



- 一、2010 年公佈實施的文化創意產業法對我國文化創意產業的發展頗有影響，設計產業亦屬於文創產業的一環，請以建築設計業、產品設計業或廣告設計業為例，規劃一套量化與質性兼顧的研究方法，用以分析該設計產業在文創法實施前後設計產業經營方式的轉變。(50%)
- 二、次級資料分析法包括：檔案紀錄研究法 (archival analysis)、內容分析法 (content)、後設分析法 (Meta analysis) 等。請說明應用次級資料分析法有何優點及限制? (20%)
- 三、研究分析時，常用到的變項有自變項 (independent variable) 與依變項 (dependent variable)。請問何謂自變項、依變項? (10%) 探討自變項與依變的關係，其常用的方法有相關分析 (correlation analysis) 與迴歸分析 (regression analysis)。請說明相關分析與迴歸分析的原理與意義。(20%)



一、What's the social significance of design? (25%)

二、What's the holistic aspect of sustainable design? (25%)

三、請嘗試闡述並比較分析「Human-Centered Design」、「Interface Design」與「Universal Design」三種理論的共同與差異。(25%)

四、以下文章是選取自Denny K. L. Ho 1 and Yanki C. Lee (2012)「The Quality of Design Participation: Intersubjectivity in Design Practice」期刊論文的部分論述，請詳加閱讀後歸納整理此段文獻的內容大意(25%)。

(A) “Design with” in the Place of “Design by” and “Design for”

We categorise various types of design practice into a threefold typology of design participation, as follows:

1. Design for People: Designers control the whole process while people are treated as passive subjects.
2. Design with People: Designers share the process with people who act as active design participants.
3. Design by People: Designers enable people to control the process, and people eventually become collaborators and creative designers.

Jane Fulton Suri (2005) from IDEO presented the model of “for>with>by” as a new democratic design development that encourages designing “with” people and even “by” people. In this process model, the intriguing bridging element, “with”, needs more attention. Banham’s (1972) assertion that the only real means of participating in design is to “do it yourself” constitutes a more extreme version of the role of participants, providing users with total autonomy to invent their rules and relegating designers to a passive role. We do not take this position, as it creates a kind of power disparity skewed towards users. On the other hand, the idea of “design for” places participants into the passive role, serving only as informants for the designers and researchers and granting them little power to direct relevant activities. Even in recent developments, as shown in Peter Dalsgaard’s work designing for participation in public knowledge institutions (Dalsgaard, Dindler, & Eriksson, 2008; Dalsgaard, 2008) and Battarbee’s co-experience, most theories mainly fall in line with the conventional “design for”. We notice that Battarbee’s co-experience has somewhat modified the “design-for” version (Battarbee, 2003; Battarbee & Koskinen, 2005), but we regard



國立雲林科技大學

101 學年度博士班招生考試試題

所別：設計學研究所

科目：設計理論與文獻

it as a process which is to “design-for” and then “design-by” in the sense that designers decide the end-products first and leave the products to the users, to see how users co-experience the product in a creative way (Battarbee, 2004). User involvement only happens at the final stage of application or consumption of the products (Lucero, Aliakseyeu, Overbeeke, & Martens, 2009), not right at the heart of the design process. This leads to the question of what is the right moment at which people should participate in the design process, and how does design research determine the role assigned to the participants.