CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Designing for dissensus: Arts-based methods for generative friction in design
Authors	Murray, Maria;Barry, Marguerite;Halperin, Brett A.;O'Keefe, Helen;Duval, Jared;Vigil-Hayes, Morgan;Rüller, Sarah;Hagemann, Shelby;Van Amstel, Frederick;Strohmayer, Angelika;Pantidi, Nadia;Robinson, Sarah
Publication date	2026-06-12
Original Citation	Murray, M, Barry, M, Halperin, B A, O'Keefe, H, Duval, J, Vigil-Hayes, M, Rüller, S, Hagemann, S, Van Amstel, F, Strohmayer, A, Pantidi, N & Robinson, S 2026, Designing for dissensus: Arts-based methods for generative friction in design. in C C Yen, J-J Lee, E Y-L Do, C Zheng, D Yoo & T Tang (eds), DIS 2026 - Companion Proceedngs of the 2026 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference, Singapore 13 - 17 ingapore June 13 - 17 June 2026 2026. DIS 2026 - Companion Proceedngs of the 2026 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference, Association for Computing Machinery, Inc, pp. 27-31, ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference, DIS 2026, Singapore, Singapore, 13/06/26. https://doi.org/10.1145/3802974.3808004
Type of publication	Conference item
Link to publisher's version	10.1145/3802974.3808004
Rights	© 2026 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). - https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Download date	2026-11-16 19:16:57
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/19033



University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Designing for Dissensus: Arts-Based Methods for Generative Friction in Design

Maria Murray
Media Communications
Munster Technological University
Cork, Ireland
maria.murray@mtu.ie

Marguerite Barry
University College Dublin
Dublin, Ireland
marguerite.barry@ucd.ie

Brett A. Halperin
Human Centered Design & Engineering
University of Washington
Seattle, USA
bhalp@uw.edu

Helen O'Keefe
Munster Technological University
Cork, Ireland
helen.okeeffe@mtu.ie

Jared Duval
Northern Arizona University
Arizona, USA
jared.duval@nau.edu

Morgan Vigil-Hayes
Michigan State University
Michigan, USA
vigilhay@msu.edu

Sarah Rüller
Sparks Create
Cologne, Germany
sarah.rueller@outlook.com

Shelby Hagemann
School of Informatics, Computing, and Cyber Systems
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, USA
seh428@nau.edu

Frederick Van Amstel
Federal University of Technology Paraná
Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil
vanamstel@utfpr.edu.br

Angelika Strohmayer
School of Design, Arts, and Creative Industries
Northumbria University
Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom
angelika.strohmayer@northumbria.ac.uk

Nadia Pantidi
School of Design Innovation
Victoria University of Wellington
Wellington, New Zealand
nadia.pantidi@vuw.ac.nz

Sarah Robinson
School of Applied Social Studies
University College Cork
Cork, Ireland
sarah.robinson@ucc.ie

Abstract

We need more critical collaborative design practices in a world fraught with meta-crisis, both exacerbated and alleviated by design and technology. This one-day workshop explores how arts-based methods can support this criticality through challenging harmful consensus that contribute to meta-crisis and encouraging a generative conflict within community-based collaborative design. Central to this is the configuring of an equitable positionality that recognises difference. We look towards Freirean praxis, centering making and reflection, to challenge assumptions inherent in computing and collaboration that contribute to social injustices. We foreground concepts from arts-based participation which disrupt social norms and reveal hidden experiences through generative friction. Workshop participants will gain insights on how positionalities are configured and negotiated, ideas for how conflict and "equality in difference" might be evoked in collaborative practices and how making activities can interrogate harmful norms, advance diverse standpoints, build mutual understanding and support more open and critical participatory processes.

CCS Concepts

• **Human-centered computing**; • **Human computer interaction (HCI)**; • **HCI design and evaluation methods**; • **Field Studies**;

Keywords

Participation, Socially Engaged Art, activism, sustainable HCI, conflict, arts-based methods, dissensus

ACM Reference Format:
Maria Murray, Marguerite Barry, Brett A. Halperin, Helen O'Keefe, Jared Duval, Morgan Vigil-Hayes, Sarah Rüller, Shelby Hagemann, Frederick Van Amstel, Angelika Strohmayer, Nadia Pantidi, and Sarah Robinson. 2026. Designing for Dissensus: Arts-Based Methods for Generative Friction in Design. In *Designing Interactive Systems Conference (DIS Companion '26), June 13–17, 2026, Singapore, Singapore*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 5 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3802974.3808004



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

DIS Companion '26, Singapore, Singapore

© 2026 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-2632-3/2026/06
https://doi.org/10.1145/3802974.3808004

1 Introduction

We are a group of design researchers and socially engaged artists with broad social justice-oriented practices [2, 18, 21, 22, 29, 32,

34, 38, 39, 42, 45, 52]. We are interested in integrating socially engaged arts-based methods into collaborative design practices to facilitate critical participation, challenge harmful assumptions, and cultivate agency to address them. To do so, we explore "dissensus", a political philosophy and practice that focuses on how to disrupt oppressive social norms (also called "consensus") to make visible and heard experiences outside of dominant paradigms [6, 15, 37]. Core to dissensus is establishing equality in difference (an equality that doesn't assume sameness but instead recognises and values difference [6, 31]) and the facilitation of a constructive conflict (where recognition of equality in difference forms the basis for a generative disagreement and dissent [37]), leading to social change. Arts-based transformative praxis (from the Freirean position of action - reflection - (re)action as a basis for conscientization [19]) can be integrated into design to examine how positionality is configured and to work towards more open, equitable and critical participation.

We contribute to the growing workshop and panel space within design that explores how computing can mitigate technological harms and challenge dominant narratives and norms that contribute to injustice [1, 3, 4, 13, 27, 40, 41, 48]. We focus on how to practically achieve dissensus through arts-based practices in design research processes, and how to create conditions of equality in difference. To do so, we start with participant explorations of conflict and equity challenges experienced in community-based social justice-oriented design and research. Specifically, we focus on reflexivity and the act of making to interrogate the various positions that are configured and reconfigured throughout a participatory process. We will identify commonalities and differences (including shared assumptions) across experiences and look for ways to support constructive conflict and to establish equality in difference. The workshop will be generative, exploratory and open, and we are interested in what we might learn from such a process to inform future social justice-oriented collaborative and participatory design.

2 Motivation and Background

This workshop builds on social justice-oriented design, arts-based research and critical pedagogy [19, 24, 25, 30, 37, 47], to draw researchers, practitioners, designers and artists together in an exploration of what an open participatory process focused on supporting conflict and equality in difference through arts-based reflection, reflexivity and making activities can contribute to more diverse, equitable and effective design. We are motivated by our individual design, research and art practices, as well as meta-crisis that implicate computing as both part of the problem and solution [35, 44, 53]. There is potential in integrating arts-based methods, such as collaborative making, into design practices to access hidden, marginalised and ambiguous experiences [17, 33, 41, 45, 46] to support more diverse and representative design practices. The challenge is in the cultivation of dissensus where equality in difference is established and conflict can be supported in an open participation that allows for multiple interpretations [31, 32]. Meeting this challenge can support design and computing research in the service of more sustainable and flourishing futures, research that values local knowledges, situated experiences, diversity and dissent.

3 Intended Participants

This workshop will be useful to those who have encountered challenges around facilitating conflict and equitable participation in their community-based and social justice-oriented design and research practices, and who are interested in how arts-based methods and philosophies such as dissensus and transformative praxis can inform their work to better support dynamics of constructive conflict and equality in difference in collaborative design practices. We will examine a range of issues as experienced by participants, and the process we use to interrogate these issues can be applied to multiple design research contexts that hope to support constructive conflict and equitable participation while disrupting norms and making marginalised experiences more visible. This workshop will also be useful to DIS participants hoping to embed a more activist, change-making approach to participation in their work, and to those who are interested in how the dynamic of making can support understanding complex, ambiguous experiences and power dynamics.

4 Workshop Themes

This workshop explores the potential of arts-based methods to support critical participation and access ambiguous, marginalised and nuanced experiences in collaborative design. The workshop uses digital and analogue making activities as a vehicle for discovery and understanding. We will spend the morning of the workshop on reflective and reflexive map-making to identify positionalities, power and key players in past collaborative research and design experiences. The afternoon will focus on rapid and playful creation of digital and analogue representations of these positionalities with the aim of further exploring complex participation dynamics, identifying and disrupting consensus, working towards "equality in difference" and allowing space for constructive and generative conflict.

4.1 Making as discovery – artefacts to promote mutual understanding.

Central to transformative arts-based methods is the idea that creative and collective making in response to ambiguous and complex issues and experiences can support mutual understanding, agency and change [19, 25]. In this workshop, we draw on Freire's praxis [19], informed by hooks [24] to facilitate a creative process that emphasises a dynamic of rapid making - reflection - (re)making, and even unmaking of artefacts to support critical thinking on nuanced experience and the examining of positionalities. Providing various modalities of analogue and digital creation (such as paper, card, maquette building, digital imaging etc.), dialogue and critique may offer avenues into deconstructing experiences, making these more accessible [11]. Co-creation of artefacts around serious topics can support trust building [14] as a pre-requisite for any constructive conflict, and we aim to centre joy and playfulness in our exploration [9, 12, 25, 50].

4.2 Equality in difference – is it ever possible for all voices to be heard equally?

We take our understanding of "equality in difference" from Rancière [36, 37], in terms of establishing equality of individual position, agency and voice while recognising and respecting differences. Evoking a dynamic of equality in difference in a collaborative group is difficult. There are in-built social norms and power hierarchies in every situation and to ensure all participants have an equal voice requires constant work [24]. Through reflexive exercises, we will examine past situations for their implicit and explicit power dynamics with a focus on an awareness of our own effects on others. Through arts-based methods such as role-playing and making processes, we will make these dynamics visible and use resultant artefacts to investigate how we might evoke an equality in difference in actionable ways, while taking every effort to adhere to this principle ourselves. This requires researchers and participants to articulate their own positionalities [20, 24] and that these positions do not dominate the participatory experience [16, 23, 25].

4.3 Facilitating conflict – confrontation and dissent as positive forces.

The openness of a participatory process, where the focus is not on agreement, but rather on understanding contrasting perspectives and creating ways of moving forward, is what allows for alternative imaginaries and new spaces of possibility [31]. A constructive and respectful conflict is required to challenge norms and assumptions, communicate experiences around difficult topics and ultimately disrupt the accepted social order of things. It is considered core to transformative arts participation [8, 31], where people need to be free to not resolve their differences [5]. The question of facilitating conflict in a constructive way, however, is challenging [28, 43]. Constructive conflict is necessary to recognise needs and agendas that are invisible to certain parts of a collaborative group [7, 10, 26], and is central in examining power [19, 49, 51]. Again we draw on hooks' idea of the need for inclusion processes to be disruptive if they are to be equitable [25]. During the workshop, we will encourage constructive conflict through role-playing scenarios and the rapid creation and discussion of artefacts on positions.

5 Workshop Goals

Our goals for this workshop are (1) to build connections and community among researchers, artists and designers who are interested in arts-based approaches to community-based and social justice-oriented interaction design, (2) to share ideas and insights across participants on how to cultivate a more transformative participation in interaction design research (3) to increase our understanding of how to evoke meaningful and generative dynamics such as conflict and equality in difference in participant groups, rather conflicts that can paralysis processes, (4) to gain experiential knowledge in how playful and practical rapid making exercises designed for reflection and to elicit equality in difference can support understanding of positionalities, tacit experiences and contribute towards more critical design practices.

6 Anticipated Outcomes

During the conference, facilitators will create a physical zine of artefacts created. We will also print artefacts (with email contact for the workshop) to leave in social spaces of the conference to spark more conversation. Beyond the conference, we will submit findings from the workshop to an ACM venue such as DIS '27 or Interactions Magazine. We will transfer the physical zine into digital format for wider distribution if agreed on by participants. We will organise follow-up events at future SIGCHI conferences.

Position papers will be published on the workshop website (https://sites.google.com/view/designingfordissensus pending author permission). We will publish a collection of the submitted papers as workshop proceedings via https://ceur-ws.org. All participants will be invited to contribute to a future publication arising from the workshop inquiry. We intend to work towards editing a journal special issue in arts-based methods in design research.

Beyond these tangible outcomes, the workshop aims to establish arts-based methods to surface contradictions, provoke generative conflict, and disrupt normative assumptions in design processes. We hope to open pathways for mutual recognition, deeper understanding of sociopolitical complexity and sociotechnical interventions that value cultural difference and multiple perspectives, advancing capacity to engage with tacit and ambiguous experiences as foundations for inclusive and sustainable interaction design.

References

[1] Mariam Asad, Lynn Dombrowski, Sasha Costanza-Chock, Sheena Erete, and Christina Harrington. 2019. Academic Accomplices: Practical Strategies for Research Justice. In *Companion Publication of the 2019 on Designing Interactive Systems Conference 2019 Companion*, June 18, 2019. ACM, San Diego CA USA, 353–356. https://doi.org/10.1145/3301019.3320001

[2] Chriszine Backhouse, Sarah Robinson, and Claudia Barton. 2023. Making the invisible visible: How forum theatre can reveal the impact of social media algorithms on local and global justice issues. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review* 37, (2023).

[3] Shaowen Bardzell, Jofish Kaye, and Katta Spiel. 2020. Moving Forward Together: Effective Activism for Change. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, April 25, 2020. ACM, Honolulu HI USA, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1145/3334480.3378929

[4] Christoph Becker, Ann Light, Chris Frauenberger, Dawn Walker, Victoria Palacin, Syed Ishtiaque Ahmed, Rachel Charlotte Smith, Pedro Reynolds Cuéllar, and David Nemer. 2020. Computing Professionals for Social Responsibility: The Past, Present and Future Values of Participatory Design. In *Proceedings of the 16th Participatory Design Conference 2020 - Participation(s) Otherwise - Volume 2*, June 15, 2020. ACM, Manizales Colombia, 181–184. https://doi.org/10.1145/3384772.3385163

[5] Dave Beech. 2008. Include me out! – Dave Beech on participation in art. *Art Monthly*. Retrieved April 2, 2023 from https://www.artmonthly.co.uk/magazine/site/article/include-me-out-by-dave-beech-april-2008

[6] Ross Birrell. 2008. Jacques Rancière and The (Re)Distribution of the Sensible: Five Lessons in Artistic Research. *Art & Research: A Journal of Ideas, Contexts and Methods* 2, (2008).

[7] Claire Bishop. 2004. Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics. *October* 110, (October 2004), 51–79. https://doi.org/10.1162/0162287042379810

[8] Claire Bishop. 2012. *Artificial hells: Participatory art and the politics of spectatorship*. Verso Books.

[9] Brooke Bosley, Christina N. Harrington, Susana M. Morris, and Christopher A. Le Dantec. 2022. Healing Justice: A Framework for Collective Healing and Well-Being from Systemic Traumas. In *Designing Interactive Systems Conference*, June 13, 2022. ACM, Virtual Event Australia, 471–484. https://doi.org/10.1145/3532106.3533492

[10] M.A. Brennan and A.E. Luloff. 2007. Exploring rural community agency differences in Ireland and Pennsylvania. *Journal of Rural Studies* 23, 1 (January 2007), 52–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2006.04.003

[11] Jill Brewster, Michelle Kindleysides, Justin Marshall, Jayne Wallace, and Colin Wilson. 2020. Making makes me feel better: Designing for wellbeing and social values. (2020).

[12] Adrienne Maree Brown. 2019. *Pleasure Activism: The Politics of Feeling Good*. AK Press, California.

[13] Stevie Chancellor, Shion Guha, Jofish Kaye, Jen King, Niloufar Salehi, Sarita Schoenebeck, and Elizabeth Stowell. 2019. The Relationships between Data, Power, and Justice in CSCW Research. In *Companion Publication of the 2019 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, November 09, 2019. ACM, Austin TX USA, 102–105. https://doi.org/10.1145/3311957.3358609

[14] Rachel Elizabeth Clarke, Jo Briggs, Andrea Armstrong, Alistair MacDonald, John Vines, Emma Flynn, and Karen Salt. 2021. Socio-materiality of trust: co-design with a resource limited community organisation. *CoDesign* 17, 3 (July 2021), 258–277. https://doi.org/10.1080/15710882.2019.1631349

[15] Gretchen Coombs. 2014. Activism, art and social practice: a case study using Jacques Ranciere's framework for analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Annual Conference of the Art Association of Australia and New Zealand. Melbourne, Australia*, 2014. QUT, BRisbane, Australia.

[16] Tawanna R. Dillahunt, Sheena Erete, Roxana Galusca, Aarti Israni, Denise Nacu, and Phoebe Sengers. 2017. Reflections on Design Methods for Underserved Communities. In *Companion of the 2017 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, February 25, 2017. ACM, Portland Oregon USA, 409–413. https://doi.org/10.1145/3022198.3022664

[17] Kellie Dunn, Irina Shklovski, and Pernille Bjørn. 2024. What Research through Art can bring to CSCW: exploring ambiguous futures of work. *i-com* 23, 1 (April 2024), 33–55. https://doi.org/10.1515/icom-2023-0038

[18] Jared Duval, Laia Turmo Vidal, Elena Márquez Segura, Yinchu Li, and Annika Waern. 2023. Reimagining Machine Learning's Role in Assistive Technology by Co-Designing Exergames with Children Using a Participatory Machine Learning Design Probe. In *The 25th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility*, October 22, 2023. ACM, New York NY USA, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1145/3597638.3608421

[19] Paulo Freire. 1967. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 30th Anniversary Edition*. Continuum International Publishing Group, New York.

[20] Carlos Garrido Castellano. 2022. Art Activism for an Anticolonial Future: a conversation with Carlos Garrido Castellano. *Community Development Journal* (October 2022), bsac027. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsac027

[21] Shelby Hagemann, Ann D Collier, Laverne Dallas, Marissa Adams, Darold Joseph, Ashish Amresh, and Morgan Vigil-Hayes. 2024. Designing a Resilience Resource Database with Hopi Behavioral Health Services. In *Designing Interactive Systems Conference*, July 2024. ACM, IT University of Copenhagen Denmark, 181–184. https://doi.org/10.1145/3656156.3663736

[22] Brett A. Halperin and Erin McElroy. 2023. Temporal Tensions in Digital Story Mapping for Housing Justice: Rethinking Time and Technology in Community-Based Design. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference*, July 10, 2023. ACM, Pittsburgh PA USA, 2469–2488. https://doi.org/10.1145/3563657.3596088

[23] Christina Harrington, Sheena Erete, and Anne Marie Piper. 2019. Deconstructing Community-Based Collaborative Design: Towards More Equitable Participatory Design Engagements. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, November 07, 2019. ACM, New York, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1145/3359318

[24] bell hooks. 1994. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. Routledge.

[25] bell hooks. 1995. *Art on My Mind: Visual Politics* (Illustrated Edition ed.). The New Press.

[26] Justin Langlois. 2020. Recuperating Conflict: Between Critical Generosity and Antagonistic Activation. *Art/Research International* 5, 1 (February 2020), 148–157. https://doi.org/10.18432/ari29489

[27] Minha Lee, Débora De Castro Leal, Max Krüger, Angelika Strohmayer, and Cristina Zaga. 2021. Activated: Decentering activism in and with academia. In *Companion Publication of the 2021 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, October 23, 2021. ACM, Virtual Event USA, 343–346. https://doi.org/10.1145/3462204.3481723

[28] Ann Light and Yoko Akama. 2012. The human touch: participatory practice and the role of facilitation in designing with communities. In *Proceedings of the 12th Participatory Design Conference: Research Papers - Volume 1*, August 12, 2012. ACM, Roskilde Denmark, 61–70. https://doi.org/10.1145/2347635.2347645

[29] Sanna Marttila, Frederick Van Amstel, Joanna Saad-Sulonen, Andrea Botero, Giacomo Poderi, Maurizio Teli, and P.D. Commoner. 2025. The Relational Becoming of a Participatory Design Commoner. August 06, 2025. . https://doi.org/10.21606/nordes.2025.22

[30] John McCarthy and Pete Wright. 2004. *Technology as Experience*. MIT Press.

[31] John McCarthy and Pete Wright. 2015. *Taking [a]part. The politics and aesthetics of participation in experience centred design*. MIT Press.

[32] Maria Murray, Nadia Pantidi, and John McCarthy. 2024. Designing for Dissensus: Socially Engaged Art to access experience and support participation. In *Designing Interactive Systems Conference*, July 2024. ACM, IT University of Copenhagen Denmark, 2851–2865. https://doi.org/10.1145/3643834.3661516

[33] Maria Murray, Geertje Slingerland, Nadia Pantidi, and John McCarthy. 2024. Socially Engaged Art Approaches to CSCW with Young People in Rurban Communities. *Comput Supported Coop Work* (June 2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-024-09494-x

[34] Nadia Pantidi, Jennifer Ferreira, Mara Balestrini, Mark Perry, Paul Marshall, and John McCarthy. 2015. Connected sustainability: connecting sustainability-driven, grass-roots communities through technology. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Communities and Technologies. Limerick, Ireland.*, June 27, 2015. ACM, New York, 161–163. https://doi.org/10.1145/2768545.2768563

[35] Jensine Raihan. 2025. The Colonial Legacy of the Human in Human-Computer Interaction: Implications for Critical Design Approaches. In *Proceedings of the sixth decennial Aarhus conference: Computing X Crisis*, August 18, 2025. ACM, Aarhus N Denmark, 140–152. https://doi.org/10.1145/3744169.3744184

[36] Jacques Rancière. 2009. Problems and transformations in critical art. In *Aesthetics and its Discontents*. Polity, 45–60.

[37] Jacques Rancière. 2011. The Thinking of Dissensus: Politics and Aesthetics. In *Reading Rancière*, Paul Bowman and Richard Stamp (eds.). Continuum International Publishing Group. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472547378

[38] Sarah Robinson, Jim Buckley, Luigina Ciolfi, Conor Linehan, Clare McInerney, Bashar Nuseibeh, John Twomey, Irum Rauf, and John McCarthy. 2024. Infrastructural justice for responsible software engineering,. *Journal of Responsible Technology* 19, (September 2024), 100087. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrt.2024.100087

[39] Sarah Rüller, Konstantin Aal, Peter Tolmie, Andrea Hartmann, Markus Rohde, and Volker Wulf. 2022. Speculative Design as a Collaborative Practice: Ameliorating the Consequences of Illiteracy through Digital Touch. *ACM Trans. Comput.-Hum. Interact.* 29, 3 (June 2022), 1–58. https://doi.org/10.1145/3487917

[40] Devansh Saxena, Erhardt Graeff, Shion Guha, EunJeong Cheon, Pedro Reynolds-Cuéllar, Dawn Walker, Christoph Becker, and Kenneth R. Fleischmann. 2020. Collective Organizing and Social Responsibility at CSCW. In *Companion Publication of the 2020 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, October 17, 2020. ACM, Virtual Event USA, 503–509. https://doi.org/10.1145/3406865.3418593

[41] Angela Schöpke-Gonzalez, Kellie Dunn, Shaowen Bardzell, Makayla Lewis, Maria Murray, and Catherine Wieczorek. 2025. Computing and the Arts: Establishing Theoretical and Methodological Foundations for Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration. In *CSCW Companion*, 2025. ACM, Bergen, Norway, 12–13. https://doi.org/10.1145/3068259

[42] Richard Scriven, Maria Murray, Claire Coughlan, Helen O'Keefe, and Molly Sterling. 'I'm terrified of becoming a headline': an exhibition responding to GBV in Ireland. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*. https://doi.org/10.1332/23986808Y2024D000000044

[43] Bibiana Serpa, Frederick Van Amstel, Marco Mazzarotto, Ricardo Carvalho, Rodrigo Gonzatto, and Sâmia Batista E Silva. 2022. Weaving design as a practice of freedom: Critical pedagogy in an insurgent network. June 25, 2022. . https://doi.org/10.21606/drs.2022.707

[44] Rachel Charlotte Smith, Liesbeth Huybrechts, Jesper Simonsen, and Daria Loi. 2025. Contemporary Participatory Design: Research Agendas for Societal Crisis. In *Proceedings of the sixth decennial Aarhus conference: Computing X Crisis*, August 18, 2025. ACM, Aarhus N Denmark, 182–201. https://doi.org/10.1145/3744169.3744183

[45] Angelika Strohmayer. 2021. *Digitally Augmenting Traditional Craft Practices for Social Justice: The Partnership Quilt*. Palgrave Macmilllan.

[46] Angelika Strohmayer. 2021. *Digitally Augmenting Traditional Craft Practices for Social Justice: The Partnership Quilt*. Springer Singapore.

[47] Miriam Sturdee, Makayla Lewis, Angelika Strohmayer, Katta Spiel, Nantia Koulidou, Sarah Fdili Alaoui, and Josh Urban Davis. 2021. A Plurality of Practices: Artistic Narratives in HCI Research. In *Proceeedings of 13th Conference on Creativity and Cognition, Virtual Event, Italy*, June 22, 2021. ACM, New York, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1145/3450741.3466771

[48] Maurizio Teli, Myriam Lewkowicz, Chiara Rossitto, and Susanne Bødker. 2021. Understanding, Promoting, and Designing for Sustainable Appropriation of Technologies by Grassroots Communities. Towards a new wave of technological activism: Sustainable Appropriation of Technologies by Grassroots Communities. In *C&T '21: Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Communities & Technologies - Wicked Problems in the Age of Tech*, June 20, 2021. ACM, Seattle WA USA, 332–335. https://doi.org/10.1145/3461564.3468163

[49] Chrissie Tiller. 2014. The Spectrum of Participation. *Create News*. Retrieved from ttp://www.create-ireland.ie/images/pdfs/create-news/Create-News-17-October-2014- Chrissie-Tiller.pdf

[50] Alexandra To, Angela D. R. Smith, Dilruba Showkat, Adinawa Adjagbodjou, and Christina Harrington. 2023. Flourishing in the Everyday: Moving Beyond Damage-Centered Design in HCI for BIPOC Communities. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference*, July 10, 2023. ACM, Pittsburgh PA USA, 917–933. https://doi.org/10.1145/3563657.3596057

[51] Griet Verschelden, Elly Van Eeghem, Riet Steel, Sven De Visscher, and Carlos Dekeyrel. 2012. Positioning community art practices in urban cracks. *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 31, 3 (June 2012), 277–291. https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2012.683607

[52] Morgan Vigil-Hayes, Lakshmi Panguluri, Harry Dececco, Md Nazmul Hossain, Ann Collier, Darold Joseph, and Ashish Amresh. 2024. ICT-facilitated Health Interventions for Indigenous Communities: A Critical Literature Review. *ACM J.*

Responsib. Comput. 1, 4 (December 2024), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1145/3687133

[53] Richmond Y. Wong. 2025. Towards Creating Infrastructures for Values and Ethics Work in the Production of Software Technologies. In *Proceedings of the sixth decennial Aarhus conference: Computing X Crisis*, August 18, 2025. ACM, Aarhus N Denmark, 13–26. https://doi.org/10.1145/3744169.3744171