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Motivation
Design Ethnography
- Evolved from anthropology techniques
- Involves immersing oneself in stakeholders' environment
- Has been shown to improve product design by allowing for complete understanding of all stakeholders
- Few studies performed to better understand how students learn these skills

Tools Include:
- Observations
- Interviews
- Formal
- Informal
- Photography
- Videotaping
- 'Deep hanging out'
- Social mapping

This subset of tools is commonly applicable to student capstone design projects
Research Question
How do capstone design teams incorporate design ethnography into their projects? How does a design ethnography immersion experience affect students' use?

Methodology
- Two (of eight) design teams (Teams 4 & 5) had members who participated in an 8 week clinical immersion experience
- These students performed clinical observations and interviews in a low-income country (LIC) during the summer prior to the design course
- The study timeline is depicted below

Findings
Largely successful use of design ethnography
Immersion students transferred their experience successfully to the design project, while non-immersion students were able to productively question the immersion students' opinions. The team continued to interact with stakeholders/experts throughout the design process.

Interview 1
"I'd say a lot of [our user requirements and engineering specifications] were guided by our interviews and observations during the immersion."
"It really helped to have two new team members because that was a good checkpoint...on things we had assumed."

Team 4

The team ran into initial issues related to conflicting stakeholder opinions (UM versus low-resource setting). The team identified certain doctors/experts who they returned to extensively to gain feedback on ideas.

Interview 1
"...because all the [low-income country] doctors were valuing some things differently than the American...doctors. That was interesting to deal with."
"Dr. [ ] really encouraged us to look at sensitivity and specificity. I guess we trust his judgement on that and agree with him, so we read more about it."

Team 5

Students weren't able to use stakeholder interviews effectively during the early portion of the semester because they would only receive solutions (not requirements). Students used published guidelines and ceased to interact with stakeholders/experts during later design phases.

Interview 1
"A lot of the ideas that [the doctors brought] to us...they were really interesting, but I don't know if we will be able to implement [them]."
"We went to [an NGO's] guidelines for our user requirements."

Team 6

Students relied exclusively on their sponsor to provide requirements for their design project. Their design concept had to be completely thrown out once they finally obtained end-user feedback due to negative reactions.

Interview 1
"...we met with one of the graduate students...and that cleared [up] a lot of requirements, but there was a lot of conflict...between what people wanted."
"...it actually took three interviews to really get the numbers [we needed]."

Team 3

Missed opportunities to use design ethnography
Sponsors/end-users had significantly different conceptions of what the design project should be and what user requirements were required. Students could not help these end-users/ sponsors define their ideas; leading to issues late in the semester.

Interview 1
"A lot of the user requirements were easy because [our sponsor] had a very clear idea of what exactly she wanted."
"...there were some features that [our sponsors] thought of late...they didn't tell us about it until [late] into the designing process."

Team 2

Students were unable to extract the necessary information from their sponsors in order to develop adequate user requirements or make informed decisions. The team was overly dependent on the project sponsor and didn't look elsewhere for the required information.

Interview 1
"Most of our requirements came directly from [our sponsor]."
"They were very good at describing what they wanted, but qualitative, not quantitative."

Team 7

Interview 3
"we originally thought the models would be more expensive...we were led to believe that by our sponsor."

Conclusions
Teams 4 & 5 (immersion students) used observations and interviews throughout the design process (to varying degrees of success) despite obstacles that were present in its use.

Teams 6 & 3 attempted to use interviews during the various design phases, however they weren't able to obtain usable information from these interactions.

Teams 1, 2, & 7 missed opportunities to implement design ethnography techniques during portions of their design process that could have helped them achieve better results and in a more efficient manner.

Future Work
Detailed coding will be performed in order to further develop the themes found during holistic analysis of the transcripts shown above.
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