When the final template was achieved, conversations and quotations selected to illustrate and provide evidence for the findings were translated into English.

4. Perspectives of jury members from different fields of expertise

The analysis of the observations in evaluation juries of the five competitions and interviews show that the relationships between jury members are patterned by their different, in some situations even conflicting, perspectives on both the goals to be achieved with these competitions, and the priorities that shape their evaluation criteria. Findings regarding these two issues are presented separately below.

4.1. The goal of the design competitions

Our findings identify significant differences between the expectations of jury members from the field of industrial design and representatives of organizations that host the competitions regarding what to be achieved through industrial design competitions. These differences were first observed in jury evaluations. During the follow-up interviews, they were also brought into discussion by the participants from the field of industrial design as an important concern.

In the juries when the jury members express their opinions regarding the goal of industrial design competitions held in Turkey, industrial designers describe their primary expectation as promoting industrial design profession. They suggest that these competitions offer a chance to industrial design students and professionals to test their skills and learn from the results. They expect industrial design competitions to bring recognition and visibility to the award-winning design students and professionals not only in Turkey,

but also in the international design market. Doing this, industrial designer jury members believe that industrial design competitions can enhance the awareness of industrial design in the Turkish industry and to provide sustainable developments in the field. The quote below by an industrial designer illustrates their expectation from design competitions:

Designer (Practitioner): Industrial design competitions enable designers to improve themselves by taking one step further in our country and in the world with the understanding of design adding a value to life. It is very significant and critical that design competitions started a learning curve and sustained the developments. Further, they are promising for the future of industrial design field in Turkey.

For the jury members representing the organizations that host the competitions, on the other hand, the goal of the industrial design competitions is to bring visibility and prestige to the hosting organization in the related industry. Observations in the juries showed that in evaluating design projects, these jury members are primarily concerned with how the competition and the organization are perceived by public, industry and the other organizations that host industrial design competitions within the same industry. This concern was usually voiced in the final phases of the jury evaluations where the final decisions are made regarding the award-winning projects, in order to ensure that the selected projects are "newsworthy" and aligned with the image that the hosting organization aims to create. In some juries, with this concern in mind, organization representatives could even ask for a change in juries' decisions. In the following quote, the organization representative explains why an amendment is required in the list of the selected award-winning projects: "*This does not look like a design product. So, think again please, is it really your final decision? Sorry, but it doesn't have any place and value in terms of the promotion of the competition.*"

The reasons behind such interventions can be explained by the fact that these competitions require considerable investment. Organization representatives seem to attach great importance to the recognition that competitions and organizations gain in return. They seek to announce the award-winning projects to a wide audience through social media, online newsroom, and publications in which these projects appear, such as catalogs.

Although the interview guide did not include a specific question regarding the aims and goals of design competitions, this issue has also been raised in the interviews by the participants from industrial design field, in a way that supports our observations. They indicated that the goal of the organizations that host competitions is to make themselves visible by supporting and making investments in design competitions. The quote below illustrates the shared opinions of both the practitioner and academic industrial designers on the goal of organizations in formulating industrial design competitions:

Designer (Practitioner): What do people who organize the competition actually plan? They either have an approach like, "Let's organize competitions"; so that they'll always be active and take part in the media or they'll come out with new ideas to the market and to take one step further. I honestly think that the first one has the stronger influence. Of course, for me, in terms of development of the profession, involvement of industrial design students in the sector, their motivation, and the effort of new graduates to improve themselves, competitions are good. However, when we leave everything aside, when we prune everything off, all that's left is the promotion of these organizations.

Paralleling with our observations in the juries, the industrial design practitioner distinguishes between his and the hosting organization's expectation from the competitions. According to him, competitions are related to the development, improvement and motivation of industrial design professionals, students and the profession itself. This shows that he expects design competitions to contribute to the status of industrial design field in Turkey. On the other hand, he expresses his opinions on the goals of organizations by using

phrases such as *being always active, taking part in the media* and *promotion*. So, for him, what to be achieved with competitions for their organizers is to make themselves visible by organizing competitions regularly.

Below another industrial designer shares her thought referring to the events and publications (specifically catalogs in which winner projects appear) that are mentioned above:

Designer (Academic): The number of the projects implemented is quite few. Rather than implementing the design projects, celebrating the results of the competitions, award-winning projects and the award ceremonies are more attractive to the organizations that open these competitions. In relation to the resources spent, looking from outside, celebration, ceremony and publication seem to be the biggest motivations behind organizing design competitions.

The account of the industrial design academic parallels with the previous quote by a design practitioner. In a similar way, she refers to the celebrations, award ceremonies and publications as the most important outcomes of design competitions for the hosting organizations. Exploiting these events, thus, organizations demonstrate how much they support and invest in design and designers. In this quote, the industrial design academic explains the goal to be achieved for her by placing emphasis on "implementing the design projects". What she calls implementing the projects, however, is more than mere manufacturing: In the analysis, we identified that for both her and the other designer participants, implementing a design project as an outcome of design competitions corresponds to the increase in the visibility of its designer(s), and as a result, all industrial designers and the profession. In order for the competitions to contribute to the field of design, designs should be implemented.

4.2. Evaluation criteria in the juries

In addition to the differences in the expectations from industrial design competitions, our findings show that the evaluation criteria of jury members also varied according to their fields of expertise. Our observations suggest that in the juries, design projects are evaluated through three criteria from three different expertise-based perspectives. These are concerned with, first, to what extent the design fits into a convincing usage scenario; second, whether or not the design is suitable for manufacturing; and third, whether or not it can find a place in the market. These three criteria, which are described below, were observed in the juries during the discussions on design projects.

Jury members from the field of industrial design evaluated projects primarily considering the user and usage scenario. They tended to validate their decisions by criticizing projects in relation to this criterion as the below quote illustrates.

Designer (Academic): I understand, you like the idea but the use of this product contradicts the existing usage scenario of the dessert inside. The distinguishing feature of the dessert inside is that the fruit remains in the juice; in fact, sinks to the bottom. It has been consumed like this for centuries but what this concept offers its users is the exact opposite. Here, fruits are separated from the juice with this part; they are not in the juice. If the student designed it, for instance, for a beverage, it would be very good design project. But, no, here the scenario does not work. It does not match with how inside product is consumed.

In the example, the industrial design academic is talking about a packaging design concept. Although jury members from other fields of expertise like the idea, she points out that the proposed use of the design project does not match how the beverage inside the package used to be consumed. In this way, she confirmed that the usage scenario does not work for the beverage inside.

While in this example, the designer refers to the usage scenario to explain the poor design decisions, there were also cases in which the user and the usage scenario viewpoints are used to draw attention to strong points of the design project.

Designer I (Academic): A successful scenario was built. Well-functioning scenario… Every step of that corresponds

to the user's life. And in relation to its design, the product matches up with the usage scenario.

Company owner in the Related Sector: So, how will it be produced? How to get out of the mold?

Designer II (Practitioner): It is possible with split core.

Company owner in the Related Sector: I am not sure whether the production of this will be worthy of such an expensive mold.

Engineer: I liked this idea quite a lot but I also have concerns about if it can be produced or not.

In addition to the perspective of industrial designers, this conservation also shows the second criterion, which is suitability for manufacturing. In design juries, jury members with an expertise in manufacturing usually consisted of engineers and/or managers of manufacturing companies in the related industry mainly tended to prioritize the issues of manufacturing and feasibility in their critiques of the design proposals. They discussed and evaluated design projects by focusing on manufacturing techniques, details and cost estimate. In one of the juries, where industrial designers found the design project successful, a manufacturer jury member explained his perspective as an expert in manufacturing regarding why the design project should not be awarded as follows:

Manufacturer: The product may be aesthetically good-looking. It has also advantages in case of cost and purchasing power, but it can't be mass-produced. What is important for us [manufacturers] is to produce fast. Otherwise, it can be done; everything can be done.

His account shows that among a number of criteria such as appearance, cost and marketability, he considers suitability for mass production as the most important criterion.

The third evaluation criterion is concerned with the marketability of the design proposal. Experts outside from the field of design, engineering and production, especially managers and organization representatives from the fields of administrative sciences employed this perspective in the juries. In the following quote, while other jury members were discussing on the area of use and production of this portable product, the organization representative from the field of administration says:

Company owner in the Related Sector: I think this design addresses the broad [market] segment. You can sell it everywhere by changing the quality of the material. You can sell this to 1TL shops, to companies manufacturing or selling phone accessories, and even to stores that sell outdoor activity equipment. It'll be sold out!

This quote illustrates that he evaluates the design project as if he is its potential marketer. In a similar way, we also observed that within this criterion some jury members discussed the projects by putting themselves in the place of the potential customers of these projects.

Organization Representative: In many tourist destinations around the world, you can see umbrellas sold as souvenirs. If you travel to New York or Paris, you'll get something like this. Personally, I would. I don't understand why you disagree with awarding this project.

Manufacturer from the Sector: Because as long as we can't make it, we can't produce it here, there's no point. It may be low in cost but this design can't be produced here. This is the reason.

In this example, two jury members are talking about a souvenir project. During the discussion, organization representative evaluates the design project and defends her opinion against the other jury members by acting as if she is the potential costumer of the discussed project. However, the quote shows that the manufacturer's perspective is quite different. According to him, since the design cannot be produced within the current technologies in that specific area, this project does not deserve to be awarded.

The conversations and statements we presented above not only demonstrate the different three evaluation criteria that we witness during the juries, but also reveal the different set of vocabularies through which jury members explain and validate their opinions and decisions. We observed that the experts criticizing design projects from the marketing viewpoint have difficulties in expressing their opinions and

reasons in detail. They generally make very short comments on the projects. *"I like it very much", "It looks so sweet.", "This is a creative idea", "This is beautiful.", "Never sells, no way", "If it existed, I would definitely buy!"*, and *"It would be sold out!"* are some of the sentences we encountered in the five design juries we observed. Although these sentences explicitly communicate the other jury members that they do or do not support that specific project, they fail to clarify the reason behind.

Designers, on the other hand, usually explained the reasons of their decisions at great length. When expressing whether they found the project successful or not, they discussed the reasons in all its aspects. The statement below illustrates how designers justify their decisions:

Designer (Academic): This project is one of my favorites here. I say so because it concerns the whole life of the product. It gives the answer to the question what will happen to the product when the thing inside is consumed. It offers an alternative to post-use. Likewise, the form of the product coincides with the usage scenario.

In all five juries, we observed that, compared to the other jury members, designers are better-equipped for demonstrating the reasons of their decisions. Being able to justify their opinions in detail, at a great length seems to bring designers to an advantageous position in jury evaluations. In this way, they manage to attract the notice of non-designer jury members to their views. Whether designers can convince the others or not, every time in negotiations with other experts they present a set of long-winded arguments and they seem to invite others to try to think within a broader perspective.

Broader perspective of designers in project evaluation in the juries was also voiced in interviews with jury members from the field of industrial design. Confirming our observations in the juries, different criteria that jury members from different fields of expertise employ in evaluation of design projects were also evident in the interviews. In the interviews, primarily the first two of the three criteria mentioned above, which are concerned with the user and manufacturing, are voiced by industrial designers and engineers respectively.

In the interviews, both industrial design academics and practitioners emphasized that their evaluation criteria are based on the user and use context. In addition, they underlined that industrial designers are the only jury members who can take the user and the use context into consideration and, as a result, evaluate design projects within a broader perspective. A design academic, for instance, answered as follows, when she was asked to reflect on different perspectives in jury evaluations:

Designer (Academic): Other experts approach design projects from a manufacturing and/or marketing points of view. As industrial designers, we know about production and marketing too, but he comes from the industry, I can never know as much as he does. That is certain; this is also the expectation of the jury members. (…) After all, distinguishing feature of us is our user-oriented approach. Whatever the designed product is, we should engage in the point of its interaction with its user.

The industrial designer describes the designer's evaluation criterion comparing it to the criterion of non-designer jury members. Identifying user-oriented approach as the distinguishing concern of designers, however, she underlines another point: Industrial designers are the only professionals who bring the user perspective into evaluation juries. In a similar way, another design academic underlines the significance of the designers' unique perspective as follows:

Designer (Academic): I think one of the most important mechanisms of design competitions is to tell experts, who come from the industry and formulate these competitions, that the use of product and usage scenario are important. They can't consider 'use' because they pay attention to the production, cost and sales. The experts coming from the industry have concerns about how much they'll produce, how much they'll sell and how much they'll save.

According to him, jury evaluations of design competitions create a suitable environment for industrial designers where they find the opportunity to ex-

plain the importance of the user and use context to non-designer jury members, who have other priorities.

Our interview data show that designers believe that they have a holistic approach in project evaluation, while non-designers focus on one single factor, being aware of only their own perspectives. For this reason, in the interviews, designers claim that bringing the user and the use context into discussion in the juries pushes non-designer jury members to pay attention to those criteria and evaluate projects from a broader perspective.

Despite this claim of designers, in the interviews with non-designers we did not encounter any reference to user and the use context as an evaluation criterion in the juries. Indeed, it was surprising for us to see that interviewees who have backgrounds in engineering, despite their different roles (academician, manager in a producing company and manufacturing company owner) describe designers' criteria quite differently from what we observed in jury evaluations and what designers stated in the interviews. Example below reveals how engineers interpret their own criteria and consider the evaluation criteria of industrial designers. One of the engineers, who is the owner of a manufacturing company, said:

Engineer (Owner of a Manufacturing Company): The biggest problem here isn't being able to attract [the attention of] the private sector, in other words, the industrialists [to design competitions]. They don't believe that there would be a positive value coming out from [design competitions]. Although they're invited, the number of those who attend the juries is really small since they don't find the projects detailed enough. When we can't see the manufacturing method, detail or cost wise information, we can neither comment on nor evaluate how they look, whether they're beautiful or not, as designers do.

The statement clearly shows engineers' criteria for evaluating design projects focus on production-related issues such as the manufacturing methods, details and cost. For him, designers' criteria, on the other hand, consist of concerns regarding the appearance of the projects. By using a very specific word, "beautiful", he claims, in design juries, designers evaluate projects considering whether they are aesthetically satisfying or not. The point of the engineer is a very good example representing how industrial designers' priorities are perceived by non-designers in their professional life.

Overall, although in juries designers evaluate projects considering their interaction with users and the context in relation to function and utility, engineers claim that designers evaluate projects considering aesthetic-related issues such as appearance and form. Thus, our findings show that while designers are aware of the priorities of non-designers, non-designers do not seem to demonstrate the same awareness. Designers consider jury evaluations of industrial design competitions as a good place to contribute to perspectives of non-designers by introducing them to the user-centered approach in the evaluation juries of competitions. However, non-designers, especially those whose expertise are in manufacturing, do not seem to perceive this effort. Instead, they seem to leave the juries without much change in their presumptions regarding industrial designers that they have previously developed.

5. Conclusion

This article investigated jury evaluations of design competitions in Turkey in order to shed light on how the perspectives of jury members from different fields of expertise influence their relations and interactions in these meetings. Based on the findings presented above, the article draws two main conclusions.

Firstly, observations in the evaluation juries and interviews with jury members revealed that there are significant differences between the expectations of invited jury members from the field of industrial design and representatives of organizations which host the competitions regarding the goal of industrial design competitions. For the former, the mission of the industrial design competitions is to increase the visibility of industrial design students and professionals, and as

a result, to contribute to the status of industrial design profession in Turkey. We discussed that designer jury members attach great importance to implementation of award-winning design projects by the manufacturing companies that carry out design competitions or by the members of the associations that host competitions. In this way, industrial designers anticipate a significant increase in the recognition of industrial design profession among manufacturers from various sectors of the Turkish industry. The objective of organization representatives, on the other hand, is to bring visibility and prestige to their organizations in the industry. With this expectation, they make remarkable financial investments in award ceremonies and catalogs that are published to document the projects submitted to the competition. Thus, although in line with the expectations of the designer jury members there is a tendency in the literature to identify the interest in organizing design competitions as an indicator of the increasing recognition and visibility of the industrial design profession (Tezel, 2011; Hasdoğan, 2012), our findings highlight that within this picture, industrial design competitions, rather than industrial design itself, are qualified as a strategic tool that can bring competitive advantage to organizations in the industry. In this sense, competitions seem to fail to meet the expectations of industrial designers regarding the improvement of the status of their profession in Turkey.

Secondly, our findings have shown that jury evaluations are where the dualistic views on engineer-designer relations, which associate the two disciplines respectively with functionality and aesthetics, are persistently reconstructed. Levi (2007) indicates that social perceptions result in biases in the environment where individuals from diverse fields of expertise carry a task together. Confirming this argument, our findings suggest that how engineer jury members identify the evaluation criterion of designers is a direct outcome of how they perceive the industrial design profession and industrial designers. This perception has been illustrated in the studies that focus on the relationship between engineers and industrial designers in professional contexts. Kaygan (2014), for example, demonstrates that in relation to engineering in product development industrial design profession is identified as an arty, subjective and aesthetic related field of expertise. Similarly, KwanMyung and Kun-Pyo (2014) argue that engineers see designers as experts on aesthetics.

Industrial designer jury members clearly indicated that they prioritize the user by evaluating design projects considering the use scenario and the interaction with the potential user. However, in the interviews engineers did not mention user as the evaluation criterion of industrial designers. Instead, they often referred industrial designers' concerns as aesthetics-related and tended to position these against manufacturability, which is the main concern of the engineers. In that sense, it is obvious that, disciplinary bias of non-designers towards industrial designers does not change easily despite their intense interaction in jury evaluations. Carrying out evaluation of design projects together, discussing on the views, and trying to convince each other in negotiations do not seem to influence their overall views on the primary concerns of industrial design profession and industrial designers. Although designers continuously make an emphasis on the user, use context, and utility and functionality of design projects, and believe that evaluation juries of industrial design competitions are where non-designers can discover that use context and user are important factors in design, engineers insist on identifying industrial designers as specialists on aesthetics. Therefore, non-designers, especially experts from the field of engineering, bring their bias towards industrial design and designers, or experiences with industrial designers from their professional life to evaluation juries; and they leave the juries in the same way without much change in their opinions.

To sum up, there is a strong belief that design promotion activities carry importance in terms of strengthening communication between different ac-

tors including industrialists, design educators, and professional organizations (Turkish Design Advisory Council, 2014). Evaluation phases of industrial design competitions offer a good place to bring all these actors as well as other experts from different fields together. For this reason, industrial design competitions, which have considerably increased in number and are organized frequently, can be considered a golden opportunity to explain the importance of design to experts from other fields and improve the relations between those people. However, this article has shown that while the ever-increasing number of industrial design competitions in Turkey leads the word "design" to be a trend topic, these competitions do not make much tangible contributions to the status of industrial design. From the start, the number of design projects implemented and launched to the market after these competitions has been very few. Nor do industrial design competitions seem to have a considerable impact upon creating an awareness regarding the user-centered approach of industrial designers and industrial design profession. Monetary awards in the form of scholarship for graduate study abroad most probably contribute to the education and self-improvement of industrial design students. Yet, whether competitions bring visibility to industrial designers, and improve the integration of industrial design profession in the Turkish industry or not, remains a controversial issue.

Based on the findings of this study, two suggestions for forming an interdisciplinary jury can be offered. First, the structure of juries and jury processes in other creative disciplines that also have competition tradition, such as architecture, can be examined. Second, activities such as workshops that center upon interdisciplinary subjects can be organized. Institutions making an investment in the organization of these competitions can also support these kinds of activities. These activities can help to raise awareness of non-designer jury members about industrial design profession and industrial designers, establish a common set of goals, and encourage multi-disciplinary approaches to design.

6. Limitations of the study and recommendations for the further research

This research was conducted in respect to the industrial design competitions that are organized in Turkey. So, the findings of this study are limited to this geography. They may not be applicable for industrial design competitions organized in other countries because of the characteristics of industrial design competitions in Turkey. Competitions outside Turkey can differ in terms of jury evaluation processes, jury compositions, awarding systems and so on.

With this study, it is argued that, industrial design competitions organized in Turkey ensure [industrial] design as a word to keep being discussed, more than contributing to the industrial design profession in Turkey. Future studies that explore the returns of being award-winning designer on the professional practices of industrial designers in the Turkish industry could reveal another dimension of design competitions and their impact on the status of industrial profession in Turkey.

References

Busseri, M. A., & Palmer, J. M. (2000). Improving teamwork: The effect of self-assessment on construction design teams. *Design Studies*, 21(3), 223–238.

Design Competitions [Tasarım Yarışmaları]. (2016). *Endüstriyel Tasarım*. Retrieved from: http://www.tasarimyarismalari.com/category/endustriyeltasarim/

Düzakın Yolsever, E. (2000). Son Yirmi Yılda Türk Endüstrisinde Türk Tasarımcıları (Endüstri Tasarımı Eğitiminin Beraberinde Endüstrinin Tasarımcıları İstihdam Etme Biçimleri) [Turkish Designers in Turkish Industry During the Last Twenty Years] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marmara University, İstanbul.

Dykes, T. H., Rodgers, P.A., & Smyth, M. (2009). Towards a new disciplinary framework for contemporary creative design practice. *CoDesign*, 5(2), 99-116.

Eder, D., & Fingerson, L. (2001). Interviewing children and adolescents. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.),

Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method (pp. 181-202). Sage Publications.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2001). Participant Observation and Fieldnotes. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of Ethnoghraphy* (pp.352-369). Sage Publications.

Eppinger, S., & Kressy, M. (2002). Interdisciplinary product development education at MIT and RISD. *Design Management Journal*, 13(3), 58–61.

Erhan, I. (2015). Yarışma ihracata ivme kazandırıyor. In *İMMİB Endüstriyel Tasarım Yarışmaları 2005-2015*. (pp.114-115). İstanbul: Küçük Mucizeler Yayıncılık.

Erlhoff, M., & Marshall, T. (2008). Design dictionary: Perspectives on design terminology. Basel, Switzerland: Birkhauser.

ETMK [Industrial Designers Society of Turkey]. (2016). *Hakkımızda*. Retrieved from http://etmk.org.tr/tr/hakkimizda/

Feast, L. (2012). Professional perspectives on collaborative design work. *CoDesign*, 8(4), 215-230.

Fixson, S. K. (2009). Teaching innovation through interdisciplinary courses and programmes in product design and development: An analysis at 16 US schools. *Creativity and Innovation Management,* 18(3), 199–208.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2004). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research, Qualitative Research Practice, eds. C. Seale, G. Gobo, J.F. Gubrium, D. Silverman, Sage, London, 420-34.

Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming Qualitative Researchers an Introduction* (4th ed., pp. 63-182). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Hasdoğan, G. (2016, April). Endüstri ürünleri tasarımı mesleği açısından Türkiye'nin son 27 yılı. *Arredamento Mimarlık*, (300), 109-111.

Hasdoğan, G. (2012). Characterizing Turkish design through good design criteria: The case of 'Design Turkey' industrial design awards. *METU Journal of Faculty of Architecture*, 29(1), 171-191. doi: 10.4305/metu.jfa.2012.

Hasdoğan, G. (2009a). The institutionalization of the industrial design profession in Turkey: Case study- The Industrial Designers Society of Turkey. *The Design Journal*, 12(3), 311-337.

Hasdoğan, G. (2009b). *Türkiye'de devletin endüstriyel tasarıma yönelik girişimleri ve Endüstriyel Tasarımcılar Meslek Kuruluşu'nun bu girişimlerdeki rolü*. In Tasarım veya Kriz 4. Ulusal Tasarım Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı (pp.173-190). İstanbul.

IMMIB. (2016). *İmmib Endüstriyel Tasarım Yarışmaları.* Retrieved from http://tasarim.immib.org.tr/tr/yarismalar

Kaygan, P. and Demir, Ö. 2017. *Learning about others: Developing an interdisciplinary approach in design education*. In E. Bohemia, C. de Bont, & L. S. Holm (Eds.), Conference Proceedings of the Design Management Academy, Vol 5: 1595-1611. London: Design Management Academy.

Kaygan, P. 2014. 'Arty' versus 'real' work: Gendered relations between industrial designers and engineers in interdisciplinary work settings. *The Design Journal, 17*(1), 73-90.

King, N. (2012). Doing template analysis. In G. Symon & C. Cassell (Eds.), *Qualitative organizational research: Core methods and current challenges* (pp. 426-450). Sage Publications.

KwanMyung, K. & Kun-Pyo, L. (2014, June 16-19). *Industrial designers and Engineering designers; Causes of conflicts, resolving strategies, and perceived images of each other*. Paper Presented at The Design Research Society 2014, Umea, Sweden.

Levi, D. (2007). *Group Dynamics for Teams* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Meyer, D.Z., & Avery, L.M. (2008). Excel as a qualitative data analysis tool. *Field Methods*, 21(1), 91-112. doi: 10.1177/1525822x08323985

MOSDER. (2016). *Mosder Tasarım Yarışması*. Retrieved from http://www.mosder.org.tr/index.php/faaliyetlerimiz/mosder-tasarim-yarismasi

Oak, A. (2010). What can talk tell us about design?: Analyzing conversation to understand practice. *Material Culture & Design Studies*, 32, 211-234. doi:10.1016/j.destud.2010.11.003

Pei, E., Campbell, I. R., & Evans, M. A. (2010). Development of a tool for

building shared representations among industrial designers and engineering designers. *CoDesign*, 6(3), 139–166.

Rasoulifar, G., Eckert, C., & Prudhomme, G. (2014). Supporting communication between product designers and engineering designers in the design process of branded products: A comparison of three approaches. *CoDesign*, 10(2), 135–152.

Richter, D. M., & Paretti, M. C. (2009). Identifying barriers to and outcomes of interdisciplinarity in the engineering classroom. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 34(1), 29–45.

Steinheider, B. (2000). *Cooperation in interdisciplllinary R&D teams*. In Proceedings of ISATA 2000: Simultaneous Engineering & Rapid Product Development. Epsom: ISATA-Dusseldorf Trade Fair, pp. 125- 130.

Tezel, E. (2011). Industrial design in Turkey: A historical segmentation in policy, industry and design. *Intercultural Understanding*, 1, 99-103.

TİM. (2011). *TİM'in görevleri*. Retrieved from http://www.tim.org.tr/tr/kurumsal gorevleri.html

Torrisi, V. S. & Hall, A. (2013). *Missing communications in interdisciplinary design practice*. In J. Lawlor, G. Reilly, R. Simpson, M. Ring, A. Kovacevic, M. McGrath, W. Ion, D. Tormey, E. Bohemia, C. Mcmahon & B. Parkinson (Ed.), Proceedings of E&PDE 2013, the 15th International Conference on Engineering and Product Design Education (pp. 581-586). Dublin, Ireland.

Turkish Design Advisory Council [Türk Tasarım Danışma Konseyi]. (2014). *Tasarım strateji belgesi ve eylem planı*. [PDF]. Retrieved from http://www.tasarimkonseyi.gov.tr/konsey/uploads/dosya/strateji.pdf

Yim, H., Lee, K., Brezing, A., & Lower, M. (2014). *A design-engineering interdisciplinary and German-Korean intercultural design project course*. In M. Laakso & K. Ekman (Eds.), Proceedings in NordDesign 2014 conference (pp. 27–36). Espoo: Aalto University.