



## D5.1 ONLINE VIDEOS PRESENTING CASE STUDIES

Project Acronym	DiDIY
Project Name	Digital Do It Yourself
Grant Agreement no.	644344
Start date of the project	01/01/2015
End date of the project	30/06/2017
Work Package producing the document	WP5 – Exploring the impact of DiDIY on creative society
WP Lead Partner	UOW
Other Partner(s) involved	all
Deliverable identifier	D5.1
Deliverable lead beneficiary	UOW
Due date	M24 (December 2016)
Date of delivery	27/12/2016
Version	1.0
Author(s)	UOW
License	Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike 4.0
Classification	PUBLIC
Document Status	APPROVED
<i>This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 644344.</i>	
<i>Disclaimer: The views expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the views of the EC.</i>	



## Disclaimer

This document is provided “As Is”; it is a study introducing the main research topics in the presented context. Any feedback, suggestions and contributions to make this document better and more useful are very welcome. Please let us know through the contact page <http://www.didiy.eu/contact>. We will seek to incorporate relevant contributions in the document and add your name to the list of contributors.

## Executive summary

Deliverable D5.1, “Online videos presenting case studies”, is not formally a report. This document is intended to provide brief accompanying information for the videos themselves, which are the actual content of the deliverable and are available to view, via the Project website at <http://www.didiy.eu/online-videos-didiy-case-studies>.

There are 6 videos, with a total running time of just under 45 minutes. Each video uses interview footage and an accompanying narrative, based on research undertaken for the DiDIY Project, to explore an aspect of the maker movement and maker ethos: Creativity, Sharing, Community, Entrepreneurship, Well-being, and Glimpses of the Future. The purpose of these videos is to present key aspects of maker culture and ethos, aspects that emerged during the case study research, in terms of broad social impact and through the first-hand accounts of leading voices within the field. Interviewees were chosen to represent a cross-section of makers, innovators and entrepreneurs who are closely involved with DiDIY activities, creativity, and creative platforms, both online and offline. The videos aim to provide insight into, and understanding of, this emerging phenomenon from the viewpoint of participants.

Revision history			
Version	Date	Created / modified by	Comments
0.1	25/11/2016	UOW	First, incomplete draft.
0.2	1/12/2016	UOW, LIUC	Second draft.
0.3	26/12/2016	UOW, LIUC	Third draft.
1.0	27/12/2016	LIUC	Approved version, submitted to the EC Participant Portal.



## Table of Contents

<a href="#">Disclaimer.....</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">Executive summary.....</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">1. Introduction.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">1.1 Defining Terms.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">2. Case study interviewees and subjects of videos.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">2.1 Selecting case studies.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">2.2 The subjects of videos.....</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">3. Carrying out interviews and producing videos.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">3.1 Consent arrangements.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">3.2 Video production.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4. Emerging videos themes.....</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">References.....</a>	<a href="#">10</a>



## 1. Introduction

According to the Project Grant Agreement, the scope of Work Package (WP5) is as follows.

The aim of this WP is to explore the impact of DiDIY on creative society. Whilst all of the WPs are necessarily concerned with social aspects of DiDIY – across areas such as work, education, law and ethics – this WP takes a broader and more sociological approach to the new meanings of social creativity, and how DiDIY may affect social participation in ways that reach beyond the more straightforward applications of these technologies.

The principal objectives of this WP are:

1. To establish whether DiDIY fosters a spirit of self-motivated creativity and entrepreneurialism that could lead to significant social change.
2. To explore how ABC technologies such as 3D printing offer a significant alternative to previous ways of making things, and the difference they make to social attitudes to material production and consumption.
3. To study how DiDIY may help societies to overcome pressing social, environmental and economic issues.
4. To explore the relationships between digital cultures, offline making, and digital making.
5. To study whether the DiDIY ethos inspires people to bring about changes in their local culture.

The scope of the research is therefore designed to be broad and ask fundamental questions. The research to be undertaken is laid out in a series of tasks. Tasks 5.1 and 5.4 relate to the videos, as below:

Task 5.1. Case studies (M15-M18) (Leader: UoW)

We will select and interview 14 cutting-edge and entrepreneurial makers about their practices and views on DiDIY, in relation to social life, engagement and organisation, in order to generate answers to five research questions related to the five objectives indicated above.

Task 5.4. Video series (M18-M26) (Leader: UoW).

On the basis of the outputs of Tasks 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3, we will create a freely-available series of 6 videos which explore aspects of the maker movement and the maker ethos in terms of broad social impact.

The deliverable associated with Task 5.4 is the present D5.1.

### 1.1 Defining Terms

The terms “Maker movement” and “maker ethos” are significant here, in that the relationship between the Maker movement and DiDIY has been the subject of work undertaken within WP2, and in particular D2.4, “Knowledge Framework, revised version”, the latest version of which is available on the Project website: [www.didiy.eu/public/deliverables/didiy-d2.4-1.0-pub.pdf](http://www.didiy.eu/public/deliverables/didiy-d2.4-1.0-pub.pdf).

Work towards definitions of terms have also formed part of the vocabulary undertaken after the Project review in mid-2016. See <http://www.didiy.eu/vocabulary-of-digital-do-it-yourself>. Quoting a note in the vocabulary, “The terms “DIYer” and “maker” are not necessarily synonymous, and in a more refined conceptualisation makers and DIYers could be distinguished.”. Within the videos presented here, such terms are used with the meanings attributed by the interviewed experts, thus



reflecting the emerging nature of the phenomenon where terms have still fluid meaning. The interviewees mostly used the term “maker” and “Maker movement”, and these have been placed within the context of DiDIY by us. For more information regarding the Project interpretation of these and other related terms please refer to the vocabulary cited above.



## 2. Case study interviewees and subjects of videos

Case study interviewees were chosen to represent a cross-section of makers, innovators and entrepreneurs who are closely involved with DiDIY activities, creativity, and creative platforms, both online and offline. The 14 interviewees, listed alphabetically by surname, are as follows:

Daniel Charny, Creative Director, From Now On  
Liz Ciokajlo, Co-founder, OurOwnsKIN  
Richard Clifford, Executive Director, MAKLab  
Liz Corbin, Researcher and Curator, Institute of Making  
Tomas Diez, Founder, Fab City Research Laboratory  
Hannah Fox, Project Director, Derby Silk Mill  
Bram Geenen, Co-founder, Wevolver  
Richard Harvey, Co-founder, Harvey&John  
Tim Hunkin, artist and engineer  
Sherry Huss, Vice President, Maker Media, Co-founder, Maker Faire  
Bethany Koby, CEO, Technology Will Save Us  
Nat Hunter, Strategic Director, Machines Room  
Dave Shepherd, Director, Barclays Digital Eagle Labs  
Torsten Sherwood, Co-founder, Noook.

### 2.1 *Selecting case studies*

In February 2016 we prepared a case study outline proposal that identified possible scenarios from which case studies could be drawn to meet the Project objectives. This exercise drew on recent published research including “Top findings from the open dataset of UK makerspaces” (Nesta 2015) and “Ours to master – How makerspaces can help us master technology for a more human end” (RSA 2015) as well as discussions with contacts, for example at a two-day symposium in Edinburgh, hosted by the Royal College of Art as part of “Future makespaces in redistributed manufacturing” (RCA 2016).

This preliminary research identified the need to include companies, organisations, and innovators, as well as makers, that were active in the areas targeted by the Project objectives. It recognized the importance to include individual makers at different stages of their careers and to include a variety of creative platforms, both online and offline. As a result individuals were selected and contacted.

The selected case studies represent a broad spectrum, including online and offline organisations, a variety of types of makerspace, and individuals and businesses with a direct link to the DiDIY sphere. Subsequent deliverable D5.2 will include a written case study presentation of each interviewee.



## ***2.2 The subjects of videos***

Six videos were produced, with a total running time of just under 45 minutes. Each video uses interview footage and an accompanying narrative, based on research undertaken for the Project, to explore an aspect of the maker movement and maker ethos:

- Creativity;
- Sharing;
- Community;
- Entrepreneurship;
- Well-being;
- Glimpses of the Future.

The purpose of these videos is to present key aspects of maker culture and ethos, in terms of broad social impact and through the first-hand accounts of leading voices within the field.



### **3. Carrying out interviews and producing videos**

Interviews were conducted between April and July 2016, with one or two being carried out slightly later in the year. The researcher travelled to interview case studies, for example travelling to Glasgow for MAKLab, Bournemouth for Eagle Labs, Southwold Under the Pier Show to interview Tim Hunkin, to the UK Maker Faire in Newcastle to meet Sherry Huss, and so forth. Two interviews were carried out by Skype, with Daniel Charny and Tomas Diez, as this was the only practicable arrangement that could be made. The online nature of these interviews is indicated in the caption.

#### **3.1 Consent arrangements**

Consent was sought to interview participants on a named and attributable basis. A consent form was developed to meet this need. The consent arrangements were agreed with LIUC, who have responsibility for this aspect of the Project.

#### **3.2 Video production**

Video production was carried out by the research team on a DIY basis. The themes emerged from the research undertaken for WP5 as a whole, the clips from interviews were selected to represent a range of views on each theme. The video narrative draws together and comments on the interview content. Additional material from Tasks 5.2 and 5.3 formed part of the background research considered, a small number of direct quotes from makers who took part in Task 5.2 are included in video 5: Well-being.

The six videos are available to view via the Project website at <http://www.didiy.eu/online-videos-didiy-case-studies>.





## 4. Emerging videos themes

The six themes of the videos – as listed above – emerged from analysis of the data, both the interviews themselves and the data generated by Tasks 5.2 and 5.3. These tasks involved carrying out workshops with over 135 makers. Each of these makers was asked to complete a written questionnaire at the end of the workshop. The workshop data will form part of the research basis for deliverables D5.3 and D5.4.

As the workshops were completed in October 2016, early analysis of questionnaire replies regarding the perceived social impact from making was undertaken. A textual analysis of the questionnaire data revealed that creativity, sharing and change – delivering both personal benefits and employment opportunities – and well-being, were identified as key themes for makers asked about how they thought making could most benefit society. The video themes emerged from this research, supplemented by textual analysis of the case study interviews themselves.

Hence the videos were constructed to follow the themes which had emerged from research. They present some of the most relevant and interesting issues and comments that arose during the case study interviews, in light of the stated Project objectives. The narrative aims to draw out the main research themes and broadly map out the landscape of DiDIY and creative society, as it was represented to us in the case study interviews. The aim was to represent the particular ideas, stories and situations that we encountered within this qualitative research task, as such the videos present an introductory view of the maker movement and maker ethos in terms of broad social impact.



## References

Nesta (2015). *Top findings from the open dataset of UK makerspaces*: <http://www.nesta.org.uk/blog/top-findings-open-dataset-uk-makerspaces>.

RCA (2016). Edinburgh symposium, 22-23rd Feb 2016, part of a two-year research project run from the Royal College of Art, London, funded by The Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC): *Exploring the role of makerspaces in redistributed manufacturing*: <http://futuremakerspaces.rca.ac.uk>.

RSA (2015). *Ours to master – How makerspaces can help us master technology for a more human end*: <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/ours-to-master>.