

FASHION DESIGN PRAXIS AND PRACTICE: THE DUALITY BETWEEN 'DESIGN FOR' AND 'DESIGN WITH'

Neshane Harvey*, Piet Ankiewicz & Francois van As

ABSTRACT

Fashion design as *design for* consumers consequently aligns with the technology-driven design and traditional user-centered design paradigms. Although not incorrect, shifts towards *design with* present the potential for an alternative fashion design praxis. However, in a South African context, fashion design praxis and practice have never been explored from the perspective of *design for* and *design with*. Without empirical investigation, the praxis and practice of fashion designers are unclear, and it is difficult to determine if *design with* emerges as an alternate strategy. A question may arise – 'so what if *design with* materialises?' – but the value lies in knowing the praxis and how it manifests in fashion design practice. This study aimed to explore and describe the praxis, as well as practice, of two Johannesburg-based fashion designers in order to determine if and how *design with* emerges. The research question is aligned with the aim: what is the design praxis and practice of two Johannesburg-based fashion designers?

Through a qualitative case study of two Johannesburg-based fashion designers, data collection was conducted face-to-face, in semi-structured interviews with the fashion designers. In addition, data collection included one dyadic, semi-structured interview with one of these fashion designers, as well as an actual user. Analysis of the collected data utilized a constant comparative method with Atlas.ti used as a tool.

The findings show that both fashion designers engaged in fashion design using a *design for* praxis. On the other hand, one fashion designer also engaged in praxis and practice as *design with*, hence an alternative strategy. The significance of this alternative strategy is twofold. Firstly, it has the potential to change fashion design praxis and practice to align with the paradigm shift towards human-centered design. Secondly, *design with* evoked inclusivity

and collaboration through actual user participation, with which to enhance design process activities and better align user needs and desires.

— Dr N Harvey*

Department of Fashion Design
Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture
University of Johannesburg
Former PhD student
Faculty of Education
University of Johannesburg
Johannesburg
South Africa
Phone: +27 (0) 11 559 1072
Email: neshaneh@uj.ac.za
*Corresponding author

— Prof P Ankiewicz

Department of Science and Technology
Education
Faculty of Education
University of Johannesburg
Johannesburg
South Africa
Phone: +27 (0) 11 559 2640
Email: pieta@uj.ac.za

— Dr F van As

Department of Science and Technology
Education
Faculty of Education
University of Johannesburg
Johannesburg
South Africa
Phone: +27 (0) 11 559 4196
Email: fvanas@uj.ac.za

ARTICLE INFO

Received February 2019
Revised June 2019
Accepted September 2019

KEYWORDS

fashion design praxis, practice, design for, design with

INTRODUCTION

There is a fundamental difference between praxis and practice. Praxis is the designer ethos, the way one thinks about and approaches the discipline of design whereas practice is the pragmatic application of praxis concepts. In fashion design, the common and perhaps dominant, praxis is *design for*. Scholars, writing about fashion design, proclaim that designers draw from multimodal aspects, such as personal feelings, self-expression, intuition, previously designed products, imagination and inspirational imagery as primary stimuli with which to drive praxis and initiate design process activities (Aspelund, 2010; Laamanen & Seitamaa-Hakkarainen, 2014; Lee & Jirousek, 2015). Such designer praxis manifests in *design for* self-gratification or products intended to meet target market consumer needs.

Market researchers study consumers as passive subjects employing data collection strategies such as literature reviews, market analysis, observations and Likert scale questionnaires to collect data about consumer needs (Keiser & Garner, 2012; Tullio-Pow & Strickfaden, 2015). As such, with *design for*, consumers are positioned at the core of marketing (Keiser & Garner, 2012). It is not the case that these strategies are inapplicable, however, *design for* pre-supposes certain considerations. If fashion designers apply secondary research to trigger the design process, the possibility exists that they may not have substantial, in-depth understanding of consumer needs. Moreover, fashion designers may not know if their designed products address target market needs if the voices of those who use designed products are excluded from design process activities.

Market research may well provide information to fashion designers about target consumer needs and trending fashions. Then again, consumer market research tends to be carried out post-product development and is thus implicated in the tail-end of the process subsequent to the design process activities of problem

identification (initial stage), ideation, conceptualisation and prototyping. It can be argued that consumer market research frames the design problem and triggers the initial design process stage. Sanders and Stappers (2008; 2012) in their fuzzy-front end design process model, maintain that the initial stage is unclear and 'wicked' because not all necessary information is available in the early stages to frame the design problem, which culminates in a lack of clear design criteria and constraints. The argument made is that *design for* is not invalid but that *design with*, within a human-centered design (HCD) paradigm, is an alternative emerging discourse and praxis that, in its own right, has the potential to change designer ethos and the practice of fashion design.

Writing about fashion design, Fletcher and Grose (2012) make it clear that *design with* users is about active, collaborative participation between designers and users whereas *design for* consumers is about addressing specific user needs. Drawing from this statement, *design for* and *design with* present opposing praxis. The technology-driven design (TDD) paradigm, echoing *design for*, continues to govern fashion design praxis and practice (Sanders & Stappers, 2014; Fletcher, 2015). The argument made in this paper is that dichotomies exist between *design with* and *design for* with the former showing potential for an alternative strategy that aligns with general paradigm shifts. However, in the context of Gauteng – as one of the nine provinces in South Africa, although studies about design process activities exist (Tselepis *et al.*, 2015), there is limited empirical evidence exploring and describing the praxis, as well as practice, of Johannesburg-based fashion designers to determine if and how *design with* emerges as an alternative strategy. The value of *design with* lies in knowing the praxis and how it manifests in fashion design practice.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The TDD paradigm is market-oriented and, as such designer praxis manifests as *design for* customers, otherwise known as consumers (Sanders & Stappers, 2014). Within this paradigm, market researchers study people as passive subjects employing observations and

surveys. This information, as an input strategy with which to drive design, is transmitted to designers who then engage in design activities from their expert lens to *design for* people (Stappers & Visser, 2007; Smal & Harvey, 2017). Essentially, general TDD praxis gives rise to the design of material products for mass production and consumption from the lens of designer intuition, and their expert knowledge and beliefs (Krippendorff, 2006; Friess, 2010; Taffe, 2015). The same scholars also note that the TDD paradigm reveals designer-centered philosophies, thinking and approaches to practice. Hence, TDD, embedded in *design for*, displays similarities with conventional fashion design praxis.

HCD discourse emerged to counterbalance the TDD paradigm (Krippendorff, 2006; Nelson & Stolterman, 2012). It must be noted that HCD also goes by the name user-centered design (UCD) (Hanington, 2003; Friess, 2010; Keinonen, 2010). However, the difference between these lies in praxis and practice. Although mainstream UCD focuses on satisfying users' needs, it is trained researchers, and not designers, who collect data (Marti & Bannon, 2009; Keinonen, 2010; Sanders & Stappers, 2012). The same scholars remark that such researchers employ quantitative data collection methods to gather information from and about submissive users. This implies that UCD is about designers applying secondary information (obtained from researchers), as input strategies with which to prompt the initial design process stage. Furthermore, UCD does not accommodate for collaborative user participation in design process and product development activities (Marti & Bannon, 2009; Keinonen, 2010). Intrinsically, conventional UCD appears similar to TDD and fashion design praxis given its focus on *design for*. Yet, from the fashion design lens, *design for* consumer needs is considered as UCD (Tselepis *et al.*, 2015; De Wet, 2016).

HCD is an alternative praxis paradigm grounded in *design with* as opposed to *design for*. The scope of HCD encompasses approaches such as co-design (also known as participatory design) and lead-user participatory design. Co-design involves two or more people (Sanders & Stappers, 2008; 2012). Whereas, lead-user

participatory design, which is aimed toward commercial and business improvement, involves a group of users who participate in the design process in order to assist designers who enhance or develop novel products (Steen, 2011). For that reason, HCD praxis places people, who are termed users, and their needs, preferences and voices at the core of design (Keinonen, 2010; Steen, 2011; Norman, 2013; Giacomini, 2014; IDEO, 2015). The authors acknowledge different terminology to be found in the literature - consumers or customers (in *design for*) and users (in *design with*). For this reason, the term customer or consumer is used to narrate from a *design for* lens whilst *design with* is accompanied by the term users.

HCD grounds itself in qualitative data collection methods such as semi-structured interviews, both individual and focus groups, as well as narratives (Hanington, 2010; Norman, 2013; Giacomini, 2014; Sanders & Stappers, 2014; IDEO, 2015). The same scholars also state that actual users are participants and that designers become researchers and instruments of data collection, analysis and interpretation. Similarly, HCD establishes itself through designer and user collaboration unfolding in collective learning, creativity and active participation of real users throughout the design process (design criteria, ideation and conceptualisation) and development stages (Hanington, 2010; Sanders *et al.*, 2010; Steen, 2011; Sanders & Stappers, 2012). The development stage entails materialisation and evaluation of multiple prototypes, with and by users for critical feedback and refinement before design solutions are finalised and products developed (IDEO, 2009; International Organization of Standards 2010).

It is evident that *design with* sees users as co-designers and collaborators throughout both the design and development stages in contrast to *design for* where consumers provide information to researchers which designers can draw from in order to trigger the initial design process stage. Thereafter, the consumer may re-emerge at the tail-end once the stages of problem identification (initial stage), ideation, conceptualisation, prototyping and product development are complete. This tail-end refers to what happens once products enter the market-place for

retailing, where consumer voices are brought in through investigation of, for example consumer perception and preference regarding clothing products, brand loyalty, buying behavior and purchase intention.

RESEARCH AIM AND QUESTION

In the South African Gauteng province context, although studies about design process activities exist, fashion design discourse is underdeveloped and offers limited empirical evidence exploring and describing the praxis and practice of Johannesburg-based fashion designers in order to determine if and how *design with* emerges as a viable strategy. In response, this study aims to explore and describe the praxis, as well as practice, of Johannesburg-based fashion designers to determine if and how *design with* emerges. This aim is embedded in the research question: what is the design praxis and practice of two Johannesburg-based fashion designers?

OBJECTIVES

Based on the aim and research question, the following objectives were formulated:

- Explore and describe the praxis of Johannesburg-based fashion designers.
- Explore and describe the practice of Johannesburg-based fashion designers.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Research design

The research employed a qualitative case study design. Case studies are bounded systems, circumscribed by time and activity, aimed at gaining in-depth, holistic understanding of a specific phenomenon in real world situations (Stake, 2008; Yin, 2012). In this situation, the case revolves around the design praxis, as well as practice, of two Johannesburg-based fashion designers. Their selection was based on specific sampling methods.

METHODS

Sampling

Guided by Merriam (2009), this research used purposive sampling to generate information-rich data about the case. Fashion designers were purposefully selected given the scope of fashion design praxis and practice. These fashion designers conformed to specific pre-determined criteria which included:

- They needed to be expert fashion designers with five or more years' experience as practicing designers.
- They had to be Johannesburg-based business owners.
- They had to design ready-to-wear clothing products.

Two fashion designers participated, referred to here by the gender-neutral pseudonyms of Ash and Jayde. At the time of data collection, Ash had approximately six years of experience whilst Jayde had almost 10 years. As such, these fashion designers were categorised as experts, according to Lawson and Dorst's (2009) design expertise framework in which designers are considered as experts when they have five to ten years of professional experience. Both were business owners designing ready-to-wear clothing products. It must be noted that, although not initially planned, the opportunity arose to include an actual consumer (referred to using the gender-neutral pseudonym, Reese) of clothing products designed by Ash. Reese was a non-designer with no formal discipline-specific knowledge. Ash acted as the gatekeeper through which to gain access to Reese. All participants participated with a research design approved by a registered Faculty Research Ethics Committee.

Data collection

Prior to data collection, all participants were informed about the nature and scope of the research via a pre-drafted written information disclosure. This outlined: 1) the procedures to maintain confidentiality, and 2) voluntary participation and withdrawal. All participants granted signed informed consent.

Qualitative methods were used to collect data.

These included individual, face-to-face, semi-structured interviews and one face-to-face, semi-structured dyadic interview. Dyadic interviews include two participants in one interview session (Morgan *et al.*, 2013). These interview methods were selected to accommodate a pre-determined line of inquiry as well as probing for clarification.

Individual face-to-face interviews were conducted with both Ash and Jayde. These interviews lasted approximately 25 minutes until a point of data saturation was achieved. Following these interviews, one dyadic interview, lasting approximately 25 minutes, was conducted with Ash and Reese. The dyadic interview allowed for Ash and Reese to steer conversation and prompt each other for more in-depth information that Ash may otherwise not have mentioned in the individual interview. All interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim. Transcribed interviews were read several times in conjunction with the digital recordings to ensure accurate transcription before data analysis commenced.

Data analysis

Data analysis entailed a constant comparative method of analysis. This method may be seen as more applicable to grounded theory, but Merriam (2009) rejects this claiming that this method of analysis is widely used in qualitative research even if the research does not aim for theory building. Constant comparative analysis requires that data is first broken up by comparing units of data in search for patterns (Babbie, 2008; Merriam, 2009).

Data analysis followed Creswell's (2014:197) step-by-step, "bottom-up" model as well as Saldaña's (2016:14) "streamlined codes-to-theory" model. Saldaña points out that raw data are coded, moved into categories and then into themes from which assertions (arguments) are drawn. Following these guidelines, the analysis included application of a Computer-Aided Qualitative Data Analysis software package called Atlas.ti through first and second coding cycles.

The first coding cycle included in-vivo and open coding methods. In-vivo coding is a method that

entails participants' verbatim words or phrases (Saldaña, 2016). Each transcribed data set was read line-by-line simultaneously highlighting fragments of raw data quotations and assigning a code using either in-vivo or open coding methods. On completion, all codes and quotations were read in context to verify coding accuracy.

The second coding cycle involved axial and selective coding. With axial coding, coded quotations that essentially held the same meaning were compared and merged, including comparing and linking codes where attributes and concepts related to the same category. Selective coding entitled comparison and clustering of codes into categories and, thereafter, moving categories into themes. Given the research aim, question and objectives, four themes emerged, namely: 1) *design for praxis*, 2) *design for practice*, 3) *design with praxis* and 4) *design with practice*.

Trustworthiness

To prevent any researcher bias especially against *design for*, four methods were employed. Firstly, a peer investigator triangulated and validated the raw data, analysis codes, categories and themes against the emerging research findings. Peer investigator suggestions were given consideration and incorporated into findings. Secondly, the findings include raw data extracts to support interpretation and convey rich, thick description. Thirdly, the findings are narrated in a way that includes contradictory views evident within the raw data. Fourthly, every effort was made to cross-check data to determine if the findings yield the same results. In addition, although Merriam (2009) states that a case study could involve one person, in this study, the data-set collected from two Johannesburg-based fashion designers and one actual user was triangulated thus allowing for different perspectives. Triangulation was also attained through member-checking by granting participants the opportunity to review emerging findings

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Narration in this section is framed by the

overarching themes that emerged from data collection and analysis. These themes include: 1) *design for praxis*, 2) *design for practice*, 3) *design with praxis* and 4) *design with practice*. Subsequently, discussion shifts to comparison between *design for* and *design with*.

Design for praxis

The praxis of both fashion designers manifested in *design for* but unfolded through different designer ethos, thinking and approaches: on one hand, *design for* self-gratification and on the other hand, *design for* a consumer target market satisfaction.

Jayde's praxis was grounded in the notion of the star designer, typically emulating traditional fashion design as well as a TDD paradigm. Such praxis is grounded in the notion that consumers passively accept ready-to-wear clothing products designed for them and that designers have the autonomy to design and do what they want based on their subjective interpretation and personal expression. This was due to the preconceived notion that consumers value what designers *design for* them. Jayde's comments below reflect this discussion:

- "You have to almost have to be a dictator".
- "No, if people want you to stay the way you are, then they must allow you to be the way you are".
- "If people like what you're doing, then they must accept what you doing".
- "People appreciate you for what you do".

Jayde did not solicit consumer needs and feedback because consumers did not have discipline-specific knowledge. The star designer ethos, thinking and approach informs design process actions that manifest in *design for* Jayde's self-gratification. This praxis clearly demonstrates designer subjectivity, self-expression, personal preference and past experience. This was because Jayde holds discipline-specific knowledge and, therefore, knows what to do, what works best for consumers, and why design decisions and activities are executed as they are. The star designer reaches a point of designer expertise and experience whereby they inherently know what works best. This emerges in the following comments:

- "They can give their opinion but I am not going to listen. You can listen to people but you still going to do what you want to do".
- "They don't really know, they don't have the knowledge even. You know, I've got the knowledge. I think most people think they can be a designer but it's not as easy as people think".
- "I still know what works. In the end, you know why you're doing things".
- "No otherwise, you know, then we are never going to do what I want to do".

Remarkably, although this demonstrates a design praxis directed towards self-gratification, Jayde claimed to be a lifestyle designer expressing the view that "I create more lifestyle". Similarly, Ash also grounds praxis in lifestyle design but, in comparison to Jayde, opposing strategies emerged. Ash, from a self-proclaimed psychologist lens, designs for the satisfaction of a specific target market lifestyle rather than for designer self-gratification.

Inconsistencies between Ash and Jayde arose regarding *design for* a target market. For Ash, identifying a target market was fundamental yet Jayde contested this saying that *design for* a target market is non-existent because consumers can be diverse without fitting into a stereotypical profile. This is clearly echoed in the comments below:

- "People always say, who's your target market? I don't think such a thing exists. I think it can be anybody" (Jayde).
- "I design for my users and not myself. I need to design for my users' lifestyle as opposed to my own lifestyle" (Ash).
- "So as a designer, it is very important to identify who your target market" (Ash).

Ash's lifestyle design praxis materialised through strategies of market research and face-to-face interaction with consumers. This market research encompassed: 1) conducting store investigations to determine what is selling well, and 2) studying consumers to examine their needs and desires. These strategies created learning opportunities to enhance business development, as opposed to expressing artistic creativity. Such interpretation was drawn from Ash's comments below:

- "Study what's selling well in different stores.

Study and examine what my customer needs”.

- “As a designer, I had to learn that, if you want to grow a design business, as a business owner, as opposed to as an artist, it is about being user-centered”.

From the perspective of face-to-face interaction post-product development, Ash, a self-proclaimed psychologist engaged consumers in conversation for two main reasons: 1) to obtain feedback from consumers as input for future designs, and 2) to understand consumer needs, desires and preferences. The following comments reflect these observations:

- “More of a psychologist than a fashion designer. Rather listen to customers, get to know them, who they are and then design for their needs”.
- “I listen to customer feedback. Often customers will try on a garment and they’ll say - oh I just wish the sleeves were a bit longer. And then when I design the garment in future, I’ll change the sleeve so that it is a bit longer”.
- “I do try to interact with my users as much as possible at trade events and I spend a large amount of time at my store”.

Design for practice

Design for practice is grounded in previously designed products, consumer feedback and inspiration as three incitements of design process action. Aligning with the literature presented earlier, Ash and Jayde both borrow from their past designs and adapt these in future designs. Former top-selling clothing products are selected for adaptation. For Ash, consumer feedback also guides selection of previous designs. Such consumer feedback thus plays a fundamental role in initiating the early design process stage. In contrast, Jayde did not consider consumer feedback as a stimulus with which to set the course of design action. The following comments support these interpretations:

- “I have a lot of things, patterns that I will sometimes just change the proportions a bit, and things for the next season. So I do make the same stuff again” (Jayde).
- “Work from past best sellers. My design process is just really from working on already

successful designs and building on them and enhancing them” (Ash).

- “If you get that feedback from quite a lot of different customers then you know that, it’s worth adapting your design to suit the needs of the general feedback that you’re getting” (Ash).

The above implies that fashion designers may not necessarily nor continuously think about generating new design ideas but that they re-purpose what already exists. Beyond that, aligning with typical strategies, designers draw on subjectivity, intuition, muses and a world of imagination to drive design practice. Supported by the literature presented earlier, the findings in this research were no different. Multimodal sources of inspiration, such as existing products designed by others, subjective feelings, intuition as well as visual imagery all seemed to evoke the conceptualisation of new design ideas. This is reflected in the following remarks:

- “So it is, it starts with a feeling. There is a bit of a muse and a kind of a feeling” (Jayde).
- “When I’m doing a new design, it’s often something I have seen somewhere, a beautiful silhouette, perhaps a very inspiring colour palette. I find existing designs, beautiful fabrics, history and art very inspiring for the design process. Also being inspired by different experiences” (Ash).

Turning to the prototype and evaluation stage of the design process, evaluations occurred post-product development at the point of retailing. Sales determined whether designs were successful in addressing consumer needs and preferences. However, prototyping activities within the design process appeared to be non-existent and did not accommodate refinement of design solutions or iterative design process actions prior to product development. This may be attributed to the level of the designers’ expertise and experience. Discussion around *design for practice* was drawn from the following statements made by Ash and Jayde:

- “Because you’ve been doing it for a long time so you know. I sometimes make a pattern, grade it and put it in production without even making a sample” (Jayde).
- “A large part of it is based on sales. After you’ve finished your collection and it’s gone into stores, that’s when you really find out if it

was successful or not" (Ash).

Design with praxis

Remarking on user role, voice and participation in the design process, Jayde confirmed the non-existence of *design with praxis* with the statement: "I would say no". Hence, *design with* did not emerge as an alternative praxis strategy in Jayde's case. In contrast, from a user-orientated praxis, Ash completely agreed with the notion of *design with* claiming that users play a critical role in the design process in order to design clothing products that actually address their needs and preferences. This assertion is drawn from the remark:

- "One hundred percent agree - for my particular design processes which is, customer-orientated, absolutely, they play a very critical role in that".

Possibly unaware of the discourse around *design with*, Ash's praxis demonstrated a HCD ethos, thinking and approach in the form of lead-user participatory design and co-design in order to engage in *design with*. From a lead-user participatory perspective, Ash develops relationships with users thus creating an opportunity to involve groups of users, representative of the target market, in design process activities. In doing so, as a decision-making strategy, lead-users express their opinions regarding design elements and steer conceptualisation of design ideas. This is expressed in Ash's comment:

- "I have developed some very good relationships with a few of my customers and I am at a point where I can call them up, show them a mock-up, show them colours that I am looking at, and get their feedback there".

From a co-design angle, Ash collaborated with Reese (the user) to design ready-to-wear clothing products. Reese, a non-designer with no discipline-specific knowledge, held knowledge not known to Ash and for that reason they combined multidisciplinary skills and knowledge to collaboratively engage in design process activities. Reese's active participation, input and critical feedback enhanced the design process activities. Below are some participant reflections that inform the discussion.

- "[She/he] actually gave some really good [features], pointed out some really nice features I could add in" (Ash).
- "Gives me really constructive feedback ... honest feedback. It's just a really constructive relationship" (Ash).
- "I don't know how ... I am never going to be that person that's suddenly inspired to sketch the top ... but I got a very clear sense of what I prefer" (Reese).

Design with practice

Ash's practice involves actual user participation in the design process stages of conceptualisation, prototyping, evaluation and refinement. Lead-user participation involved user group consultations regarding design elements, such as colour selection in order to steer abstract design concepts. From a co-design angle, Reese contributed fresh, new, abstract design ideas whilst collaboratively sketching with Ash to engage in conceptualisation activities. Without discipline-specific knowledge, Reese's design ideas could not always materialise but, combined with Ash's discipline-specific knowledge, these abstract design ideas were adapted for materialisation. The following remarks from the participants support this discussion:

- "She's given me such amazing ideas. It was her idea actually" (Ash).
- "So she'll tell me this top did not wash well at all" (Ash).
- "Feedback on what makes them feel comfortable" (Ash).
- "Could not get her foot through so I know I needed to adapt the pattern then and fix" (Ash).
- "Like those sketches we were working on" (Reese).
- "I could not get my foot in" (Reese).

These participant comments show that, when it comes to prototyping, evaluation and refinement, Reese along with other lead users are active participants in prototype testing of usability, washability and comfort. User feedback allowed for design concept and pattern refinement before product development commenced.

Comparison between design for and design with

In *design for*, although Jayde claimed to be a lifestyle designer, designer autonomy appeared as core, rather than consumer voices. This is mystifying because, on the one hand, Jayde is a business owner selling to consumers assuming knowledge of their lifestyles, yet their voices and feedback regarding their particular lifestyle needs are seen as inconsequential. In comparison, *design with*, showed that Reese, a non-designer had no discipline-specific knowledge but held knowledge not known to the designer Ash which contrasts the view of fashion designers as star designers who hold all relevant knowledge.

Ash also claimed to be a lifestyle, user-centered designer drawing emphasis on the importance of *design for* the satisfaction of a specific target market. Although Ash may have interacted face-to-face with consumers, as a strategy to understand consumer needs, desires and preferences in order to direct future designs, such interaction in *design for* was carried out post-product development at trade fairs and Ash's retail space. In contrast, *design with* saw Ash engaging with actual users in the design process stages of conceptualisation, prototyping, evaluation and refinement prior to product-development.

Similarly, when it comes to *design for*, post-product development sales appeared as the basis on which both Ash and Jayde determined if design solutions were successful in addressing consumer needs and preferences. More evident in *design for* is that actual consumers did not evaluate prototypes, hence no critical consumer feedback was used for refinement or to determine whether the intended design solution actually addressed consumer needs, preferences and design contexts, prior to retailing. In contrast, *design with* saw actual users as active participants in prototype testing before product development commenced. As such, the design process in *design with* includes iteration prior to product development and retailing but this does not appear in *design for*.

CONCLUSION

In this research, the findings indicate that the praxis and practice illustrated by the two Johannesburg-based fashion designers emerged as both *design for* and *design with*. From the findings, *design for* saw a star designer praxis emerge which expressed itself through self-gratification. This corresponds with a TDD paradigm where designers *design for* people through their expert lens, philosophies, thinking and approach (Krippendorff, 2006; Stappers & Visser, 2007; Friess, 2010; Taffe, 2015).

However, the findings also indicate that from a self-proclaimed psychologist lens, fashion design praxis also involved *design for* consumer target markets through strategies of face-to-face interaction with consumers. Of course, fashion designers are not qualified psychologists. Moreover, from the findings, market research also entails store investigations to determine what is selling well and studying consumers to examine their needs and desires. It is debatable how consumer needs and desires are established if such consumers are studied as passive subjects of study. Similarly, conducting store visits, or for that matter, concluding what is selling well in stores without tangible sales figures to draw from is also debatable because retailers do not disclose such information. These strategies of market analysis are not uncommon for collecting data about consumer needs (Keiser & Garner, 2012; Tullio-Pow & Strickfaden, 2015). However, with the passivity of consumers, as subjects of study, as well as the market-orientation, *design for* consumer target markets resonates with the TDD paradigm and conventional UCD praxis (Marti & Bannon, 2009; Keinonen, 2010; Sanders & Stappers, 2014).

The findings reveal that *design for* praxis manifests in reliance on previously designed products, consumer feedback and inspiration as drivers. Hence, past products are adapted in future designs, which means that these fashion designers do not conceptualise new ideas but appear to re-purpose existing designs. Apart from consumer feedback, the findings suggest that both designers draw on subjective feelings, intuition, muses and multimodal inspirational

sources with which to drive design practice. Such *design for* practice accords with the literature presented, in which scholars contend that designers draw from multimodal aspects, such as personal feelings, self-expression, intuition, previously designed products and inspirational imaginary (Aspelund, 2010; Laamanen & Seitamaa-Hakkarainen, 2014; Lee & Jirousek, 2015).

In contrast, drawing from the findings, *design with* praxis demonstrated the HCD ethos, thinking and approaches of co-design and lead-user participatory design. As such, *design with* practice saw actual user participation in the design process stages of conceptualisation, prototyping and evaluation, prior to product development, thus illustrating the iterative nature of design processes. Moreover, collaboration ensured that designer's discipline-specific knowledge merged with that of a non-designer, who also held knowledge, to evoke co-creativity of novel design ideas without losing either designer or user autonomy. The *design with* praxis and practice in this research aligned with the theoretical view that HCD is about designer and user collaboration, collective learning, creativity and active participation of real users throughout the design and development stages, which also includes evaluation of prototypes (Hanington, 2010; International Organization of Standards, 2010; Sanders *et al.*, 2010; Steen, 2011; Sanders & Stappers, 2012).

In conclusion, the findings show that *design with* praxis and practice emerged in Gauteng, South Africa as an alternative strategy, one of inclusivity and collaboration, with which to enhance design process activities and better align user needs and desires. This alternative strategy is significant due to its potential to change fashion design praxis and practice to align with the paradigm shift towards HCD. However, the research aim and objectives pose two limitations. Firstly, this research was limited to the Johannesburg area within the Gauteng province, hence the recommendation for a future study in another South African province to determine if the study yields similar findings. The second limitation is that *design with* praxis did not explore the value-add for designers and users. As such, it is recommended that further study explore *design with praxis and practice value-adds for fashion designers and*

consumers.

REFERENCES

- Aspelund, K., 2010, *The design process*, 2nd edn., Fairchild Books, New York.
- Babbie, E., 2008, *The basics of social research*, 4th edn., Thomson Wadsworth, United States.
- Creswell, J.W., 2014, *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*, 4th edn., SAGE, Washington DC.
- De Wet, A.J.C., 2016, 'Both sides of the coin: A teaching strategy to facilitate an alignment of the creative design purpose of a fashion designer and the requirements of the consumer', *Journal of Family Ecology and Consumer Sciences* 44, 46-57, viewed 20 September 2017, from <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/jfecscs/article/view/148746/138255>.
- Fletcher, K. & Grose, L., 2012, *Fashion & sustainability: Design for change*, Laurence King Publishing, London.
- Fletcher, K., 2015, 'Other fashion systems', in K. Fletcher & M. Tham (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of sustainability and fashion*, pp. 15-24, Routledge, New York.
- Friess, E., 2010, 'The sword of data: Does human-centered design fulfill its rhetorical responsibility', *Design Issues* 26(3), 40-50.
- Giacomin, J., 2014, 'What is human centered design?', *The Design Journal: An International Journal for All Aspects of Design* 17(4), 606-623.
- Hanington, B., 2003, 'Methods in the making: A perspective on the state of human research in design', *Design Issues* 19(4), 9-18.
- Hanington, B.M., 2010, 'Relevant and rigorous: Human-centered research and design education', *Design issues* 26(3), 18-26.
- IDEO., 2009, *Human centered design toolkit*, 2nd edn., IDEO, viewed 18 November 2015, from <https://botfl.nd.edu/pdf/IDEO%20Human%20Centered%20Design%20Toolkit.pdf>.
- IDEO., 2015, *The field guide to human-centered design*, IDEO, viewed 29 October 2016, from http://bestgraz.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Field-Guide-to-Human-Centered-Design_IDEOorg.pdf.
- International Organization of Standards (ISO)., 2010, ISO 9241-210, *Ergonomics of human system interaction, Part 210: Human-centred*

- design for interactive systems*, International Origination of Standards, Geneva, Switzerland, viewed September 2017, from <https://www.sis.se/api/document/preview/912053/>
- Keinonen, T., 2010, 'Protect and appreciate - Notes on the justification of user-centered', *International Journal of Design* 4(1), 17-27.
- Keiser, A.J. & Garner, M.B., 2012, *Beyond design: The synergy of apparel product development*, 3rd edn., Fairchild Books, New York.
- Krippendorff, K., 2006, *The semantic turn: A new foundation for design*, Taylor & Francis, New York.
- Laamanen, T.K & Seitamaa-Hakkarainen, P., 2014, 'Interview study of professional designers' ideation approaches', *The Design Journal: An International Journal for All Aspects of Design* 17 (2),194-217.
- Lawson, B. & Dorst, K., 2009, *Design Expertise*, Elsevier, Oxford.
- Lee, J.S. & Jirousek, C., 2015, 'The development of design ideas in the early apparel design process: A pilot study', *International Journal of Fashion Design, Technology and Education* 8(2), 151-161.
- Marti, P. & Bannon, L.J., 2009, 'Exploring user-centred design in practice: Some caveats', *Knowledge, Technology & Policy* 22(1), 7-15.
- Merriam, S.B., 2009, *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Morgan, D.L., Ataie, J., Carder, P. & Hoffman, K., 2013, 'Introducing dyadic interviews as a method of collecting qualitative data', *Qualitative Health Research* 23(9), 1276-1284.
- Nelson, H.G. & Stolterman, E., 2012, *The design way: Intentional change in an unpredictable World*, 2nd edn., MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Norman, D., 2013, *The design of everyday things*, rev. edn., Basic Books, New York.
- Saldaña, J., 2016, *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*, 3rd edn., SAGE, London.
- Sanders, E.B.N., Brandt, E. & Binder, T., 2010, 'A framework for organizing the tools and techniques of participatory design', *Participatory Design Conference: 11th Biennial conference, PDC 2010 proceedings*, Sydney, Australia, November 29-3 December, 2010, pp.1-4.
- Sanders, E.B.N. & Stappers, P.J., 2008, 'Co-creation in the new landscapes of design', *CoDesign* 4(1), 5-18.
- Sanders, E.B.N. & Stappers, P.J., 2012, *Convivial toolbox: Generative research for the front end of design*, BIS Publishers, Amsterdam.
- Sanders, L. & Stappers, P.J., 2014, 'From designing to co-designing to collective dreaming: Three slices in time', *Interactions*, November - December, 24-33.
- Smal, D. & Harvey, N., 2017, 'Transforming fashion education to Design with Intent', in S. Giloi & H. Botes (eds.), *#Decolonise: Design educators reflecting on the call for the decolonisation of education: 14th National Design Education Conference, DEFSA 2017 proceedings*, Tshwane, South Africa, September 27-29, 2017, pp. 277-287.
- Stappers, P.J. & Visser, F.S., 2007, 'Bringing participatory techniques to industrial design engineers' in E. Bohemia, K. Hilton, C. McMahon & A. Clarke (eds.), *International Conference on Engineering and Product Design Education: 9th International Conference, DS 43 proceedings*, Newcastle, United Kingdom, September 13-14, 2007, pp. 117-122.
- Stake, R.E., 2008, 'Qualitative case studies', in N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*, 3rd edn., pp. 119-150, SAGE Publication Inc, Thousand Oaks.
- Steen, M., 2011, 'Tensions in human-centred design', *CoDesign* 7(1), 45-60.
- Taffe, S., 2015, 'The hybrid designer/end-user: Revealing paradoxes in co-design', *Design Studies* 40(C), 39-59.
- Tselepis, T.J., Mastamet-Mason, A. & Antonites, A.J., 2015, 'Designing success: Describing a collaborative clothing design process between apprentice designers and expert entrepreneurs', *Journal of Family Ecology and Consumer Sciences* 43, 450-61, viewed 20 September 2017, from <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/jfec/article/view/125464/114997>.
- Tullio-Pow, S. & Strickfaden, M., 2015, 'Mapping the clothing taskscape to assess user's needs', *International Textile and Apparel Association (ITAA): Annual conference, Celebrating the unique 2015 proceedings*, Santa Fe, New Mexico, November 11, 2015, viewed 20 October 2017, from http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/itaa_proceedings/2015/.
- Yin, R.K., 2012, *Applications of case study research*, 3rd edn., SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks.