

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Design *in a Hurry*

Why some things just work

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 5

The Core Ideas 7

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 30

Use It 35

Terms 40

Go Deeper 44

Notes and Sources 46

Bibliography 53

The Whole Thing in One Page

Design is often mistaken for the visible finish applied after the serious work: the curve of a chair, the type on a poster, the polish of a screen. Those choices matter, but design begins before them. It decides what the thing is for, whom it expects, which actions it permits, what it communicates, how it is made, where it puts difficulty and what happens when use departs from the plan.

The simplest useful model is fit. A design works when purpose, people, form, production, context and time fit well enough for the intended outcome. Fit is not an intrinsic quality stored inside an object. A chef's knife, ticket machine or hospital form can work for one person in one setting and fail another. Beauty, familiarity and cultural meaning belong to this judgement because they affect attention, trust, desire, identity and willingness to learn. So do cost, maintenance, labour and repair.

Design creates fit through several connected moves. It frames the job before selecting the object. It gives form to action and meaning, using affordances, signifiers, mapping and learned conventions. It closes the action loop with feedback. It guides choice through constraints and defaults. It treats repeated error as evidence about the assumed user and the operating conditions. It learns through observation, prototypes, tests and revision. Finally, it widens the boundary from the visible thing to the service, production system and consequences around it.

Effort is one of the main currencies in that process. A clear label carries memory. A well-mapped control carries interpretation. A forcing function carries part of a safety check. An undo command carries recovery. A familiar convention carries prior learning. Good design does not remove every difficulty. A musical instrument, secure procedure or demanding tool may need skill and concentration. It preserves effort that belongs to the purpose and removes effort created by ambiguity, poor fit or neglect.

The history is older and wider than the modern designer. Skilled communities shaped tools, vessels, textiles, scripts and buildings through

materials, patterns and accumulated correction. Large production systems coordinated specialised decisions long before European industrialisation. Factories then increased the distance between conception, making and use, while allowing one decision to be repeated thousands of times. Design reform, industrial design, ergonomics and human factors tried to govern that multiplied consequence. Computing made states and sequences into material. Service and systems design revealed that a smooth encounter can depend on rules, workers and infrastructure far beyond the screen.

That expansion creates the final problem. A thing may work beautifully at one point because the surrounding system has been aligned deliberately. It may also appear effortless because labour, exclusion, surveillance, waste, maintenance or danger has been moved beyond the chosen boundary. A local fit can export misfit to another person, place or time.

So why do some things just work? Because people have constructed, learnt and sustained a fit, or shifted its costs elsewhere. The mature judgement is to ask for whom, towards what end, under which conditions and at whose cost.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

A badly designed door can make an intelligent adult feel briefly foolish. There is a flat metal plate, a vertical handle, perhaps a small sign added after enough people failed. You pull. Nothing happens. You push. It opens. The embarrassment belongs to you for half a second, although the evidence belongs to the door. Its visible parts suggested the wrong action, and somebody later treated the predictable result with a label.

That small failure matters because much of modern life now has the same structure. You are expected to understand ticket machines, medical devices, banking screens, road junctions, tax forms and workplace systems after a glance or hurried instruction. Each encounter assigns work between you and the thing. You must perceive what can be done, remember what

happened before, interpret the current state, choose an action and notice whether it succeeded. The design can support those tasks, leave them to you or make them harder for commercial reasons.

Once you see that allocation, ordinary frustration becomes legible. A train app that confirms payment but leaves the ticket hidden has a feedback and information problem. An infusion pump that permits a dangerous setting after an easy slip has a safety problem. A subscription that takes two taps to start and thirteen screens to stop has no usability accident at all. It is working for the seller against the user.

Design knowledge changes what you blame. People do make careless, uninformed and reckless choices. Yet repeated mistakes by different people in the same place are rarely independent character flaws. They are data. Aviation and medicine became safer partly by refusing to stop at “operator error” and examining controls, displays, procedures, workload, training and organisational pressure together. A system can invite the wrong action, hide its state and then record the predictable outcome as human weakness.

It also changes what you praise. Ease can come from clear structure, but it can also come from work displaced elsewhere. One-click delivery may depend on warehouse routes, drivers, address databases, returns staff and packaging that the customer never sees. A hotel room feels effortless because somebody cleaned, restocked, inspected and repaired it before arrival. A simple interface may be supported by thousands of rules and people behind it. Smoothness at the point of use is evidence of an allocation, not proof that the whole system is simple or fair.

The subject reaches further than products. A ballot paper, benefits application, museum sign, classroom timetable and emergency warning all shape action. So do defaults. Making organ donation, privacy, pension saving or recurring payment the preselected option can alter what people do without banning any alternative. That power may help people carry out their own intentions, exploit inattention or do both for different users. Form has politics because form controls who can proceed, how much they must know and how easily they can refuse.

There is no context-free perfect design. A knife that is safe for a child would be useless to a chef. A map that preserves distance may obscure connections; Harry Beck's Underground diagram clarified the network by distorting the city. ISO defines usability as an outcome of use in a specified context for good reason. The user, goal, environment and consequences must be named before "works" means anything.

That limit makes design more useful, not less. It replaces vague taste with better questions. What is the person trying to achieve? What do they perceive now? What must they remember? What error is likely under pressure? How will they recover? Who is missing from the assumed user? Where did the effort, cost and risk go?

You already spend your day inside other people's answers. Learning to inspect them gives you a practical power: the power to stop confusing familiarity with inevitability, frustration with personal failure and convenience with innocence.

The Core Ideas

Design Creates Fit

A design never works in the abstract. It works for somebody, towards an end, under conditions, for a period of time. Remove those terms and the praise becomes empty. A chair may fit a short conversation and fail an eight-hour shift. A route may be clear to a local and unreadable to a visitor. A secure process may protect an account while excluding the person who cannot complete its identity check. "Good design" is always a claim about a relationship.

Imagine an unfamiliar hotel shower. The job is not to admire a control but to obtain water at a safe temperature and useful pressure without a long experiment. One arrangement separates flow and temperature, marks them clearly, shows the current setting and limits the hottest range unless a release is pressed. Another presents a smooth chrome form whose moving parts and sequence are hidden. Both may contain sound plumbing. Only

one has been fitted to the cold, undressed guest who must understand it in seconds.

This is why the brief matters. “Design a better shower control” has already chosen an answer. “Help an unfamiliar guest set safe water quickly” leaves room for a different control, a preset, clearer instruction, a temperature stop or a change elsewhere in the system. Problem framing decides which cause will be attacked, which people will count and which costs remain outside the project. An elegant answer to the wrong question is still wrong.

Fit also clarifies design’s relation to engineering, art and styling. Engineering establishes and improves what can operate within physical and technical limits. Design joins that capability to use, production, communication and meaning. Art can share materials and visual judgement while pursuing interpretation rather than a specified task. Styling shapes appearance and desire, which may support a wider fit or conceal its absence. In practice these activities overlap. Their borders are professional arrangements, not laws of nature.

Several kinds of fit must often coexist. Physical fit concerns reach, force, size and movement. Perceptual fit concerns what can be detected and distinguished. Cognitive fit concerns categories, memory and sequence. Emotional fit concerns confidence, dignity and fear of irreversible damage. Social and cultural fit concern learned conventions, status, language and what an object permits a person to express. Organisational fit concerns staffing, rules, maintenance and authority. Improving one can damage another. A child-resistant cap protects against accidental opening while making access harder for some adults. A voice interface reduces typing and may create privacy or recognition problems.

Aesthetics are therefore part of design, not a pleasant addition after use has been solved. Shape, material, rhythm, colour, sound and finish can direct attention, express care, signal seriousness or make learning worthwhile. They can also create misplaced trust. A coherent surface may help people predict behaviour, or persuade them that a poorly governed system is safe. Looking resolved and being resolved are different achievements.

Minimum effort is not the universal aim. A musical instrument, game, ritual, exercise machine or safety check can need resistance, practice or deliberation. The relevant distinction is between effort that belongs to the purpose and effort caused by confusion, mismatch or avoidable organisational failure. Design often creates fit by deciding who or what will perceive, remember, calculate, wait, check and recover.

Constraints make the judgement real. Cost, materials, time, regulation, energy, production, repair, culture and existing infrastructure limit what can be done. Fit can also decay. Bodies change, components wear, conventions shift, software dependencies break and organisations lose the people who held the service together. The opening question is therefore precise: what outcome is sought, for whom, in which conditions, across what life, and which trade-offs have been accepted?

Form Carries Action and Meaning

A mechanism can operate perfectly and still fail where a person meets it. The structure may be strong, the software accurate and the motor reliable. If possible actions are hard to perceive, their effects are hard to predict or the object communicates the wrong social meaning, capability has not yet become usable form.

Affordance is often stretched to cover anything that looks clickable or grippable. Its stricter meaning is relational. A ledge may afford sitting for one body, climbing for a child and neither action for somebody who cannot reach it. A signifier is the cue indicating where or how to act: a handle, plate, label, icon, texture or sound.

Confusing possibility with communication produces the Norman door. A glass door may physically permit pushing from either side, but a large pull handle signifies the wrong action on the push side. A label reading “PUSH” repairs the message while leaving the contradiction. A flat plate on one side and a graspable handle on the other align cue and mechanism. The arrangement still depends on sight, reach and learned expectation, but it makes the likely action legible without a written apology.

Mapping is the relation between a control and its effect. Four cooker knobs in a line beside four rings arranged in a square create a translation problem. Labels can solve it, though the cook must look, read and remember. Controls arranged in the same square let spatial relation do more of the work. Mapping can be bodily, spatial, temporal or conventional. Turning a steering wheel left has a close relation to the vehicle's movement. Raising a vertical slider to increase a quantity is partly metaphor and partly habit.

A conceptual model joins the parts into a prediction. The folder on a computer screen does not explain electronic storage, yet it supports expectations about grouping, naming and moving files. The model is useful while the behaviour respects the borrowed logic. When a familiar symbol produces an unfamiliar result, prior knowledge becomes a trap.

Form also carries meaning that exceeds immediate action. Weight can suggest durability or waste. A polished counter can signal care, luxury or exclusion. A public bench can invite rest, display civic generosity or use dividers to prevent lying down. The practical function remains present, but form tells users what sort of place this is, who belongs and how they are expected to behave. These readings vary with culture and experience. There is no neutral visual language waiting outside history.

Convention is shared design infrastructure. Symbols, page order, traffic signs, control directions and interface patterns become efficient because people have learned them together. A convention can make a new object feel obvious without being natural. Breaking it may improve the arrangement and make transition harder. Keeping it can preserve fluency and an old exclusion.

Harry Beck's Underground diagram shows form creating one kind of truth by sacrificing another. Earlier maps placed the railway over London's geography. Beck regularised angles, expanded the centre and treated the network more like a circuit. Distances and directions became less accurate. Connections became easier to follow. The diagram fits route planning and can mislead a traveller choosing whether to walk between nearby stations.

No form can explain every action, function and meaning at once. The task is selection. Can people find the relevant action, distinguish dangerous alternatives, understand enough of the state and form a sound prediction before committing? Does the form support the identity and setting the design claims to serve? What appears obvious is usually a negotiated fit among bodies, materials, symbols and learned expectation.

Feedback Closes the Loop

An action without feedback is a question sent into silence. You press a lift button and nothing changes. Did the system register the press? Is the lift broken? Should you press again? A tiny light can remove the uncertainty. It does not move the lift faster. It tells you that the machine has received the request and that waiting is now the appropriate action.

Interaction is a loop. The person forms a goal, chooses an action, performs it, perceives the new state and judges whether the goal was reached. Design can fail at every crossing. The action may be difficult to discover. The control may not respond. The response may occur somewhere the person is not looking. The new state may be visible but meaningless. Good feedback closes enough of the loop for the next decision.

Speed matters. A physical switch often produces resistance, movement, sound and a visible change at once. Digital systems can separate input from effect by seconds, minutes or days. If a payment screen freezes after the user presses “Pay”, the absence of feedback can provoke repeated presses and duplicate transactions. A progress indicator, disabled button and clear receipt divide the waiting period into intelligible states. False precision is not required. Honest status is.

Feedback also needs proportion. A quiet click suits a lamp switch. A medication pump requires stronger confirmation for a critical setting. Constant alarms can become background noise, while an excessively dramatic animation can make routine work slower. The response should match the consequence and the environment. Visual feedback fails when the operator must look elsewhere. Sound fails in noise or for users who

cannot hear it. Vibration fails if the device is not being held. Redundant channels can help, though piling signals together can create its own confusion.

Feedforward is the information available before action. A greyed-out command signals that it cannot currently be used. A label beside a destructive button states what will be deleted. A preview shows the likely result of cropping a photograph. Feedback says what happened; feedforward helps the person choose what to do. Strong designs use both, particularly where the cost of experimentation is high.

The need becomes clearest in delayed systems. A thermostat is not a direct valve on room temperature. It sets a target for a heating system whose effects arrive slowly. People who do not understand that model may turn the control far above the desired temperature, as though asking harder will warm the room faster. Clear indication of current temperature, target, heating state and schedule can make the delay comprehensible. The deeper problem is not impatience. It is an invisible process with weak feedback.

Feedback can mislead too. A social platform's red badge confirms that something awaits attention, but it also creates urgency. A celebratory animation after a purchase can reassure while muting the financial consequence. A dashboard can display the metric easiest to count rather than the state the user needs to know. Response is never neutral merely because it is immediate.

The standard is not maximum noise. It is useful evidence. After an action, can the person tell what the system received, what state it entered, what remains uncertain and what can be done next? A thing that "just works" rarely leaves the user wondering whether anything happened.

Conventions, Constraints and Defaults Guide Choice

Much of an “intuitive” design is a convention encountered often enough to disappear. The order of pages in a book, the shape of road signs, the location of familiar controls and the grammar of a form let people arrive with knowledge already in hand. That shared learning is valuable infrastructure. It also varies by generation, culture, profession and ability, so a pattern obvious to one group can be opaque to another.

Conventions narrow interpretation. A red signal warns because institutions have taught people to read it that way; colour alone does not carry a complete instruction. A familiar keypad permits rapid action because practice has settled the number positions. Designers can follow, adapt or reject convention. Novelty may improve a poor pattern and make first use harder. Familiarity may ease use and preserve a bad assumption.

A constraint goes further by narrowing action itself. Writing “do not insert backwards” beside a symmetrical component leaves the error available. Shaping the connector so it fits in one orientation removes that decision. Constraints can be physical, logical, semantic or cultural. A booking system can reject an end date earlier than a start date. A guard can block access to moving machinery. A file type can limit which commands make sense. Good constraints make coherent or safe action easier to identify. Bad ones obstruct legitimate variation, produce dead ends or protect the organisation from inconvenience.

A forcing function makes one state a prerequisite for another. A machine that stops when its guard opens does not rely on memory. Such coupling can transform safety where the required sequence is known, and invite bypasses when the safeguard blocks necessary work. The workaround then belongs to the real design.

Defaults guide without making alternatives impossible. They determine what happens when a person accepts the starting point, overlooks a setting or has no strong preference. Pension contributions, privacy permissions,

delivery methods and recurring payments can therefore be shaped at scale by a preselected option. Defaults help when they provide a sensible, visible and reversible start. They exploit when the chooser of the default benefits from inattention, fatigue or difficulty in leaving.

No interface property settles the ethics. Automatic renewal can preserve a valued service or continue an unwanted charge. A paperless bill may reduce cost and waste while disadvantaging people without reliable digital access. Ask whose interest the starting point advances, whether the alternative is usable and how easily the decision can be reversed.

Choice also carries work. Twenty unfamiliar options can expand the formal menu while reducing practical control. Research on choice overload does not support a universal magic number. Effects depend on complexity, preference uncertainty, decision goals and the effort of comparison. Grouping, ranking and progressive disclosure can help. The same methods can conceal unfavourable terms or steer people towards a profitable option.

Digital manipulation has become consequential enough to attract legal limits. Article 25 of the European Union's Digital Services Act restricts specified interface practices that deceive, manipulate or materially distort free and informed decisions within its scope. The law does not convert every persuasive arrangement into an offence, and compliance is not proof of fairness. It recognises the underlying mechanism: order, prominence, friction and repetition can alter agency without removing the nominal choice.

Conventions, constraints and defaults are quiet instructions. They decide what a person already seems to know, which actions demand attention, which occur through inertia and which are unavailable. The useful test is not whether choice survives in theory. It is whether the person can perceive the path, understand the stakes, act without avoidable error and depart from the suggested route without punishment designed to exhaust them.

Errors Reveal the Assumed User

The phrase human error often closes an investigation where explanation should begin. A person selected the wrong control, entered the wrong value or skipped a step. That identifies the final action. It does not explain why the action was available, probable, difficult to notice or hard to reverse.

During the Second World War, psychologist Alphonse Chapanis examined repeated confusion between nearby aircraft controls for landing gear and wing flaps. The controls were too similar in position and feel for a stressed operator reaching without prolonged inspection. Shape coding made them distinguishable by touch. A wheel-like control could indicate landing gear while another form indicated flaps. The intervention did not improve character or attention. It reduced a predictable mismatch between people and machine.

Human factors applies that discipline to the whole encounter among people, equipment, tasks and organisations. Bodies differ in reach, strength, size and mobility. Vision changes with light and age. Gloves alter touch. Noise masks alarms. Fatigue and workload narrow attention. Memory is limited and interruptions are normal. These are not defects awaiting a better memo. They are operating conditions.

Every design contains an assumed user. Text size assumes vision and distance. Timed steps assume reading speed and motor control. Icons assume conventions. A service journey assumes language, documents, money, transport and permission. An imagined average can exclude people at the edge, and averages from one population may not transfer to another.

Error-resistant design works in layers. Remove a hazard where possible. Prevent impossible or dangerous combinations. Distinguish critical controls. Make the current mode and system state visible. Preserve work. Provide undo. Ask for confirmation when an action is consequential and unusual, rather than attaching warnings to every routine step. Place the explanation near the source and state what can be done next. “Invalid input” reports displeasure. “Use a date after 4 September” supports correction.

Severity matters alongside frequency. A common minor slip may need a small repair. A rare action that can kill requires barriers, independent checks and evidence that the safeguards survive realistic use. The Therac-25 radiation accidents between 1985 and 1987 became a central case because six known massive overdoses emerged from interacting software, hardware, interface, testing, reporting and organisational failures. Operators sometimes saw cryptic messages and resumed treatment because prior experience had taught them that such messages were routine. Their keystrokes were part of the sequence, not a sufficient explanation of the system that gave those keystrokes lethal force.

Accessibility extends the same analysis beyond one expected body or sense. Text that cannot be enlarged, video without captions, a control operable only by precise dragging and colour used as the sole signal each assume a narrow route through the task. WCAG 2.2 turns many web barriers into testable criteria while warning that conformance cannot meet every need. A standard is a floor for known requirements, not proof that every person can participate.

Inclusive design does not promise one fixed solution that is best for everyone. Needs can conflict. A kerb gives some cane users a detectable boundary; a level route supports wheelchair access. The answer may involve dimensions, separation, multiple modes, compatible assistive technology or a negotiated change to the surrounding service. Participation helps only when affected people can change the decision, rather than decorate a process whose power remains elsewhere.

Error is diagnostic. Ask what the person perceived, expected and tried to achieve; what conditions shaped the action; which assumption failed; and why recovery did not contain the damage. Blame may remain appropriate for deliberate violation or reckless conduct. It becomes credible only after the design has stopped manufacturing the failure it condemns.

Design Learns Through Making

Design conducted entirely in imagination acquires an unusually cooperative user. This person reads every instruction, shares the team's categories, has two free hands, notices every change, remembers prior steps and never arrives tired, hurried or frightened. Reality is less obliging. Contact with it is a production method, not a courtesy added after the important decisions.

Research begins before a solution hardens. Observation reveals sequence, workarounds and attention. Interviews expose goals, language and fear, though people cannot report habits they do not notice or predict future behaviour with certainty. Complaints, support records, failure logs and repair histories show patterns a workshop may miss. Each method produces partial evidence, not direct access to a universal user.

Consider a hypothetical team asked to reduce missed hospital appointments. It might begin by writing better reminder messages. Fieldwork could show that some patients receive letters too late, cannot reach the rescheduling line, misread the clinic name or fail to find the entrance. The problem has changed. It now includes postal delay, contact capacity, wayfinding and scheduling rules. Research earns its place when it changes the proposed object or the definition of success, rather than supplying a quotation after the answer has been chosen.

A prototype is a question made tangible. It can be a paper screen, cardboard grip, role-played service, rough mechanism, sample label or clickable sequence. Its fidelity should match the uncertainty under examination. A polished prototype helps when finish, trust or physical detail is the question. Used too early, polish makes a weak arrangement feel decided and directs comments towards colour and wording while the structure escapes review.

Testing gives people a goal and lets the proposal encounter action. Asking where somebody would click tests recognition. Watching a representative task exposes sequence, mapping, feedback, delay and recovery. Five people struggling can reveal a defect worth fixing. It cannot prove that all

populations will succeed. Safety-critical products need formal work with intended users, critical tasks and relevant environments. A method useful for finding common interface problems is not automatically valid for population estimates, long-term behaviour or clinical safety.

Iteration is the disciplined response. A finding may change the frame, concept, control, message or feature, or be rejected because the test was unrepresentative or the change would damage a more important case. “Users asked for it” is not a design rule. People know their experience; they do not carry sole responsibility for technical, commercial and social trade-offs.

Making is collective even when one name appears on the object. Engineers, researchers, writers, craftspeople, factory workers, suppliers, managers, maintainers and users alter the result. Production tolerances change form. Staff invent workarounds. Repairers find weak joints. Communities adapt objects to unplanned uses. The designer’s authorship is real, but it works through negotiation and knowledge held elsewhere.

Co-design and participatory methods try to redistribute some of that authority to people affected by the outcome. They can reveal values and consequences that external experts miss. They can also become theatre if participants are asked to generate ideas while budgets, ownership and decision rights remain fixed. The test is not whether a workshop occurred. It is what affected people were able to decide, refuse or revise.

The Double Diamond gives this movement a useful public shape: widen enquiry, define the problem, widen possible answers, then narrow towards delivery. The Design Council launched the diagram in 2004 as a way to communicate patterns of divergence and convergence. It is a map, not a conveyor belt. Discovery continues during making, delivery produces evidence and maintenance reopens the brief.

Design learns when plans remain vulnerable to materials, use and consequence. The purpose of research and prototypes is not to remove judgement. It is to make judgement answerable to a world that can disagree

before the cost of change becomes prohibitive.

The System Is the Object

A customer taps a button and a meal arrives at the door. The visible design may be a clear menu, accurate price, useful map and reassuring progress display. The service also contains restaurant preparation, courier allocation, platform rules, traffic, addresses, payment, refunds, ratings, support and labour conditions. Judging the screen alone is like reviewing a theatre by its ticket.

Design's object expands whenever the outcome depends on relationships beyond the visible artefact. A kettle includes buying, filling, reading the gauge, cleaning scale, storing the cable, finding parts and disposing of it. An identity check crosses a screen, documents, databases, policies and exception handling. A system works through components whose local goals may conflict. Improving one point can move difficulty rather than remove it.

Front stage and back stage make that movement visible. The front stage is the encounter a customer or citizen sees: the desk, form, screen, message and handover. The back stage includes workers, rules, stock, databases, maintenance and coordination. A graceful front can rest on a disorderly back, with experienced staff repairing failures through memory and goodwill. The service appears coherent until the person leaves or demand rises.

This is where effort allocation remains useful inside the wider model of fit. Stored address and payment details reduce typing and raise the consequence of account compromise. A thinner device is easier to carry and harder to repair when its parts are glued. A self-service form saves administrative entry by requiring applicants to classify their own circumstances. A gate reduces routine staffing and may move difficult cases into a distant queue. Each trade can be defensible. None removes work from the system.

Time widens the object again. Materials wear, batteries decline, instructions separate from products and software dependencies change. Users build skill, then an update moves the control. Organisations combine systems that

were never designed to meet. Launch-centred design rewards the first encounter. Design across a life asks how the thing will be cleaned, maintained, repaired, adapted, migrated and retired. Modularity and replaceable parts preserve options while adding connectors, tolerances, cost or bulk.

The boundary is itself a design decision. A reusable cup looks favourable if washing, return rates and transport are ignored. A fast app looks favourable if failed cases and support labour sit outside the measure. A public service can report digital completion while people who cannot complete it disappear from the denominator. Systems thinking does not demand an account of every effect in existence. It demands that the chosen boundary be named and that important consequences just outside it be tested.

Power matters because commissioner, purchaser, user, worker, data subject and person exposed to failure may be different people. A project naturally hears those with money and authority. Others can become “edge cases”, constraints or externalities in the document, even when they carry the result in life. Participation, regulation and professional ethics are attempts to correct that imbalance, not guarantees that it has been corrected.

Fit began as a relation at the point of use. At system scale, its boundaries become visible. A design can fit a chosen task and still fail the worker, neighbour, repairer, environment or future user excluded from the brief. It can also achieve a difficult, durable fit because the surrounding relationships have been composed carefully: parts are available, staff have authority, exceptions are supported and maintenance was funded.

Some things seem to work by themselves. None does. A fit has been made through form, convention, labour, infrastructure and learning, and it must survive the conditions in which the thing lives. The mature question is not merely “is this easy?” It asks: for whom does this work, towards what end, because what happens elsewhere, and for how long?

How It Actually Works

Designing before the designer

Designing is ancient. The separate professional title is recent. People have always shaped tools, vessels, textiles, scripts, furniture, vehicles and rituals towards purposes, using knowledge stored in materials, patterns, apprenticeship and repeated correction. A handle thickened after earlier ones split. A loom encoded a structure for cloth. A writing system disciplined marks so that strangers could read them. Decisions were distributed across communities rather than waiting for a person whose job title was designer.

This closeness did not make pre-industrial making humane, egalitarian or perfectly adapted. Craft traditions could preserve hierarchy, waste, exclusion and poor conventions. Nor were conception and labour always joined in one hand. Courts, temples, workshops, shipyards and armies coordinated specialists through drawings, models, templates, measures and authority. What differed was the modern scale and status of the separation, not its absolute existence.

Jingdezhen offers a useful correction to a purely European origin story. For centuries its porcelain production linked specialised raw-material work, kiln technology, modelling, decoration, firing, merchants, guilds, imperial requirements and civilian markets. The system did not depend on one author controlling the whole object. Quality and identity emerged from place-based production capable of large output, accumulated technique and exacting coordination. It was not a modern factory in disguise. It shows that complex design decisions, standardisation and distributed expertise existed outside the later Euro-American profession.

Printing created another early system of repeatable decisions. Type design, page composition, paper, ink, presswork and binding had to meet. Shipwrights and military engineers coordinated labour around drawings and rules. By the eighteenth century Josiah Wedgwood divided modelling, production, decoration, marketing and sale with unusual discipline. These arrangements prepared the modern problem: the people deciding form,

making the thing and living with it could occupy different worlds.

Industrialisation made that distance common and multiplied its consequences. Once one pattern could govern thousands of objects, a useful choice travelled further and a bad choice became cheap to repeat. The modern design profession emerged partly to manage the opportunity and risk created by that separation.

Industry creates the modern problem

Industrial production depended on drawings, gauges, moulds and specifications that could travel farther than the craftsman. Decisions moved upstream, before the buyer or worker could respond. Standardisation allowed parts to match and prices to fall; it also fixed assumptions about bodies, repair and taste into every copy.

Michael Thonet's bentwood furniture showed what a form could become when material process, shipping and assembly were considered together. Steam-softened beech could be bent in moulds into light, strong curves and produced in large numbers. The famous coffee-house chair used a small set of repeatable components rather than carved imitation ornament. Parts could be packed efficiently, transported and assembled away from the factory. Its shape was therefore tied to a production and distribution system, not drawn as an isolated silhouette. Industrial design at its strongest coordinates such relationships.

The nineteenth century displayed both the promise and the anxiety. The Great Exhibition of 1851 filled the Crystal Palace with manufactured goods from across the world. To reformers, much of the ornament looked borrowed and badly attached, as though new production had copied old status symbols without understanding either material or purpose. Schools, museums and public debates formed around the question of how industrial goods should be shaped.

The Arts and Crafts movement answered by restoring value to workmanship, material honesty and the conditions of labour. William Morris attacked a system that separated pleasure from work and flooded homes

with objects whose decoration disguised poor making. The movement is often reduced to nostalgia for handcraft. Its sharper claim was social: the quality of an object could not be separated from the way work was organised. A beautiful chair produced through degrading labour contained a contradiction that surface judgement missed.

The answer had a cost. Hand production made many Arts and Crafts goods expensive. A movement concerned with ordinary life often sold to wealthy customers. That tension would return throughout design history. Mass production could lower price, spread sanitation, lighting, transport and useful equipment, while also standardising bodies, tastes and repair. Craft could preserve skill and local fit, while keeping goods scarce. There was no clean side to choose.

Form for the machine age

By the early twentieth century, designers and manufacturers were trying to give industrial production a language of its own. In Germany, Peter Behrens worked across buildings, products and graphics for AEG, helping to demonstrate that a company's objects and public identity could be coordinated. In 1919 Walter Gropius founded the Bauhaus in Weimar with a programme that joined fine art, craft and making. Students passed through foundational study and workshops in metal, weaving, furniture, typography and other fields.

The school's image is now clean geometry and tubular steel, but its course shifted. Gropius's early language centred on a new unity of art and craft. By 1923 he was stressing design for mass production. In Dessau, the school became more closely engaged with industry, standardisation, housing and communication. Marianne Brandt's metalwork, Marcel Breuer's furniture and Herbert Bayer's typography were not one style applied everywhere. They were attempts to rethink objects for new materials, machines and patterns of life.

The Bauhaus lasted only from 1919 to 1933, moving from Weimar to Dessau and then Berlin before Nazi pressure closed it. Its reach came later

through teachers, students, publications and institutions abroad. The slogan that modern design began there is too neat. Russian Constructivism, De Stijl, commercial engineering, reform schools and manufacturers were working on related problems. The Bauhaus became a powerful symbol because it compressed education, social ambition, art and industry into one institution.

The Frankfurt Kitchen of 1926 turned related ideas towards domestic labour. Margarete Schütte-Lihotzky organised a compact fitted room around movement, storage, hygiene and workflow for new public housing in Frankfurt. It was an important attempt to reduce repetitive work through spatial arrangement and standardised components. It also reveals the politics inside efficiency. The kitchen treated housework as labour worthy of analysis, while largely accepting that one woman would perform it in a small separate space. A design can improve a task and preserve the social arrangement that assigned the task.

After the Second World War, the Ulm School of Design pushed further away from the romantic designer as inspired artist. Active from 1953 to 1968, it joined product and visual communication to technology, semiotics, information, production and systematic analysis. Work associated with firms such as Braun gave consumer equipment a coherent language across controls, graphics and product families. The Ulm model could become austere and overconfident in method, yet it helped establish that modern products were systems of information and manufacture rather than sculptures with mechanisms hidden inside.

In the United States, the industrial designer emerged as a recognisable commercial specialist. Raymond Loewy, Norman Bel Geddes, Walter Dorwin Teague and Henry Dreyfuss worked on products, interiors, transport and corporate systems. During the Depression, streamlining gave refrigerators, radios, pencil sharpeners and other stationary objects the look of speed. Sometimes the form reduced drag. Often it signified modernity and made an old product seem new. Styling was not a trivial fraud. It shaped desire and sales. It also showed how easily a new surface could renew

desire without improving use.

Designing around bodies

Henry Dreyfuss made the user a more explicit part of industrial design. His office studied bodies, reach, posture, hearing and sight, then translated measurements into products and diagrams. In *Designing for People*, published in 1955, the figures Joe and Josephine represented accumulated anthropometric data rather than ideal beauty. The aim was to fit controls, seats, telephones and workspaces to people instead of forcing people to fit the machine.

The word average concealed a problem. A product designed around a mean body can fit nobody particularly well, and averages across one population do not transfer automatically to another. Military data overrepresented young men. Dimensions that suit standing adults fail children, wheelchair users or people with limited reach. Later ergonomics and inclusive design moved from one representative body towards ranges, adjustability and diverse use conditions.

The Bell System's telephone work shows the method. A handset had to fit face and hand, survive repeated use, transmit speech and sit securely on its cradle. Push-button layouts were tested rather than chosen by visual symmetry alone. Researchers compared arrangements for speed and error, contributing to the familiar three-by-four keypad with numbers running from 1 at the top left. The calculator later used a different numerical order because its history and tasks were different. Familiarity hardened both into conventions.

Maps offered another kind of fit. Harry Beck's Underground diagram, devised in 1931 and first issued as a pocket map in 1933, treated navigation as a problem of connections rather than a miniature picture of London. Its regular angles, expanded centre and coloured lines reduced geographic truth to improve route planning. The object became a model for network diagrams worldwide. It also proved that accurate representation and useful representation are different achievements.

Public road signs made the same problem safety-critical. Jock Kinneir and Margaret Calvert developed a coordinated British system of lettering, colour, shape, symbols and spacing that came into use nationwide in 1965. A driver sees the sign at speed, from a changing distance, in varied light and among competing demands. Legibility therefore depends on more than a handsome typeface. Message length, word shape, hierarchy, placement and consistency must work as one timed encounter. The finished sign is graphic design measured in seconds and missed turns.

From operator blame to human factors

War accelerated the study of people inside machines. Aircraft, radar, communications and weapons systems became too complex for performance to depend on mechanical reliability alone. Designers had to account for perception, workload, reach, coding, fatigue and action under stress. Psychology, physiology and engineering met in the field now called human factors or ergonomics.

Alphonse Chapanis's investigation of cockpit controls became its durable story. Pilots could confuse nearby landing-gear and flap controls that looked and felt too alike. The machine recorded a wrong selection; the surrounding account called it pilot error. Shape coding changed the controls so they could be distinguished by touch. A wheel-like form indicated landing gear, while another shape indicated flaps. The intervention did not make pilots wiser. It made the dangerous confusion less available.

That shift changed the object of investigation. Instead of asking why a person failed to remember, human factors asked why memory was carrying a safety-critical task. Instead of assuming more training would solve a problem, it examined whether the display, control, procedure and environment supported the action. The approach entered aviation, nuclear power, transport, manufacturing and medicine, though institutions still revert to blame because redesign is slower and more expensive than discipline.

The six known Therac-25 overdoses, which occurred from 1985 to 1987, showed why system boundaries matter. Patients received massive radiation

doses from a computer-controlled medical machine. The failure cannot be reduced to one defective screen or one coding mistake. Software race conditions, removal of hardware interlocks, weak testing, poor incident reporting, overconfidence in software and interface behaviour interacted. Cryptic messages had become routine to operators, so some resumed treatment instead of reading them as evidence of danger. Safety had been assigned to assumptions that did not hold together.

Modern medical-device guidance therefore treats the user interface as more than buttons and displays. It includes setup, connections, packaging, labels, cleaning, maintenance and training. Critical tasks are tested with intended users in realistic conditions. The goal is not a device on which error is theoretically avoidable. It is a system in which foreseeable use does not produce unacceptable harm.

Interaction becomes a material

Computing moved design into time. A chair presents most of its form at once. Software reveals itself in states, sequences, menus, messages and delays. The same screen can become a document, control panel, marketplace or conversation. Designers now shape what appears after each action and what the system remembers between them.

Early computers were operated through specialist commands, cards and manuals because expensive machines were expected to train their users. Research at several institutions, including SRI and Xerox PARC, developed and combined pointing, windows, icons and direct manipulation. Commercial graphical interfaces later made some operations visible as objects on a desktop. The metaphor reduced the need to remember command syntax, while importing new conventions that still had to be learned.

Douglas Engelbart's 1968 demonstration made the change visible in one room: a mouse, linked text, windows, collaborative editing and a screen used as a space for organised work rather than a terminal that merely received commands. Xerox's Alto in the 1970s developed a graphical,

networked workstation around related ideas. The Alto was a research machine, not the origin of every later interface, and many contributors sit behind the familiar lineage. What mattered was the shift in ambition. The computer could present objects that people manipulated and provide continuous visual response.

When graphical systems reached wider commercial use, designers discovered that visibility could create clutter as quickly as clarity. Menus hid commands to preserve space; icons compressed labels into symbols; overlapping windows let one screen hold several tasks while requiring users to manage the overlap. The desktop metaphor helped people transfer expectations from offices, but it never removed learning. Files still had abstract locations, modes still changed the meaning of actions, and a small pointer demanded precision. Each apparent simplification created a new convention, which later generations mistook for nature. The interface worked because education, repetition and inherited patterns completed the design in daily practice.

Interaction design brought old concerns into a new medium: signifiers, mapping, feedback, constraints and error recovery. It also added navigation, information architecture, latency and mode. A hidden system state could make the same action produce different results. An undo command could turn exploration from a risk into a method. Defaults could configure millions of devices at once.

The interface then became a place of business. Search ranking, notifications, subscription flows, privacy settings and recommendation systems made attention and behaviour commercial outputs. The tools used to reduce effort could also obstruct refusal, conceal alternatives and prolong engagement. “User-friendly” stopped being enough because the platform could be friendly to one immediate action while hostile to the person’s longer aim.

Accessibility standards made many assumptions testable. Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.2 address perceivability, operation, understanding and technical robustness through criteria covering matters such as

keyboard access, captions, focus, target size and error identification. Conformance improves access for many people and often improves general use, yet the standard states that it cannot cover every need. A checklist catches known barriers. Contact with diverse users remains necessary.

From products to services and systems

By the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, designers were increasingly asked to shape services, organisations and public systems. The object might be a hospital appointment, airport journey, bank account or benefits claim. Touchpoints mattered, but so did the rules and handovers behind them. Service blueprints made front-stage encounters and back-stage processes visible together.

Design methods were codified for teams that needed a shared language. The Design Council's Double Diamond, launched in 2004, described two movements of divergence and convergence: investigate and define the problem, then develop and deliver an answer. Its success came from making iteration discussable across organisations. Its danger came from being mistaken for a guaranteed four-step recipe. No diagram can remove politics, evidence quality, technical risk or the authority needed to change a system.

The present field therefore contains a productive argument. One side emphasises human-centred design, observation and fit with use. Another warns that “the user” can narrow attention to the paying customer while excluding workers, communities, non-users and environmental effects. Systems and transition design widen the frame. Critical design questions the brief. Participatory and co-design methods redistribute some decisions to people affected. None removes the need for judgement, and participation can become theatre when power stays fixed.

The object has grown from the crafted thing to the industrial product, the human-machine system, the interface, the service and the network of consequences around it. Each expansion preserves the same judgement: which relationships are being fitted, and whose conditions define the result.

How we know

Design history preserves winners unevenly. Museums collect finished objects; companies save drawings and publicity; professional archives centre named designers. Factory judgement, maintenance, repair, adaptation and ordinary failure leave thinner records. The result can make design appear more individual, intentional and Euro-American than production was.

This account therefore uses dated institutional collections for objects and schools, original research for human-factors and interaction claims, current standards for usability and accessibility, documented accident analysis where safety matters, and UNESCO material for Jingdezhen's production landscape. The examples establish mechanisms, not a universal genealogy. Chapanis's secure contribution is the diagnosis of confusable controls and shape coding, not every number attached to later retellings. Therac-25 is treated as a coupled technical and organisational failure.

Terms such as affordance, human-centred design and systems thinking have shifted across disciplines. They are used here only where the distinctions change the reader's model. The central claim that design creates fit is an editorial synthesis, tested against these histories rather than presented as one field's settled definition.

What People Get Wrong

“Good design is a matter of taste”

Taste matters wherever people judge beauty, identity, pleasure and cultural fit. It does not follow that every design judgement is personal preference. A label can be unreadable at the required distance. Two controls can be dangerously easy to confuse. A page can block keyboard use and a product can fail before a reasonable service life. These are claims about performance in stated conditions, open to observation and test.

The mistake survives because design is visible while much of its work is

hidden. People see colour, shape and style, not the discarded prototypes, task analysis, reach measurements, manufacturing tolerances, service rules and repairs behind the result.

Evidence does not settle every value. Teams still decide which outcomes matter, who counts and which trade-offs are acceptable. Nor can one usability score decide beauty or meaning. The correction is narrower: design contains questions of taste, measurable fit and public consequence, often in the same object. Calling the whole subject subjective shields decisions from inspection. The practical consequence is poor accountability: a disputed preference and a repeated safety failure are treated as the same kind of disagreement. Separate what can be tested, what must be negotiated and what remains a matter of taste.

“Form follows function”

Louis Sullivan’s phrase gave modernists a sharp weapon against borrowed ornament. It remains useful when appearance disguises structure or obstructs purpose. It fails as a complete law because functions do not generate one inevitable shape.

A chair may support a short meal, a long shift, mobility, ceremony or rest. A can opener must pierce, guide, transmit force, fit a hand, survive cleaning, store safely and communicate its use. Which function leads, and whose body supplies the test? Form can also create a function by reassuring, intimidating, excluding or expressing status. A bench with dividers supports sitting and prevents lying down. Its form follows a policy.

The slogan became persuasive because it makes design sound deducible: state the purpose and the correct form appears. Real briefs contain competing purposes, materials, prices, meanings and lifecycles. Form answers them through judgement. It does not trail behind one function like a shadow. The correction matters because a technical brief can hide value choices inside the word function. Naming the full set of purposes makes those choices available for challenge before one is presented as necessity.

“Intuitive means natural”

When a design feels intuitive, its logic seems to arrive without teaching. Much of that ease is learned. Reading direction, symbols, page order, keypad layouts, control movements and interface patterns become fast because people encounter them repeatedly. The instruction has moved into culture and memory.

Some correspondences are closer to bodily action than others. A larger grip may be easier to grasp; a control placed beside its effect may reduce translation. Even these relations depend on reach, strength, attention and setting. A familiar icon can be meaningless to a new generation, and a convention efficient in one culture can confuse another.

Calling a pattern natural hides who had the chance to learn it. It also discourages explanation, testing and alternatives. The useful question is not “is this intuitive?” but “what knowledge does this require, who has it, and what cue supports those who do not?” Familiarity is a design resource. It is not evidence that the arrangement was inevitable. Distinguish first-use discoverability from learned fluency. A specialist tool may become fast through training, while a public emergency control must explain itself to people who may meet it once. Calling both intuitive conceals the difference. This distinction determines whether a design needs onboarding, a visible cue, a stable convention or room for deliberate practice.

“More choice gives users more freedom”

Removing an option can restrict freedom. Adding one does not always increase usable agency. Choice requires finding alternatives, understanding differences, predicting consequences and accepting the result. A large, unfamiliar or deliberately incomparable menu can expand formal choice while reducing practical control.

Quantity keeps the claim persuasive because it is easy to count and sounds neutral. Yet order, categories, defaults, descriptions and hidden fees shape the decision before the user selects anything.

There is no universal ideal number of choices. Experts may need control that burdens occasional users. Progressive disclosure can preserve advanced settings without placing them in every path. Strong defaults can reduce repeated low-value decisions when they are visible, reversible and aligned with the person's interest. Freedom depends on comprehension, comparison and exit, not the number of buttons alone. A choice architecture should therefore be judged by whether material differences are visible, likely consequences are intelligible and refusal is practical. A long list can be honest; a short list can still conceal the decision that matters.

“If users make mistakes, train them”

Training is necessary when a task contains knowledge that cannot or should not be designed away. Surgeons, pilots and electricians need skill. The mistake is treating training as the first repair for every repeated failure.

Organisations prefer that answer because it leaves equipment, schedules and authority unchanged. A memo is cheaper than a redesigned control and moves responsibility towards the person nearest the incident. When competent people repeat the same confusion, another explanation is available: the system demands unreliable perception, memory or coordination.

A stronger order is to remove the hazard where possible, constrain dangerous states, distinguish controls, expose status, support checks and recovery, then train for what remains. Knowledge fades, staff change and pressure narrows attention. Expert workarounds can even hide a defect until the experienced people leave. Capability is valuable evidence, not free compensation for a weak system. Training itself must also be designed: it needs time, practice, feedback and renewal. Attaching a slide deck to an unstable process satisfies neither learning nor safety. The correction reallocates responsibility without pretending that design can replace expertise.

“Simple means fewer features”

A knife has fewer components than a food processor and may demand more skill for the task. Removing features can clarify an object or transfer work to the user.

Visible minimalism keeps the belief alive because it photographs well. Few controls and smooth surfaces signal confidence. A single multifunction button can still be harder than several dedicated controls. A screen that hides status looks calm until failure. A service with one customer-facing step may depend on staff resolving every exception by hand.

Useful simplicity concerns the task and the model. It may require complex machinery behind a clear encounter, or several visible parts whose relationship is easy to understand. Frequency matters too. A professional tool can expose many controls because users build skill and need speed. A fire alarm should not demand exploration. Fewer features are one possible method. They are not the definition. A better test separates essential complexity, which belongs to the task, from accidental complexity created by the arrangement. Good simplification exposes the structure needed for prediction and hides detail only when hiding it does not destroy control.

“Great design comes from a lone genius”

A famous name helps museums, companies and histories organise attention. It rarely describes how a designed thing reached use. Materials, engineering, writing, research, production, supply, maintenance, management, regulation and user adaptation alter the result. A road-sign system, telephone or service cannot be authored in the same way as a signed sketch.

The lone-genius story survives because finished objects compress disagreement. Archives preserve the designer’s drawings more readily than the machinist’s adjustment, the operator’s workaround or the repairer’s warning. Marketing also benefits from attaching a complex system to one recognisable person.

Individual judgement can still be decisive. The correction is not that authorship disappears, but that it is exercised through other people's knowledge and constrained by institutions. Ask who made the outcome possible, who corrected it after launch and whose contribution became invisible. Design improves when responsibility remains clear without turning collaboration into scenery. The correction also protects learning. When success belongs to one hero and failure to an operator or supplier, the organisation cannot see the network of decisions that produced either result. Credit and accountability both need more than one name.

Use It

State the fit before judging the object

Begin with an outcome from the affected person's position. "Buy the correct ticket before the train arrives" is more useful than "use the ticket machine". "Take the prescribed dose without confusion" is more useful than "operate the dispenser". The object is one proposed means, not the problem itself.

Then state the user, conditions, timescale and consequence. A commuter using a machine daily differs from a visitor reading another language. A control used in daylight with two free hands differs from one used in darkness with gloves. A launch experience says little about repair after five years.

This prevents universal praise based on a favoured case. A complete design claim has a subject: works for whom, doing what, where, for how long and with what cost of failure? The answer may reveal several legitimate fits that no single arrangement can maximise at once. Write the competing cases down. A design meeting becomes clearer when convenience for a frequent user, access for an occasional user, safety for staff and cost for the purchaser are visible as separate claims rather than blended into "the user".

Follow the action loop

Watch one complete task rather than admiring the static surface. What tells the person where to begin? Which action appears possible? What do they expect? What response follows? Can they recognise success and decide what comes next?

Failures often sit between stages. A button is easy to find but its label describes the organisation's process rather than the person's goal. A request is accepted but confirmation goes to a hidden inbox. A form explains an error after deleting the entered data. Each screen can look competent while the loop remains broken.

Use conditions that matter to the task: a weak connection, one occupied hand, glare, noise, interruption or unfamiliar language. This is not a search for theatrical edge cases. It tests whether the design survives outside the demonstration for which it was rehearsed. Record the states between beginning and success, including waiting, interruption and uncertainty. Teams often fix the visible screen while leaving the handover or delay that breaks the task.

Read the form and convention

Ask what the form says before reading the instruction. Which part invites touch, movement or attention? What appears related? Which elements signal status, seriousness, welcome or exclusion? Does the visible hierarchy match the task, or merely the organisation's internal chart?

Then separate bodily relation from learned convention. A grip may fit the hand. A symbol, page order or control direction works because people have learned it. Identify who shares that learning and who may not. Breaking a convention can improve a weak pattern, but the transition needs support. Following one can create fluency while carrying an old assumption forward.

Finally, ask what the form sacrifices. Beck's diagram clarifies railway connections by distorting distance. Every representation and interface edits reality. The missing information may be irrelevant to the job, or exactly what

another user needs. Compare novice and expert readings where both matter. Experts may prefer compression and stable convention; newcomers need cues and explanation. One surface can support both through hierarchy rather than a forced compromise.

Find the effort ledger

List the work required before, during and after the smooth moment. Include perception, memory, comparison, waiting, data entry, lifting, emotional uncertainty, staff judgement, repair and disposal. Assign each item to the person, artefact, worker, organisation or future system carrying it.

This exposes false simplicity. Self-service can remove a queue and require a customer to classify a complex case. Automation can reduce routine effort and make exceptions harder to understand. A sealed product can remain clean until the battery fails. Work may move across people or time rather than disappear.

The ledger also reveals where investment matters. One clear status message can prevent repeated support calls. A standard connector can avoid years of adapters. A better internal tool can improve thousands of customer encounters without changing the visible brand. Mark whether each burden has been removed, automated, postponed or transferred. Those are different outcomes. Only the first claims a net reduction, and that claim must include any new maintenance.

Test error, exclusion and recovery

Do not ask only whether the intended path works. Try the likely wrong date, repeated press, interruption, empty field, lost connection, reversed part and accidental deletion. Check whether the design prevents the mistake, makes it visible, contains damage and supports recovery.

Inspect the assumed user at the same time. What reach, force, sight, hearing, language, reading speed, documents, money and prior knowledge are required? Variation may be permanent, temporary or situational. A person carrying a child, using a device after little sleep or standing in glare

can meet the same barrier as somebody whose access need is constant.

Match protection to consequence. Harmless exploration needs freedom and undo. A costly transfer may need review and confirmation. A lethal setting needs constraints, independent checks and validated use. Good recovery restores agency rather than making an anxious person decode the organisation's internal error category. Observe near misses as well as completed failures. They reveal confusion that skilled people rescued before the metric noticed it, and often provide an earlier signal than complaints or harm.

Read the whole life and system

Follow the design before purchase and after novelty. How is it made, transported, installed, learned, cleaned, repaired, updated, shared and retired? What happens when the manufacturer disappears, the account closes, demand spikes or the experienced employee is absent?

Time changes the trade-offs. A glued joint may improve sealing and block repair. A service can update continuously and move controls on which users built skill. Modularity preserves replacement while adding cost, bulk and interfaces. Long life is a design problem, not a moral label attached after manufacture.

Follow the front stage into the back. Identify workers, rules, databases, maintenance and exception handling. A process held together by one person's memory is an undocumented prototype. It works until that person leaves. Ask what the organisation measures and rewards. A service can be locally elegant while targets encourage rushed handling, deferred maintenance or rejection of difficult cases. The operating incentives belong inside the design boundary.

The limits

Design cannot decide what a society should want. It can make a voting process legible without deciding who may vote. It can make surveillance consent clearer while leaving the bargain coercive. It can reduce energy per task while a business model multiplies the tasks. A well-framed design project can still serve a bad policy.

Nor can design dissolve every conflict. Safety can slow access. Privacy can obstruct personalisation. Repairability can add size and cost. One person's necessary signal can be another's distraction. Evidence exposes and measures trade-offs; it does not abolish them.

Testing remains partial. A prototype cannot reproduce years of wear, institutional gaming, cultural change or national scale. Participants may behave differently when observed. Metrics reward what can be counted and can displace the purpose that mattered. Release begins another period of learning and responsibility. The limit is not an excuse for vagueness. It is a reason to state confidence, monitor consequences and preserve the ability to change course.

Finally, design competence is morally neutral. A clear tool can serve a cruel end. An accessible propaganda system remains propaganda. Some design also aims to interrupt, provoke or preserve difficulty rather than smooth a task; a memorial or protest object may work by refusing easy passage. The power to arrange action needs an argument about purpose, rights and distribution as well as professional skill.

The one thing to keep

Keep the fit.

Whenever something feels obvious, smooth or inevitable, ask what made the relation work. Perhaps a team studied the task, chose a clear form, used a familiar convention, aligned control with effect, supplied feedback and protected recovery. Perhaps production, training and maintenance keep the promise alive. That is earned fit.

Then widen the frame. The same ease may rely on a worker correcting exceptions, a default collecting consent, a sealed component postponing failure, a standard excluding unfamiliar bodies or a waste stream outside the photograph. That is local fit purchased through misfit elsewhere.

The purpose is not to distrust every convenience. It is to stop treating convenience as self-explanatory. Ask who can act, what they must know, which values the form communicates, who carries the effort and risk, and whether the arrangement survives time.

A thing does not just work. A fit has been made, learned, maintained or paid for. Design becomes visible when you can see both the achievement and its boundary. That habit replaces admiration of surfaces with a fairer judgement of purpose, form, labour, use and consequence.

Terms

Design. The deliberate shaping of an artefact, interface, service or system towards a purpose under constraints. It includes framing the problem, deciding the boundary and joining form, production, use and consequence.

Fit. A workable relation among purpose, people, form, context and time. Fit is never universal: it must be stated for named users, conditions and consequences. It can decay or conflict with another fit.

Problem framing. The choice of what is being solved and what remains outside the boundary. Framing determines which causes, people, timescales and possible answers become visible.

Constraint. A limit on possible action or solution arising from physics, cost, time, regulation, production, culture or deliberate safety design. A constraint can guide, protect or exclude.

Trade-off. A gain purchased through a loss elsewhere. Good design makes important trade-offs visible and asks who bears them rather than pretending that every goal can be maximised.

Function. What a design is expected to do. Most things have several

functions, including practical performance, safety, communication, maintenance, social meaning and commercial work. These functions often compete.

Form. The perceivable arrangement of shape, material, colour, typography, sound, movement and space. Form influences action and meaning rather than decorating a complete function. It shapes expectation before use begins.

Affordance. A possibility for action created by the relation between an actor and an environment. A ledge may afford sitting to one body and climbing to another.

Signifier. A perceivable cue indicating where or how to act, such as a handle, label, icon, groove or change in sound. Signifiers communicate action and state.

Mapping. How a control corresponds to what it changes. Strong mapping uses spatial, directional, bodily or conventional correspondence to reduce translation and memory. Poor mapping invites preventable selection errors.

Conceptual model. A person's working explanation of how a thing behaves. It need not reproduce the mechanism, but it must support accurate predictions during the relevant task. A borrowed model fails when behaviour breaks its logic.

Convention. A shared pattern made efficient through repeated learning, such as reading order, a symbol or control direction. Conventions create fluency and can also preserve exclusions or obsolete assumptions. Novelty spends this accumulated learning.

Feedback. Information produced after an action about what the system received, changed or failed to change. Timely feedback closes the action loop and supports the next decision.

Feedforward. Information available before action about what can be done and what is likely to happen. Labels, previews, disabled controls and warnings can provide it. Good feedforward reduces hazardous trial and

error.

Discoverability. How readily a person can find possible actions and understand the current state. It matters most where prior training and repeated use cannot be assumed.

Default. The option applied when a person accepts the starting point or makes no active change. Defaults reduce decisions and can also exploit inattention. Visibility, reversibility and whose interest they serve matter.

Forcing function. A feature that makes one state a prerequisite for another. It is powerful in safety-critical work, though a poor fit with the task can invite bypasses.

Usability. The outcome of using a system, product or service to achieve goals in a stated context, commonly judged through effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction. It is not an intrinsic score. The user, goal, environment and measure must be stated.

Accessibility. The degree to which people with differing abilities can perceive, understand, operate and contribute. It concerns mainstream products, services, communications and environments. Compliance with one standard cannot cover every need.

Inclusive design. A process that treats human variation and exclusion as design inputs. It seeks broad participation and compatible alternatives without claiming that one solution suits everyone. Conflicting needs may require several routes.

Ergonomics. The discipline concerned with fitting work, tools and environments to human capabilities and limits. It covers physical, cognitive and organisational conditions.

Human factors. A closely related field studying interaction among people, tasks, technology and organisations, especially where performance and safety depend on the whole system. It resists stopping at operator blame.

Anthropometry. The measurement of human bodies and their variation. It

informs reach, clearance, fit and posture while warning against one fictional average person. Population and percentile choices matter.

Prototype. A provisional representation built to answer a question before full commitment. It may be paper, digital, physical or performed, with fidelity matched to the uncertainty.

Iteration. Repeated movement through evidence, making and revision. It has value when findings change the frame or design, rather than polishing one assumption indefinitely. Repetition without learning is not iteration.

Usability testing. Observation of representative people attempting relevant tasks. It reveals interaction problems but does not alone prove population-wide success, long-term safety or desirability. Sample and task boundaries remain visible.

Interaction design. The shaping of behaviour across time through controls, states, sequences, feedback, transitions and recovery. Its material is the exchange between person and system.

Service design. The coordination of encounters, staff activity, rules, information and infrastructure across a journey. It joins the visible front stage to the operational back stage.

Systems thinking. Attention to relationships, feedback, boundaries, delays and consequences across connected parts. It helps distinguish a solved problem from a burden moved elsewhere. The chosen boundary should be explicit.

Dark pattern. An interface arrangement designed to steer, obstruct or deceive people in ways that serve the provider against informed choice, such as disguised consent or difficult cancellation.

Go Deeper

The everyday introduction

Don Norman, *The Design of Everyday Things*, revised and expanded edition (Basic Books, 2013). Start here for doors, controls, signifiers, mapping, conceptual models, feedback, constraints and error. Norman writes from cognitive science and product experience, using ordinary failures to show the gap between intended operation and perceived action. The revised edition also clarifies the distinction between affordance and signifier. Its examples lean towards products and interfaces, so do not mistake it for a complete social history of design. It remains the quickest book for changing what you notice in the next room. Read it with a door, cooker or settings screen nearby and test each concept against something you can operate.

The practitioner's account

Henry Dreyfuss, *Designing for People* (Simon and Schuster, 1955; Allworth reprint, 2003). Dreyfuss describes industrial design from inside a major mid-century American practice, moving through telephones, tractors, aircraft interiors and the measured figures Joe and Josephine. Read it for the negotiation among bodies, engineering, production, clients and commercial judgement before user experience became a job title. Its representative bodies and period assumptions need scrutiny. That limitation makes the book more revealing: it shows both the advance of measured fit and the power involved in deciding who represents everyone. Pay particular attention to the case-study negotiations, where form emerges from compromise rather than one inspired sketch.

The social history

Adrian Forty, *Objects of Desire: Design and Society Since 1750* (Thames and Hudson, 1986). Forty treats manufactured objects as evidence about labour, business, class and social ideas rather than as a parade of heroic forms. It is the strongest correction to histories in which one designer invents modern life alone. The book is denser than Norman and its examples are concentrated in industrial Britain and Europe, but its method travels: ask what commercial and social work an object performs, not only whether its surface is attractive. Pair it with a museum catalogue and notice how different the same objects look when labour and markets return to the account.

The challenge about power

Sasha Costanza-Chock, *Design Justice: Community-Led Practices to Build the Worlds We Need* (MIT Press, 2020). Read this to test who defines the problem, whose knowledge counts and whether participation changes decision rights. Costanza-Chock challenges universal users and expert-led processes through community-led practice and structural analysis. The framework is openly normative and politically committed, so it should be argued with rather than treated as a neutral manual. Its value is the pressure it puts on any design that works smoothly for the purchaser while shifting harm to people outside the room. It is the recommendation most likely to change who you think should define the brief.

Notes and Sources

Scope and central model

The claim that design creates fit is the book's organising synthesis, not a quotation or one profession's settled definition. It combines Herbert Simon's account of changing existing situations into preferred ones, human-factors work on fitting systems to human capabilities, Don Norman's analysis of action and feedback, design history on production and social meaning, and service and systems approaches that trace labour beyond the visible object. Effort allocation remains a mechanism inside the broader model rather than a complete definition.

"Works" is kept context-specific. ISO 9241-11:2018 treats usability as an outcome of use in a specified context and applies the concept across systems, products and services. It does not make usability an intrinsic property detached from users, goals and conditions. The book extends beyond usability by including meaning, production, lifecycle and distribution, while preserving the requirement to name the person, task, environment and consequence.

The book distinguishes design from styling without treating aesthetics as dispensable. Masaaki Kurosu and Kaori Kashimura's 1995 study and Noam Tractinsky, A. S. Katz and Dror Ikar's 2000 experiment support only a bounded relation between perceived aesthetics and perceived usability in particular interface settings. They do not establish that beauty universally improves objective performance.

The shower, cooker, payment, thermostat, meal-delivery and appointment examples are explicitly generic or hypothetical illustrations. They are not presented as reports of named events. Historical examples, standards, laws and accident cases are documented below.

The Core Ideas

Problem framing and constrained choice draw principally on Simon, Norman and the Design Council's account of divergent and convergent enquiry. The shower, cooker, payment and thermostat cases are generic illustrations rather than reported incidents. They are written as examples, contain no invented named people and carry no claim about one manufacturer.

Affordance follows James J. Gibson's relational account in *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Norman's revised terminology is used to separate affordances from signifiers, the perceivable cues that communicate possible action. This distinction corrects the broad popular use of affordance for any visible control.

Harry Beck developed his diagrammatic London Underground map in 1931. London Transport first issued the familiar pocket form in 1933. The London Transport Museum's object and historical records support the dating and the account of regular angles, expanded central area and topological emphasis. The map improves one task by distorting distance and direction; this is treated as a trade-off rather than a context-free improvement.

Feedback, feedforward, conceptual models, mapping, constraints and forcing functions follow Norman's working vocabulary, with the warning that the categories overlap in practice. The lift button, payment state and thermostat are illustrative mechanisms. No exact response-time threshold is asserted because acceptable timing depends on task and consequence.

Defaults are described as choices with effects rather than as inherently good or bad. Eric Johnson and Daniel Goldstein's organ-donation work and Brigitte Madrian and Dennis Shea's study of automatic pension enrolment support the claim that a preselected option can alter behaviour in consequential settings. Neither study establishes one universal default effect or proves that default policy alone determines final outcomes. The discussion also avoids claiming that every persuasive interface is unlawful. Regulation (EU) 2022/2065, the Digital Services Act, Article 25 restricts specified online-interface practices that deceive, manipulate or materially

impair informed decisions within its scope. The legal text was rechecked on 4 September 2026; the manuscript narrows the claim to the services and conduct covered.

The Chapanis cockpit case is retained at the secure level. Similar, adjacent landing-gear and flap controls contributed to predictable confusion under workload, and shape coding made them distinguishable by touch. Later retellings attach varying aircraft lists, incident counts and absolute claims about what happened afterwards. Those details are unnecessary to the lesson and have been omitted. The Association for Psychological Science profile and later ergonomics scholarship were used alongside the broader human-factors record.

The Therac-25 account follows Nancy Leveson and Clark Turner's 1993 investigation. Six known patients received massive radiation overdoses between 1985 and 1987. The book does not attribute the accidents to software alone. It retains the interaction among race conditions, hardware changes, interface messages, incident handling, testing and safety assurance because that coupled account is the point of the case.

US Food and Drug Administration human-factors material was rechecked on 4 September 2026. Its current medical-device guidance treats the user interface as including setup, controls, displays, connections, packaging, labelling, maintenance and training, with use-related risk as a central outcome. The book paraphrases that scope and makes no claim that one jurisdiction's guidance governs every device worldwide.

Accessibility claims use W3C's *Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.2*. WCAG 2.2 covers a wide range of disability-related barriers and uses testable, technology-independent success criteria. W3C explicitly warns that conformance cannot address every need, especially across combinations of disability. The book preserves that limit and does not treat a compliance level as complete inclusion.

The account of research, prototypes and iteration is a synthesis of human-centred design standards and professional methods. ISO

9241-210:2019 supplies the lifecycle and human-centred frame. The Design Council supplies the public history of the Double Diamond, launched in 2004 with Discover, Define, Develop and Deliver. The diagram is described as a communication model rather than an original discovery or mandatory linear process.

Operating history sources

The account of designing before the profession is deliberately plural. It does not claim that craft joined conception and labour everywhere, that pre-industrial work was user-led, or that industrialisation invented planning at a distance. Its narrower claim is that modern industrial replication increased the scale and reach of decisions and helped create specialised professional mediation.

The Jingdezhen passage follows UNESCO's account of the porcelain production landscape, including specialist raw-material work, kiln development, imperial and civilian production, guilds and merchants. It is used to defeat a solely European origin story, not to label Jingdezhen a modern factory or to compress Chinese design history into one place.

The Thonet material follows Victoria and Albert Museum and Design Museum histories of bentwood furniture. Steam-bending enabled light, strong, repeatable components, efficient packing and assembly away from the factory. The text avoids disputed sales totals and the absolute claim that Chair No. 14 was the first mass-produced furniture object.

The Great Exhibition, design reform and Arts and Crafts account draws on Victoria and Albert Museum material and Adrian Forty's social history. William Morris joined workmanship, labour and everyday surroundings. The price contradiction remains visible, and Morris is not reduced to absolute opposition to machinery.

The Bauhaus dates are 1919 to 1933. Metropolitan Museum of Art and Bauhaus archive histories support the workshop structure and Walter Gropius's 1923 turn towards designing for mass production. The manuscript rejects a sole-origin story and does not treat every geometric modern object

as Bauhaus.

Margarete Schütte-Lihotzky designed the Frankfurt Kitchen in 1926 for Frankfurt's public-housing programme under Ernst May. Museum of Modern Art material supports its compact arrangement and relation to scientific management. The book retains both the improvement to repetitive work and the gendered assumption that one woman would perform it.

The Ulm School of Design operated from 1953 to 1968. HfG-Archiv material supports its expanded relation among design, science, technology, communication and production. Braun appears as an example of coordinated systems, without attributing every product to the school or one person.

The account of American industrial design uses Dreyfuss and Forty. Streamlining is described as aerodynamically useful in some moving objects and commercially symbolic in many stationary ones. Styling is neither dismissed as fraud nor credited with better use by default.

Dreyfuss's Joe and Josephine were representative figures assembled from anthropometric data and published in *Designing for People*. They mark a move towards measured fit while also showing how a chosen representative body can erase ranges and populations. R. L. Deininger's 1960 Bell System study compared push-button arrangements for speed, accuracy and preference; the text does not credit Dreyfuss alone with the final arrangement.

Harry Beck developed his Underground diagram in 1931, and the first familiar pocket issue appeared in 1933. London Transport Museum records support the dating and network emphasis. The British road-sign system developed by Jock Kinneir and Margaret Calvert came into nationwide use in 1965; Design Museum records support the coordinated use of lettering, colour, shape, symbols and spacing.

Wartime human factors is presented as an acceleration rather than a clean birth. Earlier ergonomics, industrial psychology and time-and-motion work existed. Alphonse Chapanis's secure contribution is the study of confusable

controls and the use of shape coding. Unstable aircraft lists, incident totals and claims that one change ended all confusion are excluded.

Douglas Engelbart's 1968 demonstration, Xerox PARC's Alto work in the 1970s and commercial graphical interfaces are treated as a many-contributor lineage. Computer History Museum records support the dates and the combination of pointing, linked text, windows, collaborative work, graphical display and networking. Their purpose here is to show interaction becoming a designed sequence of states. Detailed computing history remains with its owning titles.

Service design and systems thinking are described through front-stage and back-stage relations, maintenance, exceptions and institutional rules. These are professional tools rather than inventions credited to one school. The Design Council supports the Double Diamond's 2004 public launch and current terminology. The diagram is treated as communication about divergence and convergence, not a universal linear method.

What People Get Wrong and Use It

"Form follows function" derives from Louis Sullivan's 1896 essay *The Tall Office Building Artistically Considered*. The book uses the familiar shortened phrase and rejects only its promotion into a rule from which one correct form can be deduced. Functions are plural, and social purposes can be embedded in form.

The discussion of convention distinguishes learned fluency from bodily correspondence without claiming that either category is pure. Culture, embodiment and repeated use interact. No example is treated as a universal symbol system.

The correction on choice overload is conditional. Alexander Chernev, Ulf Böckenholt and Joseph Goodman's review and meta-analysis found that assortment effects vary with choice-set complexity, task difficulty, preference uncertainty and decision goals. The manuscript rejects both "more is always better" and "fewer is always easier".

The Digital Services Act statement is confined to specified online-interface practices covered by Article 25. It does not imply that every persuasive interface is unlawful or that legal compliance establishes informed choice.

The discussion of defaults uses Eric Johnson and Daniel Goldstein's organ-donation work and Brigitte Madrian and Dennis Shea's study of 401(k) participation as setting-specific evidence that starting states can matter. It does not transfer one effect size or mechanism to every institution or population.

The Therac-25 account follows Nancy Leveson and Clark Turner's investigation. Six known massive overdoses between 1985 and 1987 are retained. The case is described as coupled software, hardware, interface, testing, reporting and organisational failure rather than a software-only lesson.

WCAG 2.2 is the current W3C Recommendation checked on 4 September 2026. It covers many disability-related barriers and explicitly does not meet every need. FDA human-factors guidance is used only for medical devices in its jurisdiction and supports realistic use conditions, intended users and critical tasks.

The practical lenses are editorial tools derived from the final model. The fit statement, action loop, form-and-convention reading, effort ledger, recovery test and whole-life check are not presented as published standards. Generic scenarios are labelled as illustrations or tests rather than documented incidents.

Terms and further reading

Definitions follow the distinctions used in the manuscript rather than attempting a complete disciplinary glossary. Ergonomics and human factors are treated as strongly overlapping fields whose preferred labels vary by region and institution. Affordance retains James J. Gibson's relational sense, while signifier follows Don Norman's later distinction. Inclusive design is kept separate from a promise of one universal form. Dark pattern is a descriptive professional and regulatory term, with legal scope left to the relevant jurisdiction.

Publication details for all four recommended books were rechecked against publishers or catalogue records on 4 September 2026. Dreyfuss is cited through the 2003 Allworth reprint while retaining the original 1955 publication date. Forty's 1986 Thames and Hudson edition and Costanza-Chock's 2020 MIT Press edition were verified. Each recommendation has a different purpose: everyday interaction, practitioner history, social history and power.

Bibliography

Primary sources, standards and original research

Chernev, Alexander, Ulf Böckenholt, and Joseph Goodman. "Choice Overload: A Conceptual Review and Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 25, no. 2 (2015): 333-358.

Deininger, R. L. "Human Factors Engineering Studies of the Design and Use of Pushbutton Telephone Sets." *Bell System Technical Journal* 39, no. 4 (1960): 995-1012.

Design Council. "Framework for Innovation" and "History of the Double Diamond." Current online editions, accessed 4 September 2026.

European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 on a Single Market for Digital Services, Article 25. *Official Journal of the European Union*, 2022.

International Organization for Standardization. *ISO 9241-11:2018, Ergonomics of Human-System Interaction, Part 11: Usability: Definitions and Concepts*. Geneva: ISO, 2018.

International Organization for Standardization. *ISO 9241-210:2019, Ergonomics of Human-System Interaction, Part 210: Human-Centred Design for Interactive Systems*. Geneva: ISO, 2019.

Johnson, Eric J., and Daniel Goldstein. "Do Defaults Save Lives?" *Science* 302, no. 5649 (2003): 1338-1339.

Kurosu, Masaaki, and Kaori Kashimura. "Apparent Usability vs. Inherent Usability: Experimental Analysis on the Determinants of the Apparent Usability." In *CHI '95 Conference Companion*, 292-293. New York: ACM, 1995.

Leveson, Nancy G., and Clark S. Turner. "An Investigation of the Therac-25 Accidents." *Computer* 26, no. 7 (1993): 18-41.

Madrian, Brigitte C., and Dennis F. Shea. "The Power of Suggestion: Inertia in 401(k) Participation and Savings Behavior." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 116, no. 4 (2001): 1149-1187.

Sullivan, Louis H. "The Tall Office Building Artistically Considered." *Lippincott's Magazine* 57 (March 1896): 403-409.

Tractinsky, Noam, A. S. Katz, and Dror Ikar. "What Is Beautiful Is Usable." *Interacting with Computers* 13, no. 2 (2000): 127-145.

US Food and Drug Administration. *Applying Human Factors and Usability Engineering to Medical Devices*. Guidance and current Human Factors and Medical Devices pages, accessed 4 September 2026.

World Wide Web Consortium. *Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.2*. W3C Recommendation, current edition accessed 4 September 2026.

Modern works

Costanza-Chock, Sasha. *Design Justice: Community-Led Practices to Build the Worlds We Need*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2020.

Dreyfuss, Henry. *Designing for People*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955. Reprint, New York: Allworth Press, 2003.

Forty, Adrian. *Objects of Desire: Design and Society Since 1750*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1986.

Gibson, James J. *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979.

Lupton, Ellen. *Beautiful Users: Designing for People*. New York: Cooper Hewitt, Smithsonian Design Museum and Princeton Architectural Press, 2014.

Norman, Don. *The Design of Everyday Things*. Revised and expanded ed. New York: Basic Books, 2013.

Simon, Herbert A. *The Sciences of the Artificial*. 3rd ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996.

Institutional collections and histories

Association for Psychological Science. “Alphonse Chapanis: Pioneer in the Application of Psychology to Engineering Design.” Accessed 4 September 2026.

Computer History Museum. Douglas Engelbart, 1968 demonstration and Xerox Alto histories and object records. Accessed 4 September 2026.

Design Museum. “British Road Signs”; “Jock Kinneir and Margaret Calvert”; and “Thonet Chair No. 14.” Accessed 4 September 2026.

HfG-Archiv Ulm. “From the Zero Hour to 1968.” Accessed 4 September 2026.

London Transport Museum. Harry Beck map histories and 1933 pocket-map

object record. Accessed 4 September 2026.

Metropolitan Museum of Art. “The Bauhaus, 1919-1933” and “Peter Behrens, Tea Kettle.” Accessed 4 September 2026.

Museum of Modern Art. “Grete Lihotzky, Frankfurt Kitchen from the Frankfurt Municipal Housing Project.” Accessed 4 September 2026.

UNESCO World Heritage Centre. “Jingdezhen Imperial Kiln Sites” and associated tentative-list material on the porcelain production landscape. Accessed 4 September 2026.

Victoria and Albert Museum. Arts and Crafts histories and “Thonet and the Invention of Bentwood Furniture.” Accessed 4 September 2026.