

HCI's Making Agendas

Jeffrey Bardzell

Indiana University School of Informatics
Computing, and Engineering

Shaowen Bardzell

Indiana University School of Informatics
Computing, and Engineering

Cindy Lin

University of Michigan
School of Information

Silvia Lindtner

University of Michigan
School of Information

Austin Toombs

Purdue University
Department of Computer Graphics Technology

now

the essence of knowledge

Boston — Delft

Foundations and Trends[®] in Human-Computer Interaction

Published, sold and distributed by:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 1024
Hanover, MA 02339
United States
Tel. +1-781-985-4510
www.nowpublishers.com
sales@nowpublishers.com

Outside North America:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 179
2600 AD Delft
The Netherlands
Tel. +31-6-51115274

The preferred citation for this publication is

J. Bardzell, S. Bardzell, C. Lin, S. Lindtner and A. Toombs. *HCI's Making Agendas*. Foundations and Trends[®] in Human-Computer Interaction, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 126–200, 2017.

This Foundations and Trends[®] issue was typeset in L^AT_EX using a class file designed by Neal Parikh. Printed on acid-free paper.

ISBN: 978-1-68083-372-0

© 2017 J. Bardzell, S. Bardzell, C. Lin, S. Lindtner and A. Toombs

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Photocopying. In the USA: This journal is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by now Publishers Inc for users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC). The 'services' for users can be found on the internet at: www.copyright.com

For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license, a separate system of payment has been arranged. Authorization does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as that for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. In the rest of the world: Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the copyright owner. Please apply to now Publishers Inc., PO Box 1024, Hanover, MA 02339, USA; Tel. +1 781 871 0245; www.nowpublishers.com; sales@nowpublishers.com

now Publishers Inc. has an exclusive license to publish this material worldwide. Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright license holder. Please apply to now Publishers, PO Box 179, 2600 AD Delft, The Netherlands, www.nowpublishers.com; e-mail: sales@nowpublishers.com

**Foundations and Trends® in
Human-Computer Interaction**
Volume 11, Issue 3, 2017
Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief

Desney S. Tan
Microsoft Research
United States

Editors

Ben Bederson
University of Maryland

Sheelagh Carpendale
University of Calgary

Andy Cockburn
University of Canterbury

Jon Froehlich
University of Maryland

Juan Pablo Hourcade
University of Iowa

Karrie Karahalios
*University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign*

Youn-Kyung Lim
*Korea Advanced Institute of Science and
Technology*

Nuria Oliver
DataPop Alliance

Orit Shaer
Wellesley College

Kentaro Toyama
University of Michigan

Editorial Scope

Topics

Foundations and Trends[®] in Human-Computer Interaction publishes surveys and tutorials on the foundations of human-computer interaction. The scope is broad. The list of topics below is meant to illustrate some of the coverage, and is not intended to be an exhaustive list.

- History of the research community
- Design and evaluation
- Theory
- Technology
- Computer supported cooperative work
- Interdisciplinary influence
- Advanced topics and trends

Information for Librarians

Foundations and Trends[®] in Human-Computer Interaction, 2017, Volume 11, 4 issues. ISSN paper version 1551-3955. ISSN online version 1551-3963. Also available as a combined paper and online subscription.

Foundations and Trends® in Human-Computer
Interaction

Vol. 11, No. 3 (2017) 126–200

© 2017 J. Bardzell, S. Bardzell, C. Lin, S. Lindtner
and A. Toombs

DOI: 10.1561/1100000066



HCI's Making Agendas

Jeffrey Bardzell
Indiana University School of Informatics
Computing, and Engineering

Shaowen Bardzell
Indiana University School of Informatics
Computing, and Engineering

Cindy Lin
University of Michigan
School of Information

Silvia Lindtner
University of Michigan
School of Information

Austin Toombs
Purdue University
Department of Computer Graphics Technology

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Democracy and Tools: HCI's Overarching Maker Agendas	7
2.1	Making and the democratization of computing and innovation	8
2.2	Developing tools, developing makers	14
3	Cultivating Making and Maker Identities	21
3.1	Cultivating a maker/DIY ethos to upgrade HCI design . . .	23
3.2	Intervening in or co-opted by capitalism?	28
3.3	Reframing making: Handwork, appropriation, repair, and maintenance	32
3.4	The cultural production of Makers	36
4	Critiquing Making and Critical Makers	41
4.1	Critiquing Making	41
4.2	Making as Critique	49
5	Conclusion	55
5.1	The Utopian Project of Making	56
5.2	Paradise Lost	58
5.3	Paradise Regained?	59
	References	64

Abstract

In this survey, we examine how making emerged as an interdisciplinary arena of scholarship, research and design that connects entrepreneurs, designers, researchers, critical theorists, historians, anthropologists, computer scientists and engineers. HCI is one among many other fields and domains that has declared having a stake in making. And yet, a lot of what and who defines making is happening outside the familiar research laboratory or design studio. We take this article as an opportunity to reflect on HCI's relationship to making and how this relationship has changed over the last years. Making, we argue, presents HCI with the opportunity to question and revisit underlying principles and long-held aspirations and values of the field. Exactly because HCI and making share some fundamental ideals such as user empowerment and the democratization of participation and technology production, making confronts us with both the potential and the unintended consequences of our own work.

1

Introduction

2012 might well be called the year of the maker. It was in that year that former US president Barack Obama visited a techshop in Ohio and famously declared that a future of “made in America” was being prototyped at Maker Faires, in makerspaces, and at hackathons. 2012 was also the year in which Pebble smartwatch raised one of the largest Kickstarter campaigns in history, with more than US \$10 Million of funding, provided by 68,929 consumers who invested in a future of interconnected devices that the small hardware company promised. To implement this promise, the co-founders would spend the following year seeking partners in the manufacturing region in and around the city of Shenzhen in Guangdong, China, to scale into mass production. Pebble had successfully demonstrated that a move from hobbyist tinkering to mass-produced end-consumer electronics was insofar feasible as it showcased how the combination of crowdfunding and electronics manufacturing in China would enable a whole new generation of technology entrepreneurs to experiment with hardware: platforms like Kickstarter would provide seed capital for hardware start-ups to implement technological visions that might appear too risky for a Venture Capitalist and Shenzhen would be the place where one implemented in practice the move from idea into production.

Excitement was in the air also in scholarly and academic networks. Making appeared to provide - at last - the concrete tools and methods to implement a long-held promise of the tech industry and tech research communities like Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) and Participatory Design (PD): the democratization of technology production [Lindtner and Lin, 2017]. From HCI designers and researchers who saw in making a continuation of their commitment to empower users to governments across regions, large tech corporations like Intel, and venture capitalists to activists, artists, designers, and tech enthusiasts, a range of diverse actors saw something of themselves in one of the key vision of makings: to democratize technology production [Lindtner et al., 2016].

The particular excitement that surrounded making is in many ways reminiscent of earlier techno-optimistic narratives that had risen in the heydays of the Internet and entrepreneurship in software. Social media and digital publishing platforms, in particular, were celebrated as sites of empowerment of many by giving people to the tools and platforms to creatively express themselves, to socially organize, and make money in new ways [Benkler, 2006, Lessig, 2008, Shirky, 2009, Jenkins, 2006a]. Just like content creation and distribution tools—word processors, web and phone cams, Photoshop, iMovie, YouTube—back in the mid to late 2000s enabled anyone with a computer to produce and distribute cultural content, now a variety of hardware tools and maker platforms, paired with the power of digital networks, would allow anyone to make a phone, a computer, a smart watch - so the story went. And just like influential writers would help proliferate a story about a new era of media, software and information, so would an old and new cast of thinkers help spread ideas about making and hardware by means of writing - this includes but is not limited to Neil Gershenfeld's early book on *Fab* [2005], Chris Anderson's book on *Makers: The Third Industrial Revolution* [2005], the writings of Dale Dougherty including blog posts and books (founder of Make Media) as well as "how-to" periodicals from the founders of Arduino and the writers at *Make*. In other words, making and its story of individual empowerment by way of democratizing tech production appeared as if it had transplanted earlier visions of open source software and user participation into hardware. But was

making really just about a transition from software into hardware, from making digital things to making physical things, from coding on machines to making machines?

One of the key differences, we argue, was that the optimistic narratives of making were almost immediately accompanied by sharp criticism. Whose empowerment was this?, many asked. Maker and hackerspaces seemed to advance the interests of masculine and technological elites rather than constituting a space for “everybody” as the promotional campaigns of Make Media and writers like Chris Anderson wanted us to believe [e.g. Anderson, 2012]. It was as if the kind of techno-optimism that had persisted even after and despite the 2000 burst of the dot com bubble [Neff, 2012] had suddenly run out of steam. People began differentiating between hacking as a countercultural practice and making as a commercial endeavor [Maxigas, 2012, Sivek, 2011]. The commercialization of open source 3D printing projects like Makerbot in 2013 made stories of mass empowerment that had fueled so much of the 2012 and earlier rhetoric appear stale at best and co-opted by market capitalism at worst [Söderberg and Delfanti, 2015]. People began critiquing making’s underlying premise of producing more and more stuff by turning attention to sites of repair, maintenance, and re-use [Houston et al., 2016, Jack and Jackson, 2016, Jackson, 2014, Jackson and Kang, 2014], but even there making’s potential was circumscribed by economic and political forces opposed to reuse and repair [Avle and Lindtner, 2016, Irani, 2015, Lindtner, 2015b, Roedl et al., 2015]. Others challenged making’s affinity with “hard” projects (soldering, CNC machines, hardware) and critiqued how, in contrast, craft and many other forms of making were rendered as less technological innovative and hence valued less [Fox et al., 2015, Rosner and Fox, 2016]. In other words, making simultaneously fueled earlier techno-optimistic promises *and* was the site to voice criticism of the political and capitalist gains that such promises granted. Many of these debates did not occur in maker-related networks alone, but were also carried out in the writings and talks of fields like HCI.

In this survey, we outline this process, examining how making emerged as an interdisciplinary arena of scholarship, research and

design that connects entrepreneurs, designers, researchers, critical theorists, historians, anthropologists, computer scientists and engineers. HCI is one among many other fields and domains that has declared having a stake in making. And yet, a lot of what and who defines making is happening outside the familiar research laboratory or design studio [Lindtner, 2014]. We take this article as an opportunity to reflect on HCI's relationship to making and how this relationship has changed over the last years. Making, we argue, presents HCI with the opportunity to question and revisit underlying principles and long-held aspirations and values of the field. Exactly because HCI and making share some fundamental ideals such as user empowerment and the democratization of participation and technology production, making confronts us with both the potential and the unintended consequences of our own work.

If we openly acknowledged and debated such overlapping interests and values, we might raise important questions that often remain silent in the publications and talks at conferences like CHI, e.g., questions about the relationship between HCI design/production and economics, the politics of participation, our relationship to industry and corporate management: What does HCI's strong focus on tool making and problem solving preclude us from seeing? What are the consequences of our commitments to democratize design? How is designing and making of technologies imbricated in the advancement of capitalist interests? What is HCI's position as making oscillates between the promise of building alternative futures on the one hand [Ehn et al., 2014] and the capitalist and economic interests this very promise allowed to pursue? Is HCI furthering a naive promise of a better future for the select few or working alongside those rarely included into conversations on technology production and innovation? In which ways does HCI confront or fail to confront its own affinities and alignments with the ideals and capitalist tendencies of making? How does HCI construe the relationship between making as an ideal and making as an economic project that has brought funding to universities, schools, entrepreneurs? How has HCI construed the tensions and overlaps between making, hacking, DIY, open hardware, craft, repair, and entrepreneurship?

That said, even though we maintain a critical stance throughout this work, we want to stress that in the end we share the optimistic and even utopian goals of maker practitioners and researchers. We believe that making does have the potential to emancipate, democratize, educate, and empower. As three of us wrote in Lindtner et al. [2016], we hope to learn from voices critical of making not to tear anyone down, but rather to help makers pursue their utopian aspirations in a pragmatic, hard-headed, and dogged way.

The survey is structured as follows. In Chapter 2, we summarize the two dominant frames of making research in HCI: the idea that making democratizes computing, innovation, and fabrication; and the idea that the development of new tools and infrastructures is one of the key roles for HCI researchers. Another key role is to develop solid and actionable empirical understandings of makers, both mainstream and those on the edges. Accordingly, in Chapter 3, we examine the maker methods and identity; how/where makers hope to intervene; how this fashionable notion of making relates to much older as well as tangential traditions, including handwork, craft, and repair; and finally how making empowers people to identify as makers and express themselves through making. Then, in Chapter 4, we step back and out of making to look at making's relationship to critique. This includes critiques of making, and it also includes making's critiques of society, including both critical making and also feminist un-hacking.

Throughout this survey, we consider ways that making is used as part of an intervention—into STEM learning, social justice, innovation and entrepreneurship, nation-building, and even reflexively back onto making itself. We share stories of hope, and technical achievements, of sociotechnical breakthroughs, and of coming up short. If we may, our intervention in writing this survey is to bring readers into maker research and practice, to cultivate their appreciation for making's many potentials while shining a critical light on cases of over-optimism and even delusion, and to empower you, our reader, to participate in this project of making making.

References

- G. Adamson. *Thinking through Craft*. Berg, 2007.
- B. Akah and S. Bardzell. *Empowering Products: Personal Identity through the Act of Appropriation*, pages 4021–4026. ACM Press, 2010.
- Morgan G. Ames. Learning consumption: Media, literacy, and the legacy of one laptop per child. *The Information Society*, 32(2):85–97, 2016.
- Morgan G. Ames and G. Morgan. Charismatic technology. *Aarhus Series on Human Centered Computing*, 1(1):12, 2015.
- Chris Anderson. *Makers: The Third Industrial Revolution*. New York: Crown Business, 2005.
- Chris Anderson. *Makers?: The New Industrial Revolution*. Crown Business, 2012.
- Seyram Avle and Silvia Lindtner. Design(ing) ‘here’ and ‘there’. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI ’16*, pages 2233–2245. New York, USA, ACM Press, 2016.
- Seyram Avle, Silvia Lindtner, and Kaiton Williams. How methods make designers. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI ’17*, pages 472–483. New York, USA, ACM Press, 2017.
- M. Balaam, L. Hansen, C. D’Ignazio, E. Simpson, T. Almeida, S. Kuznetsov, M. Catt, and M. Søndergaard. *Hacking women’s health*. ACM, 2017. CHI2017’EA.
- L. Bannon and S. Bødker. *Beyond the Interface: Encountering Artifacts in Use*, pages 227–253. Cambridge University Press, 1991.

- J. Bardzell. Amateur multimedia. *J Human Technology*, 2007.
- J. Bardzell and S. Bardzell. *Humanistic HCI*. Morgan & Claypool, 2015.
- J. Bardzell, S. Bardzell, and A. Toombs. “now that’s definitely a proper hack”: Self-made tools in hackerspaces. 2014.
- S. Bardzell. *E-textiles and the body: Feminist technologies and design research*. Peter Lang, 2013.
- S. Bardzell. Utopias of participation: Feminism, design, and the futures. In *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (ACM TOCHI)*, forthcoming.
- S. Bardzell, D. Rosner, and J. Bardzell. Crafting quality in design: Integrity, creativity, and public sensibility. 2012.
- S. Bardzell, J. Bardzell, and S. Ng. Supporting cultures of making: Technology, policy, visions, and myths. 2017.
- Shaowen Bardzell. Feminist hci. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on Human factors in computing systems - CHI '10*, page 1301. New York, USA, ACM Press, 2010.
- Yochai Benkler. *The Wealth of Networks?: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. Yale University Press, 2006.
- Jenny Bergström, Brendon Clark, Alberto Frigo, Ramia Mazé, Johan Redström, and Anna Vallgård. Becoming materials: Material forms and forms of practice. *Digital Creativity*, 21(3):155–172, 2010.
- Jean-François Blanchette. A material history of bits. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62(6):1042–57, 2011.
- Paulo Blikstein. Gears of our childhood: Constructionist toolkits, robotics, and physical computing, past and future. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Interaction Design and Children - IDC '13*, pages 173–82. New York, USA, ACM Press, 2013.
- Leanne Bowler and Ryan Champagne. Mindful makers: Question prompts to help guide young peoples’ critical technical practices in maker spaces in libraries, museums, and community-based youth organizations. *Library and Information Science Research*, 2016.
- Leah Buechley. Questioning invisibility. *Computer*, 43(4):84–86, 2010. URL <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/5445175/>.
- Leah Buechley and B. Hill. Lilypad in the wild: how hardware’s long tail is supporting new engineering and design communities. In *Proc. of DIS2010*. ACM, 2010.

- Leah Buechley and Hannah Perner-Wilson. *Crafting technology: Reimagining the processes, materials, and cultures of electronics*, 2013.
- Leah Buechley, M. Eisenberg, J. Catchen, and A. Crockett. The lilypad arduino: Using computational textiles to investigate engagement, aesthetics, and diversity in computer science education. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems (CHI)*, pages 423–432. Florence, Italy, 4 2008.
- Ruy Cervantes and Bonnie Nardi. Innovating from the global south: practices to connect local and global networks of innovation. In *Proc. of ICIC'10*, pages 259–262, 2010.
- Gilbert Cockton. Revisiting usability's three key principles. In *CHI '08 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '08)*, pages 2473–2484. New York, NY, USA, ACM, 2008. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1358628.1358704>.
- E. Gabriella Coleman. *Coding Freedom?: The Ethics and Aesthetics of Hacking*. Princeton University Press, 2012.
- Geoff Cooper and John Bowers. *Representing the user: notes on the disciplinary rhetoric of human-computer interaction*, pages 48–66. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Laura Devendorf, Abigail De Kosnik, Kate Mattingly, and Kimiko Ryokai. Probing the potential of post-anthropocentric 3d printing. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Designing Interactive Systems*, pages 170–181, 2016.
- Catherine D'Ignazio, Alexis Hope, Becky Michelson, Robyn Churchill, and Ethan Zuckerman. A feminist hci approach to designing postpartum technologies: “when i first saw a breast pump i was wondering if it was a joke. In *Proc. of CHI2016*. New York, ACM, 2016.
- Carl DiSalvo, Illah Nourbakhsh, David Holstius, Ayca Akin, and Marti Louw. The neighborhood networks project: A case study of critical engagement and creative expression through participatory design. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Anniversary Conference on Participatory Design 2008*, pages 41–50. Indiana University, 2008.
- Peter Dormer. *The culture of craft*. Manchester University Press, 1997.
- P. Dourish and M. Mazmanian. *Media as Material: Information Representations as Material Foundations for Organizational Practice*, volume 3. Oxford University Press, 2012.

- Paul Dourish. Hci and environmental sustainability. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM Conference on Designing Interactive Systems - DIS '10*, page 1. New York, USA, ACM Press, 2010.
- Ducheneault. Socialization in an open source software community: A socio-technical analysis. 2005.
- Anthony Dunne and Fiona Raby. *Design Noir: The Secret Life of Objects*. Birkhauser, 2004.
- Anthony Dunne and Fiona Raby. *Speculative Everything*. MIT Press, 2014.
- Tamara Anna Efrat, Moran Mizrahi, and Amit Zoran. The hybrid bricolage: Bridging parametric design with craft through algorithmic modularity. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '16)*, pages 5984–5995. New York, NY, USA, ACM, 2016. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858441>.
- Pelle Ehn, Elisabet M. Nilsson, and Richard Topgaard. *Making Futures?: Marginal Notes on Innovation, Design, and Democracy*. MIT Press, 2014.
- FabLab Inventory. 2017. URL <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1U-jcBWOJEjBT5AON84IUubtcHKMEMtndQPLCkZCkVsU/pub?single=true&gid=0&output=html>.
- G. Fischer and E. Scharff. *Meta-Design: Design for Designers*, pages 396–405. ACM, 2000.
- Daniel Fitton, Janet C. Read, and John Dempsey. Exploring children’s designs for maker technologies. In *Proc. of IDC'15*, pages 379–382, 2015.
- Forlano. Hacking feminist body, 2016.
- Sarah Fox, Rachel Rose Ulgado, and Daniela Rosner. Hacking culture, not devices. pages 56–68, 2015. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=2675133.2675223>.
- C. Frayling. Research in art and design. *Royal College of Art Research Papers*, 1(1):1–5, 1993/4.
- G. Freeman, J. Bardzell, and S. Bardzell. Aspirational design and messy democracy: Partisanship, policy, and hope in an asian city. In *Proc. of CSCW2017*. New York, ACM, 2017.
- David Gauntlett. *Making Is Connecting?: The Social Meaning of Creativity, from DIY and Knitting to YouTube and Web 2.0*. Polity Press, 2011.

- William W. Gaver, John Bowers, Kirsten Boehner, Andy Boucher, David W. T. Cameron, Mark Hauenstein, Nadine Jarvis, and Sarah Pennington. Indoor weather stations: investigating a ludic approach to environmental hci through batch prototyping. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '13)*, pages 3451–3460. New York, NY, USA, ACM, 2013. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2470654.2466474>.
- Neil A. Gershenfeld. *Fab?: The Coming Revolution on Your Desktop—from Personal Computers to Personal Fabrication*. Basic Books, 2005.
- E. Goodman and D. Rosner. *From garments to gardens: negotiating material relationships online and 'by hand.'* ACM CHI2011, 2011.
- Greenhalgh. 2002.
- P. Greenhalgh. The history of craft. In P. Dormer, editor, *The Culture of Craft*, pages 20–52, 1997.
- Betsy Greer. *Knitting for Good: A Guide to Creating Personal, Social & Political Change, Stitch by Stitch*. Trumpeter, 2008.
- Grimme, Bardzell, and Bardzell. We've conquered dark: Shedding light on empowerment in critical making. 2014.
- S. Gross, T. Pace, J. Bardzell, and S. Bardzell. Machinima production tools: A vernacular history of a creative medium. In *Proc. of CHI'2013*. New York, ACM, 2013.
- Björn Hartmann, Scott Doorley, and Scott R. Klemmer. Hacking, mashing, gluing: Understanding opportunistic design. *Pervasive Computing*, 7(3), 2008.
- Haywood. The ethic of the code: an ethnography of a humanitarian hacking community, 2013.
- Dick Hebdige. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. Routledge, 1979.
- G. Hertz. Critical making. 2014. URL <http://conceptlab.com/criticalmaking/>.
- G. Hertz. Disobedient electronics: Protest. 2017. URL <http://www.disobedientelectronics.com/>.
- Jonathan Hook, Sanne Verbaan, Abigail Durrant, Patrick Olivier, and Peter Wright. A study of the challenges related to diy assistive technology in the context of children with disabilities. In *Proc. of DIS'14*, pages 597–606, 2014.

- Lara Houston, Steven J. Jackson, Daniela K. Rosner, Syed Ishtiaque Ahmed, Meg Young, and Laewoo Kang. Values in repair. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI '16*, pages 1403–1414. New York, USA, ACM Press, 2016. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=2858036.2858470>.
- Hudson. Printing teddy bears: A technique for 3d printing of soft interactive objects, 2014.
- Nathaniel Hudson, Celena Alcock, and Parmit K. Chilana. Understanding newcomers to 3d printing: Motivations, workflows, and barriers of casual makers. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '16)*, pages 384–396. New York, NY, USA, ACM, 2016. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858266>.
- J. Hunsinger and A. Schrock. The democratization of hacking and making. special issue for new media and society, 2016.
- L. Irani. Hackathons and the making of entrepreneurial citizenship. *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, 2015.
- Margaret Jack and Steven J. Jackson. Logistics as care and control. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI '16*, pages 2209–2219. New York, USA, ACM Press, 2016.
- Steven J. Jackson. *Rethinking Repair*. 2014.
- Steven J. Jackson and Laewoo Kang. Breakdown, obsolescence and reuse: Hci and the art of repair. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 449–458, 2014.
- Steven J. Jackson, Alex Pompe, and Gabriel Krieschok. Repair worlds: maintenance, repair, and ict for development in rural namibia. In *Proceedings of the ACM 2012 conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW '12)*, pages 107–116. New York, NY, USA, ACM, 2012. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2145204.2145224>.
- H. Jenkins. *Fans, Bloggers, and Gamers: Media Consumers in a Digital Age*. NYU Press, 2006a.
- Henry Jenkins. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. NYU Press, 2006b.
- D. Kera. Hackerspaces and diybio in asia: connecting science and community with open data, kits and protocols. *Journal of Peer Production*, 2012. Issue #2 - June 2012.
- Denisa Kera and Connor Graham. Collective sensor networks and future communities: designing interaction across multiple scales. pages 396–399, 2010.

- Beth Kolko, Alexis Hope, Brook Sattler, Kate MacCorkle, and Behzod Sirjani. Hackademia. page 129, 2012. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=2347635.2347654>.
- I. Koskinen, J. Zimmerman, T. Binder, J. Redstrom, and S. Wensveen. *Design research through practice: From the lab, field, and showroom*. Elsevier, 2011.
- Stacey Kuznetsov and Eric Paulos. Rise of the expert amateur. In *Proceedings of the 6th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction Extending Boundaries - NordiCHI '10*, page 295. New York, USA, ACM Press, 2010.
- L. Layne, S. Vostral, and K. Boyer. *Feminist Technology*. U of Illinois Press, 2010.
- Lawrence Lessig. *Remix?: Making Art and Commerce Thrive in the Hybrid Economy*. Penguin Press, 2008.
- Steven Levy. *Hackers*. O'Reilly Media, 2010.
- Kaiying Cindy Lin and Silvia Lindtner. Legitimacy, boundary objects & participation in transnational diy biology. In *Proceedings of the 14th Participatory Design Conference on Full papers - PDC '16*, pages 171–180. New York, USA, ACM Press, 2016.
- S. Lindtner. Hacking with chinese characteristics the promises of the maker movement against china's manufacturing culture science. *Technology, & Human Values*, 40(5), 2015a.
- S. Lindtner, S. Bardzell, and J. Bardzell. Reconstituting the utopian vision of making: Hci after technosolutionism. In *Proc. of CHI2016*. ACM, 2016.
- Silvia Lindtner. Hackerspaces and the internet of things in china: How makers are reinventing industrial production, innovation, and the self. *China Information*, 28(2):145–167, 2014.
- Silvia Lindtner. Hacking with chinese characteristics. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 40(5):854–879, 2015b.
- Silvia Lindtner. Laboratory of the precarious: Prototyping entrepreneurial living in shenzhen. 2017. Womens Quarterly.
- Silvia Lindtner and Seyram Avle. Under review. tinkering with governance: Technopolitics and the economization of citizenship. 2017.
- Silvia Lindtner and Cindy Lin. Making and its promises. *CoDesign*, 13(2): 70–82, 2017.
- Silvia Lindtner, Garnet D. Hertz, and Paul Dourish. Emerging sites of hci innovation. In *Proceedings of the 32nd annual ACM conference on Human factors in computing systems - CHI '14*, pages 439–48, 2014.

- Silvia Lindtner, Anna Greenspan, and David Li. Designed in shenzhen: Shanzhai manufacturing and maker entrepreneurs. *Aarhus Series on Human Centered Computing*, 1(1):12, 2015.
- Hod Lipson and Melba Kurman. Factory @ home?: The emerging economy of personal fabrication one of a series of occasional papers in science and technology policy hod lipson and melba kurman. *Science And Technology*, page 103, 2010.
- E. Lovell and L. Buechley. *LilyPond: An Online Community for Sharing E-Textile Projects*. 2011.
- Maxigas. Hacklabs and hackerspaces – tracing two genealogies. *Journal of Peer Production*, 0(2):1–10, 2012.
- M. McCullough. *Abstracting Craft: The Practiced Digital Hand*. MIT Press, 1996.
- David Mellis, Sean Follmer, Björn Hartmann, Leah Buechley, and Mark D. Gross. Fab at chi: digital fabrication tools, design, and community. In *CHI '13 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '13)*, pages 3307–3310. New York, NY, USA, ACM, 2013. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2468356.2479673>.
- David A. Mellis and Leah Buechley. Case studies in the personal fabrication of electronic products. In *Proceedings of the Designing Interactive Systems Conference on - DIS '12*, page 268. New York, USA, ACM Press, 2012.
- E. Morozov. Making it: Pick up a spot welder and join the revolution. *The New Yorker*, 2014. Jan 13, 2014.
- Catarina Mota. The rise of personal fabrication. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM conference on Creativity and cognition (C&C '11)*, pages 279–288. New York, NY, USA, ACM, 2011. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2069618.2069665>.
- Stefanie Mueller, Bastian Kruck, and Patrick Baudisch. Laserorigami: Laser-cutting 3d objects, 2013. CHI 2013.
- Stefanie Mueller, Tobias Mohr, Kerstin Guenther, Johannes Frohnhofen, and Patrick Baudisch. Fabrickation: Fast 3d printing of functional objects with building blocks. In *CHI '14 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 187–188, 2014.
- Mark Muro and Peter Hirshberg. Five ways the maker movement can help cataluze a manufacturing renaissance. 2017.
- G. Neff. *Venture Labor: Work and the Burden of Risk in Innovative Industries*. MIT Press, 2012.

- L. Nguyen, S. Toupin, and S. Bardzell. Feminist hacking/making: Exploring new gender horizons of possibility. introduction to special issue “feminism and (un)hacking.”. *Journal of Peer Production*, 2016. Online open access.
- Lilly Nguyen. Infrastructural action in vietnam: Inverting the techno-politics of hacking in the global south. *New Media and Society*, 18(4):637–652, 2016.
- T. Pace, A. Toombs, S. Gross, T. Pattin, J. Bardzell, and S. Bardzell. A tribute to mad skills: Expert amateur visuality and world of warcraft machinima. In *Proc. of CHI’2013*. New York, ACM, 2013.
- Sofia Papavlasopoulou, Michail N. Giannakos, and Letizia Jaccheri. Empirical studies on the maker movement, a promising approach to learning: A literature review. *Entertainment Computing*, 18:57–78, 2017.
- Peppler. Makeology: Makers as learners, 2016.
- Alison Powell. Democratizing production through open source knowledge: from open software to open hardware. *Media, Culture & Society*, 34(6): 691–708, 2012. ISSN 0163-4437.
- Ratto & Boler. Diy citizenship: Critical making and social media, 2014.
- M. Ratto. Critical making: Conceptual and material studies in technology and social life. *The Information Society: An International Journal*, 27(4): 252–260, 2011.
- Redström. Re:definitions of use. design studies 29, 2008. URL 10.1016/j.destud.2008.05.001.
- Rheingold. *Smart Mobs*. 2002.
- Gabriela T. Richard, Yasmin B. Kafai, Barrie Adleberg, and Orkan Telhan. Stitchfest: Diversifying a college hackathon to broaden participation and perceptions in computing. In *Proc. of SIGCE’15*, pages 114–119, 2015.
- H. Risatti. *A Theory of Craft: Function and Aesthetic Expression*. U of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Erica Robles and Mikael Wiberg. Texturing the “material turn”; in interaction design. In *Proceedings of the fourth international conference on Tangible, embedded, and embodied interaction - TEI ’10*, page 137. New York, USA, ACM Press, 2010.
- Erica Robles and Mikael Wiberg. From materials to materiality. *Interactions*, 18(1):32, 2011.
- Jennifer A. Rode. A theoretical agenda for feminist hci. *Interacting with Computers*, 23(5):393–400, 2011.

- D. Roedl, S. Bardzell, and J. Bardzell. *Sustainable Making? Balancing Optimism and Criticism in HCI Discourse*. ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI). ACM, 2015.
- Sophia Roosth. *Synthetic: How Life Got Made*. U Chicago P, 2017.
- D. Rosner and K. Ryokai. *Spyn: augmenting the creative and communicative potential of craft*. ACM CHI2010, 2010.
- D. Rosner and A. Taylor. *Antiquarian answers: Book restoration as a resource for design*. ACM CHI2011, 2011.
- D. K. Rosner and K. Ryokai. Reflections on craft: Probing the creative process of everyday knitters. In *Proceeding of the 7th ACM Conference on Creativity and Cognition (C&C'09)*. ACM, 2009. URL [10.1145/1640233.1640264](https://doi.org/10.1145/1640233.1640264).
- Daniela Rosner and Jonathan Bean. Learning from ikea hacking: i'm not one to decoupage a tabletop and call it a day. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '09)*, pages 419–422. New York, NY, USA, ACM, 2009. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1518701.1518768>.
- Daniela K. Rosner and Sarah E. Fox. Legacies of craft and the centrality of failure in a mother-operated hackerspace. *New Media & Society*, 18(4): 558–580, 2016.
- Danielav Rosner, Jean-François Blanchette, Leah Buechley, Paul Dourish, and Melissa Mazmanian. From materials to materiality. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM annual conference extended abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems Extended Abstracts - CHI EA '12*, page 2787. New York, USA, ACM Press, 2012.
- R. Sennett. *The Craftsman*. Yale UP, 2008.
- C. Shirky. *Here Comes Everybody. The Power of Organizing Without Organizations*. Penguin Books, 2009.
- Christo Sims. *Disruptive Fixation: School Reform and the Pitfalls of Techno-Idealism*. Princeton University Press, 2017. URL https://books.google.com/books?id=LA9pDQAAQBAJ&dq=christo+sims+2017&lr=&source=gsb_navlinks_s.
- Susan Currie Sivek. We need a showing of all hands. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 35(3):187–209, 2011.
- Johan Söderberg. Automating amateurs in the 3d printing community: Connecting the dots between ‘deskilling’ and ‘user-friendliness’. *Work Organization, Labour & Globalisation*, 7(1):124, 2013.

- Johan Söderberg. The cloud factory: Making things and making a living with desktop 3d printing. *Culture and Organization*, pages 1–17, 2016.
- Johan Söderberg and Alessandro Delfanti. Hacking hacked! the life cycles of digital innovation. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 40(5):793–98, 2015.
- Joshua Tanenbaum, Karen Tanenbaum, and Ron Wakkary. Steampunk as design fiction. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '12)*, pages 1583–1592. New York, NY, USA, ACM, 2012. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2207676.2208279>.
- Joshua G. Tanenbaum, Amanda M. Williams, Audrey Desjardins, and Karen Tanenbaum. Democratizing technology: pleasure, utility and expressiveness in diy and maker practice. In *Proc. of ACM CHI'13*, pages 2603–2612, 2013.
- Tapscott & Williams. *Wikinomics*. 2006.
- A. Toombs, S. Bardzell, and J. Bardzell. The proper care and feeding of hackerspaces: Care ethics and cultures of making. *Proc. of CHI2015*, 2015.
- A. Toombs, S. Gross, S. Bardzell, and J. Bardzell. From empathy to care: A feminist care ethics perspective on long-term researcher-participant relations. special issue: Ethical matter(s) in design research. *Interacting with Computers*, 29(1):45–57, 2017.
- Vasiliki Tsaknaki, Ylva Fernaeus, and Mischa Schaub. *Leather as a material for crafting interactive and physical artifacts*. ACM DIS, 2014.
- Anna Vallgård and Johan Redström. Computational composites. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems - CHI '07*, page 513. New York, USA, ACM Press, 2007.
- R. Wakkary and L. Maestri. The resourcefulness of everyday design. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGCHI conference on Creativity & cognition*, pages 163–172. ACM, 2007.
- R. Wakkary and K. Tanenbaum. A sustainable identity: The creativity of an everyday designer. *CHI 2009*, 2009.
- Ron Wakkary, Markus Schilling, Matthew Dalton, Sabrina Hauser, Audrey Desjardins, Xiao Zhang, and Henry Lin. Tutorial authorship and hybrid designers: The joy (and frustration) of diy tutorials. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '15)*, pages 609–618, 2015.
- A. Weibert, A. Marshall, K. Aal, K. Schubert, and J. Rode. *Sewing interest in E-textiles: analyzing making from a gendered perspective*. Proc. of DIS2014. ACM, 2014.

- Mark Weiser. The computer for the 21st century. *Mobile Computing and Communications Review*, 3(3):3–11, 1999.
- Mikael Wiberg, Hiroshi Ishii, Paul Dourish, Anna Vallgård, Tobie Ker-ridge, Petra Sundström, Daniela Rosner, and Mark Rolston. Materiality matters—experience materials. *Interactions*, 20(2):54, 2013.
- J. O. Young. *Cultural Appropriation and the Arts*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- J. Zimmerman, E. Forlizzi, and S. Evenson. Re-search through design as a method for interaction design research in hci. In *Proc. of CHI'07*. ACM, 2007.