

## **DARIA LOI**

RMIT University  
Design Studies Coordinator –Industrial Design Department  
project-mu – Interactive Information Institute

### BIOGRAPHY

Daria Loi (BArch - Politecnico di Milano; current: PhD - RMIT) worked as an architect and interior designer (1994-97) and as a researcher at L.I.M. in Milan (1994-96). She joined Industrial Design at RMIT University in 1999, lecturing in design theory, history and methodology. Currently, she coordinates the Design Studies Stream in the undergraduate program.

Daria's research interests include: co-design; Product-Service Systems; constructivist learning/teaching; studies on semiotics, synaesthesia, and usability; and design of collaborative work environments.

Her practice revolves around the following fields: Inter-disciplinary research methods; Design of collaborative work environments; Constructivist learning/teaching; Participatory Design; Product-Service Systems; Management Consulting.

Daria Loi is part of an inter-disciplinary contract research team called *project-mu* located at the Interactive Information Institute, RMIT University. Due to its interdisciplinary flavour *project-mu's* activity is around teaching and learning methods, design, information technologies and management.

### CONTACT DETAILS

PO Box 12781 – A'Beckett Street - Melbourne 8006 VIC, Australia  
Phone: +61 3 9925 5337/2594  
Fax: +61 3 9925 5342  
e-mail: [daria.loi@rmit.edu.au](mailto:daria.loi@rmit.edu.au)

## **SHARED WORK ENVIRONMENTS AS ECOLOGIES: NEW WAYS OF WORKING AND DESIGNING - ABSTRACT**

This paper explores the nature of Shared Work Environments and argues their systemic nature by re-defining them as ecologies (Dix 2002). For the purposes of this paper, the term ecology refers to an entity composed of interdependent elements and their environment.

The analysis of the development of a community telecentre in Melbourne Australia (Morelli & Loi 1998; 2002; Loi 2001) gave the author an opportunity to further investigate the nature of shared workspaces, with a specific emphasis on users and their practices.

Important aspects of ecology that relate to shared workspaces are:

- Teaching – each entity of an ecology teaches those who operate within that ecology;
- Relationships - ecologies evolve and increase in size and complexity as new relationships are formed;
- Responsiveness – as the nature and composition of an ecology change entities need to act and respond differently to ensure they still have a role within that ecology;
- Surprise - when part of an ecology individual entities often prosper for reasons that could not be foreseen;
- Dependence – an ecology’s ‘form will be dependant on all the entities within the ecology and the environment in which that ecology is embedded’ (O’Reilly 2000; Burrows, Coburn & Loi 2002).

In this paper the relationships between workspace and work practices are emphasised. These relationships appear to be significant in shaping workspace ecologies and are fundamental for sustaining those ecologies.

This paper highlights the role of users within these ecologies and a consequent shift in design responsibilities. It is proposed that appropriate design methodologies are required in order to develop and sustain these ecologies.

The paper examines two interrelated aspects of Shared Work Environments as ecologies.

In the first part a definition of ecology is articulated and the issue of Shared Work Environments as ecologies is discussed. Furthermore, some examples of Shared Work Environments as ecologies are outlined.

In the second part of the paper a range of consequences that stem from such a redefinition are discussed, with particular emphasis on the role and responsibilities of designers.

The paper proposes that Shared Work Environments are complex ecologies where each ‘actor’ represents a necessary condition for the system to be sustained. The notion of ecology offers a new way of conceptualising work and shared workspaces.

# SHARED WORK ENVIRONMENTS AS ECOLOGIES: NEW WAYS OF WORKING AND DESIGNING

## INTRODUCTION

This paper explores the nature of Shared Work Environments and argues their systemic nature by re-defining them as ecologies<sup>1</sup> (Dix 2002).

Shared Work Environments are complex ecological systems where ‘actors’ are necessary conditions for the system to be sustained and construct its identity on a daily basis.

It is argued that users’ practices and actors’ dynamics represent strong features of Shared Work Environments and that within such systems actors should not adapt themselves to a pre-designed space, but rather develop and manage their own.

Generated and created by users’ practices and actors’ dynamics, Shared Work Environments help shaping social systems that will be the foundations for physical and organisational settings.

## BACKGROUND

In 1999-2000 I had the opportunity to be part of a six months experience as research assistant and supervisor of an urban telecentre<sup>2</sup>. Following an analysis of this case study (Morelli & Loi 2001; 2002), some observations arose around the notion of Shared Work Environments:

- Shared Work Environments are product-service systems, therefore a systemic approach should be considered in their design, implementation and management;
- Users of such environments play an essential role in the development of such spaces; their unpredictability needs to be acknowledged; a design that reflects such unpredictability and users’ needs is necessary;
- The relationships between various actors (users, technological artefacts, software and interfaces, physical space) play an important role in during the life of such spaces (Loi 2001);
- These spaces require constant upgrades, re-designs, re-assessments and modifications, and have to be designed considering such characteristics to allow their maintenance over time.

Following these findings, my proposal is that Shared Work Environments should be considered, designed and managed as if they were ecologies as they behave as ecologies.

An interesting event that made me reflect on the notion of Shared Work Environments as ecologies was my January 2002 visit to some Reggio Emilia schools (Reggio Children 1996; Reggio Children & Project Zero 2001). Reggio Emilia schools are learning environments, based on constructivist methodologies, where experiences and ways of teaching, learning, playing and sharing common spaces are interrelated to the point that they become one thing – like ecologies.

Reggio Emilia’s characteristics of interconnectedness of learning and work practices, of bond between practices and space and of respect of the importance of users within such systems consolidated and encouraged some thoughts that were incubating since my telecentre experience.

## THE SYSTEMIC NATURE OF SHARED WORK ENVIRONMENTS

A Shared Work Environment is a complex system composed of actors and their relationships where parts are linked to the whole and the complexity of the system represents its strength.

Besides, a Shared Work Environment is part of a larger system. In this investigation the larger system is represented by an *organisation*.

Systems are complex *creatures* made of a series of elements (or actors). In this paper I will focus on the following actors which I see as components of organizations:

- People – Users;
- Physical space – room, walls, building, urban area;
- Objects – technology, furniture, little tools, decorations, etc;
- Relationships – Between all components;
- Values and opinions – of an individual, a team, a company, a social group, etc.

I argue that a Shared Work Environment should be included in the list of actors of an organization (see Figure 1) and suggest that:

- people and relationships are necessary conditions for the existence of a Shared Work Environment – they generate Shared Work Environments;
- objects and physical space are influenced by and influence people and their relationships (and therefore Shared Work Environments);
- values (and opinions) are held by people and manifest in their actions therefore influencing Shared Work Environments.




Figure 1 - Organization system

## ECOLOGY: A DEFINITION

ecol-o-gy \ i-'käl-ə-jé\ n. pl. -gies [G ökologie, fr. Ök-ec- + -logie -logy] (1858) 1. A branch of science concerned with the interrelationship of organisms and their environments. 2. The totality or pattern of relations between organisms and their environment. 3. HUMAN ECOLOGY. (Source: Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary)

The term ecology is used in several domains and disciplines, including science, information technology, management, philosophy and design.

For instance, Eric Trist (Emery & Trist 1972; Trist 1976; 1979; 1983) and several social scientists developed the organizational ecology concept 'investigating the possibility of developing new patterns of interorganizational relations that can help shape the future in a proactive way' (Morgan 1986: 70-71).

As these relations are a natural response to the environment's complexity and turbulence, Trist argues that 'they should be encouraged to help make the environment more manageable' (Morgan 1986: 71). As individualistic actions can make the social world unmanageable, evolution and survival of the ecology of organizational relations are Trist's main concerns.

Nardi and O'Day (1999: 49) have defined information ecologies as 'a system of people, practices, values, and technologies in a particular local environment. In information ecologies, the spotlight is not on technology, but on human activities that are served by technology'.

Fritz Steele (1986: 8) states that:

a human organization is an ecological system whose health is determined by its balance of a number of factors: users' preferences and needs, users' activity patterns, the required action patterns of the organization (including major technology), the physical features of the organisation's settings, the environments in which these settings are located, and the management decision processes that control the stability and rate of change of the settings.

The author (Steele 1986: ix) defines organizational ecology as 'the pattern of reciprocal relationships and influences among organizational members and their workplaces'. Borrowing his terminology from animal ecology studies, Steele's intent is to understand the relationships between organisations and the settings in which they operate 'so better choices can be made about how to structure, use, and change these settings to satisfy both organizational and individual needs' (Steele 1986: ix).

In this paper I borrow the notion of ecology from a variety of sources and domains and I define it as an *entity composed of interdependent elements and their environment*.

Important aspects of ecology that relate to shared workspaces discussed by some authors (Emery & Trist 1972; Trist 1976; Steele 1986; Kelly 1994; Walck 1996; Nardi & O'Day 1999; O'Reilly 2000; Burrows, Coburn & Loi 2002; Dix 2002a; 2002b) include:

- o Teaching – each entity of an ecology teaches those who operate within that ecology;
- o Relationships - ecologies evolve and increase in size and complexity as new relationships are formed;
- o Responsiveness – as the nature and composition of an ecology change entities need to act and

respond differently to ensure they still have a role within that ecology;

- Surprise - when part of an ecology individual entities often prosper for reasons that could not be foreseen;
- Dependence – an ecology’s ‘form will be dependant on all the entities within the ecology and the environment in which that ecology is embedded’ (O'Reilly 2000; Burrows 2002).

In the next section I discuss the implications of an ecological view of Shared Work Environments, provide some characteristics of these spaces, and offer a case study to demonstrate.

## **PART 1 - SHARED WORK ENVIRONMENTS AS ECOLOGIES**

Stating that a Shared Work Environment behaves like an ecology, does not provide any specific tangible description of what a Shared Work Environment should look like and be designed. The statement offers however a series of points of departure to create a methodological framework for Shared Work Environments to emerge.

The main aim of this paper is to discuss and develop understandings and possibilities for the designing of Shared Work Environments where the organising metaphor is that of an ecology. Furthermore, I suggest that the physical space should mirror and be consequent to such understandings.

Gareth Morgan (1986: 73) discusses the limitation of the use of the metaphor of organizations like organisms stating that ‘we are led to view organizations and their environments in a way that is far too concrete’ – view that breaks down because organizations can be understood as ‘socially constructed phenomena’ and have therefore ‘a more fragile and tentative’ shape and structure if compared with the ‘material structure of an organism’ (Morgan 1986: 73).

A consequence of this critique is the acknowledgement that organizations depend on the ‘creative actions of human beings’ and that ‘it is misleading to suggest that organizations need to *adapt* to their environment’ and that ‘environments *select* the organizations that are to survive’ (Morgan 1986: 73, italics mine).

These points are consistent with the discourse around Shared Work Environments. The ecology-metaphor has value if regarded as a *flavor* and *opportunity*. A Shared Work Environment is a space created by relationships, by people – it is *socially constructed*.

I suggest that the physical space should mirror such social construction and that each Shared Work Environment is different from another due to this characteristic.

Consequently, the Shared Work Environment I discuss in this paper represents an *ideal socially constructed type* I intend to explore and promote.

### SHARED WORK ENVIRONMENT AS ECOLOGIES: SOME CHARACTERISTICS.

I will now discuss major characteristics of Shared Work Environments that behave like ecologies. These are: evolution, co-evolution, responsiveness, dependence, surprise, flexibility, playfulness and beauty.

## **EVOLUTION**

An important aspect of ecologies is their evolutionary dynamism. Actors and their practices evolve; relationships evolve.

An ecology experiences continual evolution (Nardi & O'Day 1999) - it is a fluid entity that should be acknowledged, observed, and fostered.

Fritz Steele (1986: 8) mentions that, in the case of workplace management, continuous processes should be in place 'with regular attention given to data collection, diagnosis, action, and assessment as a cyclical process'.

Due to its ecology-like behaviour, a Shared Work Environment should be considered in terms of continuous processes and modification.

A Shared Work Environment is a fluid entity as it evolves constantly. This implies that flexible mechanisms should be in place to encourage and cultivate such fluidity.

## **CO-EVOLUTION**

As a new actor enters an ecology, relationships are reformed and the ecology morphs/adapts itself to accommodate the new patterns and 'as the nature and composition of the ecology changes, many entities will have to act and respond differently to ensure they still have a role' (Burrows, Coburn & Loi 2002: 188).

When the nature and composition of an ecology changes, different parts of an ecology '*co-evolve*, changing together according to the relationships in the system'(Nardi & O'Day 1999).

The same occurs in Shared Work Environments where actors, linked by relationships, co-evolve and re-assess as patterns change.

The individuality of each actor is granted within a system where the space between such actors is the centre of consistent evolution. As evolution occurs, actors, due to their relationships, adapt to new patterns *together*, co-evolving. In this way individuality is enriched at the same time as the space between individuals.

## **RESPONSIVENESS**

Like in an ecology, both a Shared Work Environment and its actors are required to respond to change, acting like organisms – they are required to be responsive.

Failing to be responsive may imply losing a place in an ecological system and losing opportunities for growth and enrichment.

This characteristic is significant as it put emphasis on actors as active organisms. Actors are required to respond, be active, create, be open to change and contribute.

## **DEPENDENCE**

Marco Polo describes a bridge, stone by stone.

*But which is the stone that supports the bridge?* Kublai Khan asks.

*The bridge is not supported by one stone or another,* Marco answers, *but by the line of the arch that they form.*

Kublai Khan remains silent, reflecting.

Then he adds: *Why do you speak to me of the stones? It is only the arch that matters to me.*

Polo answers: *Without stones there is no arch.*

(Calvino 1972: 83, italics mine)

An ecology's form is 'dependant on all the entities within the ecology and the environment in which that ecology is embedded' (O'Reilly 2000; Burrows, Coburn & Loi 2002). Each entity is dependant on the rest of the system; each entity influences other entities and the entire system.

Similarly, in a Shared Work Environment entities cannot function in isolation – each entity requires the rest to exist and create meaning.

As Jonathal Benthall (1972: 127) points out 'where human artefacts are concerned, we are dealing with entities that are not self-sufficient but depend on continuous refreshment from *their* environment, including ourselves'.

This characteristic emphasises not only the requirement for actors to be active, but also that this *being active* is both an internal and external process where one is active towards oneself, the system (Shared Work Environment) and other actors (see Figure 2).




Figure 2 - Active toward... oneself, others, and the entire system.

## **SURPRISE**

When part of an ecology, actors often prosper for reasons that could not be foreseen. Unpredictability is at the base of an ecology and of a Shared Work Environment.

Such characteristic is a positive one as it represents a possibility for growth. Actors should embrace surprise and be empowered by it.

A Shared Work Environment should have mechanisms that trigger surprise. Surprises make actors respond and act.

## **FLEXIBILITY**

A Shared Work Environment should 'lend itself to manipulation and transformation' by its occupants and 'be open to different ways of use' (Ceppi & Zini 1998: 38).

Only a flexible mentality and environment can accommodate growth, evolution and dynamism.

As Bateson (1978: 494) suggests a healthy ecology is 'a single system of *environment combined with high human civilization* in which the flexibility of the civilization shall match that of the environment to create an ongoing complex system, open-ended for slow change of even basic (hard-programmed) characteristics'.

## **PLAYFULNESS**

A Shared Work Environment, to be and grow must enable playfulness.

Play is 'a function of the imagination' (Alexander, Ishikawa & Silverstein 1977: 368) and it should be not simply enabled, but fostered.

Play is central to learning patterns, allows surprise and unpredictability to emerge, it is a creative act which carries co-evolution.

In a Shared Work Environment people should feel free to contribute with their individual self. The physical space which houses a Shared Work Environment should become the place for creative activity and display – people should be encouraged to bring *stuff*, their own creations and artefacts, to create a sense of shared identity and play with it.

A Shared Work Environment should be like a playground. A playground that enables ownership.

As Alexander, Ishikawa & Silverstein (1977: 369-370) argue when describing children's playgrounds: 'Not a highly finished playground, with asphalt and swings, but a place with raw materials of all kinds – nets, boxes, barrels, trees, ropes, simple tools, frames, grass, and water – where children can create and re-create playgrounds of their own'.

In a Shared Work Environment actors are free to play and bring their own identity to create ways of playing. Objects become triggers for play to take place and for relationships to be created and sustained.

## **BEAUTY**

A Shared Work Environment should be a beautiful place to be in and be part of. Like a home it should reflect its *inhabitants*, their feelings, ideas, and dreams.

The finding of beauty is up to the inhabitants of a Shared Work Environment – they are responsible for finding and creating beauty, whatever beauty may mean to them.

A sense of beauty which is built and maintained by actors enriches the identity of a Shared Work Environment. Actors need to understand how their own and the shared sense of beauty can be sustained, fostered, modified, and created. They are in charge of their Shared Work Environment's beauty.

## SHARED WORK ENVIRONMENTS AS ECOLOGIES: AN EXAMPLE

I report in this section the example of a Shared Work Environment I have been part of for few years. I will analyse this case study according to the characteristic I mentioned previously to clarify them and open up some methodological questions which I will then discuss in Part 2.

### **BACKGROUND TO CASE STUDY<sup>3</sup>**

Early in 1998 RMIT University approached the Telstra Corporation, Australia's largest telecommunications company, with the concept of establishing a research team. This team (THT aka Telstra Home Team) would create and develop ideas for the information economy. A formal business agreement was signed between RMIT and Telstra to assemble an interdisciplinary team of PhD Researchers that in return for scholarship would undertake research projects for Telstra. The researchers would get a dedicated space to work collaboratively within the University.

A group was assembled and co-located at the Interactive Information Institute (I-cubed), a research centre attached to the university. I-cubed provided the team with administrative support and links to a network of people working on related or complementary projects within the institute, within the university or in the broader community.

Each research project then team worked on explored the possibilities and prospects for on-line products and services suitable for various communities of interest. The team presented a series of solutions to Telstra, acting as a creative stimulus and generating alternative ways of looking at the market.

The team undertook research in the areas of early childhood development, health-care, distributed learning, the digital trading of text and information, Internet for seniors, and computer supported collaborative work environments.

### **ANALYSIS OF CASE STUDY**

As previously mentioned Shared Work Environments that behave like ecologies have a series of characteristics. I will now discuss such characteristics using events and examples I withdraw from the team's experience.

Evolution. The THT went through a series of restructures during its life. Each time a member decided to depart or a new member became involved the entire team had to face a change in practices and ways of doing things collaboratively. Relationships between members modified consequently. Being an interdisciplinary team, the evolutionary dynamism was even greater, as new disciplines were introduced to become part of the shared space and *shared modus operandi*. Both team members as individuals and Team as a system evolved continuously during the experience.

Co-evolution. As evolution occurred, team members were able to effectively adapt to and develop new patterns *together*, co-evolving. This was due to the relationships linking team members. A good example of this was the creation of a very peculiar shared writing and presenting style the team developed – a style which did not belong to one or another member but to the *space between them*.

Responsiveness. Team members were constantly required to respond to several stimuli and in turn were providing stimulus for each other. Each response was a chance to learn something new that was generally from another disciplinary mindset. To some members the issue of being responsive was too complex to deal with and had to leave the ecological system the team represented.

Dependence. Meetings and tasks felt incomplete if a member was not present. The team soon realised that the shared space the team occupied was more an intangible space rather than a physical space. *Presence* was a necessity within a system where each participant was dependant on the others.

Surprise. Sudden due dates, strange disturbance, personal issues, and similar were often triggers for new patterns and ideas. To the group triggers represented beginnings of new possibilities. Each time a team member decided to leave the group (a few times unexpectedly) the departure was interpreted as an opportunity to create a new ecology, new projects and ways of operating.

Flexibility. Being an interdisciplinary team made of five people with different lives, ideas, and ways of being, flexibility was a necessary condition - not an option. Some people left the team due to the extremes to which we could take the word flexibility. Timetables, spaces, methodological and disciplinary notions were constantly stretched or compressed.

Playfulness. Play was central at all times. We used to bring in materials, books, and interesting objects that sometimes would be the centre of play for a bit, and then become a trigger for creation. At times objects of play would become a written piece or a project component – just because team members spent time playing with things, allowing meanings and possibilities to emerge.

Beauty. We soon developed a shared sense of belonging and associated beauty. Some places became special as they had a flavour that the team felt they could be associated with. Our sense of beauty would probably find a place in a design magazine but it did *fit* for us and our shared space. A shared sense of beauty emerged quite clearly in the team's way of shaping content, writing and presenting it.

## **A QUESTION**

Like ecologies, Shared Work Environments dynamically grow via evolutionary mechanisms. They are fluid entities constantly morphing, growing, and changing.

From the case study it is clear that if one had to design the team's space, it would have been a quite complex task. Rules about workspaces would not have worked as each team, person, system, and organization has its own dynamic, character, values, and ways of doing.

Like an ecology, a Shared Work Environment cannot be managed or designed in the traditional sense. If this is the case, who should design such spaces? How should they be designed? Is it even possible to design them?

In Part 2 I discuss these issues and provide some methodological frameworks.

## PART 2 – DESIGNERS’ ROLE

Stating that a Shared Work Environment cannot be managed or designed in the traditional sense implies that ‘is not feasible to think in terms of building them. However it is possible to facilitate a diverse range of user practices in order to watch for and eventually capitalise on patterns and trends’ (Burrows, Coburn & Loi 2002: 194).

Users’ practices and actors’ dynamics are strong features of ecologies – ‘entities that thrive in an ecology become part of that ecology because they have a capacity to contribute to the well-being and livelihood of other entities and vice versa’ (Burrows, Coburn & Loi 2002: 189).

Users’ practices and actors’ dynamics are strong features of Shared Work Environments as well. I suggest that Shared Work Environments’ generation and creation should be up to their actors<sup>4</sup>.

In *A Pattern Language* (Alexander, Ishikawa & Silverstein 1977: 963) it is argued that ‘the fundamental philosophy behind the use of pattern languages is that buildings should be uniquely adapted to individual needs and sites; and that the plans of buildings should be rather loose and fluid, in order to accommodate these subtleties’.

The same notion should be applied to Shared Work Environments: actors should not adapt themselves to a pre-designed Shared Work Environment, but rather develop and manage their own. As Steele (1986: xii) highlights:

Management processes should enhance the sense of self-worth of members, not degrade it. People should be able to influence or control some elements of their immediate work surroundings, so they do not feel powerless and so they can get information back about the effectiveness of their choices over time.

The author (Steele 1986: 22) discusses the importance of flexible enabling acts and the relationships between the act of enabling and organizations’ long-term strategies:


I have come across a few organisations whose leaders have attempted to develop and operate an overall facilities design/management process that helps people at different levels to influence their own settings.

Their approach is to do this in the context of (or be ‘nested in’) a longer-term strategy that defines several factors: facilities management goals, basic assumptions about the basic organisation’s appropriate physical shape and relationships with its environment, types of decisions that are possible and appropriate for different levels of the organisation, and how the quality of fit between settings and user groups that can be monitored on a regular basis.

A Shared Work Environment should be responsive, transformable, personalizable, soft, open to receiving imprints, enabling ‘different ways of inhabitation and use during the course of the day and with the passing of time’ (Ceppi & Zini 1998: 17).


The inhabitants of a Shared Work Environment construct its identity on a daily basis – if something has to be designed and managed, it will have to accommodate this characteristic.

At the same time the Shared Work Environment that such inhabitants created will influence their ways of being and relating to each other. A loop is created between people and the Shared Work Environment they co-inhabit (see Figure 3).



**Figure 3 - People-Shared Work Environment Loop**

People's practices contribute to the design of a Shared Work Environment. Somehow people design that place. The design of that Shared Work Environment follows its users and uses. At the same time users and uses are influenced by that Shared Work Environment that will evolve and morph consequently (see Figure 4).



**Figure 4 - The people-design loop**

If Shared Work Environments behave like ecologies, a design methodology capable of addressing the complexity of such systems - in particular the role of users within the system - should be identified. It is proposed that to a design Shared Work Environment one should:

- Acknowledge its complexity and the fact that space should follow practices, understandings and observation;
- Observe the space - its dynamics and characteristics;
- Understand users' practices and acknowledge their impact on the ecology in which they are embedded;
- Encourage and enable users' practices, trying to develop an understanding of how the Shared Work Environment's characteristics we discussed could manifest themselves within a specific context;
- Involve users in the design process – both on an organizational and spatial level;
- Iterate all previous points as a Shared Work Environment evolves in time.

One methodology what would suit this proposal is Participatory Design (Sanders 1984; Sanoff 1990; Muller et al. 1992; Schuler & Namioka 1993; Trigg et al. 1994; Sanders 1999; Sanders in

press).

Participatory design allows users to contribute to the design process, by recognising the importance of people's practices, and by enabling and empowering them.

The use of these methodologies opens up however an issue: understanding users, being able to *ask the right questions*, listening to their answers and interpreting responses are not easy tasks. Questionnaires and similar tools are often unsuitable if we want to *illuminate* everyday practices and users' feelings and views about space and use of that space.

If the role of designers within the described context is to utilise participatory practices, then the question of how to properly understand users' practices on one side and of how to maintain a sense of continuity via iterative processes must be asked and discussed more widely and deeply.

## CONCLUSION

Shared Work Environments are complex ecologies where each *actor* represents a necessary condition for the system to be sustained. The notion of ecology offers a new way of conceptualising work and shared workspaces and opens up the issue of the methodological approach to undertake.

This paper proposes Participatory Design as an interesting option to address users' practices and requirements within a Shared Work Environment. Such options unlock questions on how to create an appropriate dialogue with users, how to decode and use such dialogue, and how to iterate it. These issues unchain several questions about the role of design in the context, including:

Should a designer be a present/constant figure within organisations to ignite and maintain a Shared Work Environment?

Where does the role of a designer end and that of a manager start?

Are the role of design and that of management so different within the discussed context?

Where does the role of a designer end and that of a users start?

It is proposed that opportunities for a substantial shift in the notion of design and management should be considered and discussed. Such opportunities see design and management blurring to create new figures that, within organisations, can act as enablers for users' practices to emerge and for Shared Work Environments to be sustained and co-developed.

A reflection on 'disciplinary territories' within organisations could provide useful insights to understand how to enable users' practices and design appropriate spaces to house such practices.

## FOOTNOTES

1. For the purposes of this paper, the term ecology refers to an entity composed of interdependent elements and their environment.
2. The project was funded by the Australian Research Council under the SPIRT (Strategic Partnership with Industry, Research and Training) scheme and it was a cooperative research between University (RMIT University and Melbourne IT) and private institutions (Virtual Moreland and COASIT).
3. This background section is heavily informed by the paper *A Multi-disciplinary team based approach to innovation and research for an Australian telecommunications company* I co-authored in 2001 with Peter Burrows, Michael Coburn and Linda Wilkins from the former Telstra Home Team.
4. Frits Steele (1986: 86-87, italics mine) reports an interesting example of a space designed with such a mindset: the Dutch insurance company Central Beheer. The company hired Dutch architect Herman Hertzberger 'to create an environment that would truly feel like *home* to the users and thus be likely to increase the employees' sense of identification with and loyalty to the company'. The architect employed the notion of the building as 'the beginning of the design and creation process, not the end of it. It was made to encourage and require the touches of its users in order to be functional, and both the designer and the company encouraged users to make it their own by personalizing both individual and common areas. Plants, graphics, banners, personal furniture and the like were all considered to be a natural part of bringing the building to life as a real place – not just something to be tolerated if a few people wanted to be stubborn, as is often the attitude of top management when they commission a new building'.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My acknowledgement goes to Dr. Carlene Boucher and Dr. Nita Cherry for their support and inspiring advice. I would also like to thank THT ex members and *project-mu* members, in particular Peter Burrows and Michael Coburn for their generous presence in my life and research activity.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, C., Ishikawa, S. and Silverstein, M. 1977, *A pattern language : towns, buildings, construction*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Bateson, G. 1978, *Steps to an ecology of mind*, Ballantine, New York.
- Benthall, J. 1972, *Science and Technology in Art Today*, Thames and Hudson, London.
- Burrows, P., Coburn, M. and Loi, D. 2002, 'Finding a place in the publishing ecology', in *Markets for New Book Products*, eds. Cope, B. and Kalantzis, D., Common Ground Publishing Pty Ltd, Altona, Victoria, pp. 181-198.
- Burrows, P., Coburn, M. and Loi, D. 2002, 'The reader as user in a re-intermediated supply chain - Making the shift from Consumer to User', in *Markets for New Book Products*, eds. Cope, B. and Kalantzis, D., Common Ground Publishing Pty Ltd, Altona, Victoria, pp. 163-179.
- Calvino, I. 1972, *Le città invisibili*, Einaudi, Torino.
- Cepi, G. and Zini, M. 1998, *Children, Spaces & Relations - Metaproject for an Environment for Young Children*, Reggio Children S.r.l. & Domus Academy Research Center, Reggio Emilia, Italy.
- Dix, A. 2002a, *The Ecology of Information*, August 8, <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/computing/users/dixa/topics/ecology/>.

- Dix, A. 2002b, 'Managing the ecology of Interaction', *Tamodia 2002 - First International Workshop on Task Models and User Interface Design*, 18-19 July 2002, Bucharest, Romania.
- Emery, F. E. and Trist, E. L. 1972, *Towards a social ecology: contextual appreciation of the future in the present*, Plenum Press, London ; New York.
- Kelly, J. G., Azelton, S., Burzette, R., Mock, L. 1994, 'Creating social settings for diversity: An ecological thesis', in *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context*, ed. Trickett, T., Birman, D., Watts, R., Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 424-451.
- Loi, D., Burrows, P., Coburn, M. and L. Wilkins 2001, 'A Multi-disciplinary team based approach to innovation and research for an Australian telecommunications company', *Designing Designers - Training strategies for the third Millennium - International Convention of University courses in Industrial Design*, 7-8 April 2001, Milan, Edizioni POLI.DESIGN.
- Loi, D. 2001, 'Commercial Shared Workspaces as Product-Service Systems', *Desire Designum Design - Fourth European Academy of Design International Conference*, April 2001, University of Aveiro, Aveiro Portugal, European Academy of Design.
- Loi, D., Burrows, P., Coburn, M., Wilkins, L. 2001, 'The Need for a New Mindset', in *Print and Electronic Text Convergence - Technology Drivers across the Book Production Supply Chain, from Creator to Consumer*, ed. Cope, B., Kalantzis, D., Common Ground Publishing Pty Ltd, Altona, pp. 17-57.
- Morelli, N. and Loi, D. 2001, 'Design and Heterogeneous Networks. A case Study Designing a Service for Internet Access', *Desire Designum Design - Fourth European Academy of Design International Conference*, April 2001, University of Aveiro, Aveiro Portugal, European Academy of Design.
- Morelli, N. and Loi, D. 2002, 'Designing Product-Service Systems, a Social Construction Activity. A Case Study on Urban Telecentres', in *Human Aspects of the Information Society: an International Collection of Papers*, ed. Banwell, L., Collier, M., Information Management Research Institute, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, pp. 78-88.
- Morgan, G. 1986, *Images of organization*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills.
- Muller, M. J., Kuhn, S., Meskill, J. A. and Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility. 1992, *PDC '92, proceedings of the Participatory Design Conference, Kresge Auditorium, MIT, Cambridge, MA, US, 6-7 November 1992*, Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility, Palo Alto, CA.
- Nardi, B. A. and O'Day, V. 1999, 'Information ecologies', in *Information ecologies : using technology with heart*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., pp. 49-58.
- O'Reilly, T. 2000, *The Ecology of E-Book Publishing*, 11/07/01, <http://tim.oreilly.com/publishing/drmtalk.html>.
- Reggio Children 1996, *The Hundred Languages of Children*, Reggio Children, Reggio Emilia.
- Reggio Children and Project Zero 2001, *Making Learning Visible: Children as Individual and Group Learners*, Reggio Children srl, Reggio Emilia, Italy.
- Sanders, E. B. N. 1999, 'Postdesign and Participatory Culture', *Useful and Critical: The Position of Research in Design*, 9-11 September 1999, Tuusula, Finland.
- Sanders, E. B. N. in press, 'From user-centered design to participatory design approaches', in *Design and the Social Sciences*, ed. Frascara, J., Taylor & Francis Books Limited.
- Sanders, K. A. 1984, Participatory design in public housing.
- Sanoff, H. 1990, *Participatory design : theory & techniques*, Henry Sanoff (distributor), Raleigh, N.C.
- Schuler, D. and Namioka, A. 1993, *Participatory design : principles and practices*, L. Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, N.J.
- Steele, F. 1986, *Making and Managing High-Quality Workplaces: An Organizational Ecology*, Teachers College Press, New York.

Trigg, R. H., Anderson, S. I., Dykstra-Erickson, E., SIGCHI (Group : U.S.) and Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility. 1994, *PDC '94, proceedings of the Participatory Design Conference, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA, 27-28 October, 1994*, Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility, Palo Alto, CA (P.O. Box 717, Palo Alto 94302-0717).

Trist, E. L. 1976, 'A Concept of Organizational Ecology', *Australian Journal of Management*, vol. 26, pp. 161-175.

Trist, E. L. 1979, 'New directions of hope: recent innovations interconnecting organizational, industrial, community and personal development', *Regional Studies*, vol. 13, pp. 439-451.

Trist, E. L. 1983, 'Referent organizations and the development of interorganizational domains', *Human Relations*, vol. 36, pp. 269-284.

Walck, C. L. 1996, 'Organizations as places: a metaphor for change', *Journal of Organizational Change Management, Bradford*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 26-40.