We are now in a position to draw a few conclusions from this examination of designer fallacies. First, in spite of language concerning designer capacity in textbooks – recognizably there in engineering, architecture, and other design textbooks – I am attempting to show that the design situation is considerably more complex and less transparent than it is usually taken to be. Both the designer-materiality relation, and the artifact-user relations are complex and multistable. While it is clear that a new technology, when put to use, produces changes in practices – all of the examples show that – these practices are not of any simple 'deterministic' pattern. The results are indeterminate but definite, but also multiple and diverse. Moreover, *both* intended results and unintended results are unpredictable in any simple way, and yet results are produced. And, finally, what emerges from this examination looks much more like an inter-relational interpretation of a human-technology-uses model in which the human, material, and practices all undergo dynamic changes. If this is the case, then there are also implications for designer education. One of these is that the design process must be seen to be fallibilistic and contingent. Some worry that this recognition may be demotivating – but it could also be a call for a more cooperative, mutually co-critical approach as well.

I am also implicitly suggesting that the re-descriptions which have arisen out of the past several decades of work in the history and philosophy of science, the new sociologies of science, and cultural and science studies, which undertake careful case studies of developments in technologies, give hints of the complexities suggested.[2]

References

DeLanda, M., 1991, *War in the Age of Intelligent Machines*, Swerve Editions, Zone Press, New York, pp. 12–14.

Kittler, F., 1990, The mechanized philosopher, in: *Looking after Nietzsche*, L. A. Rickels, ed., SUNY Press, Albany, NY.

Latour, B., 1987, *Science in Action*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Nyre, L., 2003, *Fidelity Matters: Sound Media and Realism in the 20th Century*, Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Media Studies, University of Bergen, Volda University College, Norway.

Pickering, A., 1995, *The Mangle of Practice: Time, Agency, and Science*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, p. 102.

Tenner, E., 1996, *Why things Bite Back: Technology and the Revenge of Unintended Consequences*, Alfred Knopf, New York.

Toffler, A., 1970, *Future Shock*, Bantam, New York.

White, Jr., L., 1971, Cultural climates and technological advance in the Middle Ages, *Viator* **2**:171–201.

Winner, L., 1986, Do artifacts have politics?, in: *The Whale and the Reactor*, L. Winner, ed., University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 19–39.

[2] Reproduced – with slight changes – with permission of Palgrave Macmillan from Ihde, D., 2006, The designers fallacy and technological imagination, in: *Defining Technological Literacy: Towards an Epistemological Framework*, Dakers, J. R., Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp. 121–131.