

# DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

## Abstract

This work investigates the social collaboration and creative outcomes of teams of learners in Higher Education (HE) Design studies, in the context of cross-organizational (university/industry) Communities of Practice (CoP). These refer to groups of people who share a common interest in a field and connect to co-create knowledge. The study focuses on the feedback delivered by the industrial members of the CoP through the means of collaboration technologies, to complement academic feedback. Findings have shown a twofold effect on learners. On the one hand, critical feedback on the deliverables increased both the time-pressure and the complexity of the work, affecting the teams' perception of their performances. On the other hand, feedback appeared to inspire better creative outcomes while improving the teams' metacognitive activity and learning regulation. Furthermore, it enabled learners to pragmatically realize their status within the broader geography of professional practice and reconfigure their achievement goals accordingly. These findings confirm the contribution of cross-organizational CoPs in HE and are discussed with reference to CoPs theory and modes of belonging as fundamental for learning and identity evolution.

**Keywords:** Communities of practice, feedback, creativity, collaboration, design education, collaboration technologies

# DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

## 1. Introduction

Basic academic knowledge aside, creativity, collaboration skills and vocational relevance are key qualities required of graduates transitioning into today's creative digital industries (Binkley et al., 2012; Botma et al., 2015; Edmondson et al., 2012; Onsman, 2016). By digital creative industries, we refer to the convergence of the fields of design, programming, interactive media and business (Proctor-Thomson, 2013). *Creativity* is presently the cause of much movement in educational research, as it is crucial not only in the arts, but also in seemingly disparate areas such as the domains of science and engineering (Crilly & Cardoso, 2017; Cropley, 2015; Oh et al., 2013).

Creativity nevertheless remains particularly important in the digital creative industries that are intrinsically associated with innovation (Wijngaarden et al., 2019). Creative and innovative outcomes aim for both novelty and appropriateness for real-world problems; this makes *authenticity* a crucial factor in all creative activity (Amabile, 1982). Authenticity, from a learning perspective, involves the assignment of ill-defined problems in interdisciplinary settings, active ties and collaboration professionals and experts in the field and—crucially—industry-driven criteria and feedback to guide the ensuing work (Grohs et al., 2018; Herrington, 2009; Lombardi, 2007).

Social collaboration competencies are also crucial for authenticity in learning, especially in the digital creative domains, where teamwork is essential (Becker et al., 2017; Leung & Bentley, 2017; Nguyen et al., 2016). Higher education (HE) is nevertheless falling behind in producing social creative thinkers who have real-world experience and feel confident to collectively drive innovative performances in the professional domain (Edmondson et al., 2012; Mourshed et al., 2013). A key cause appears to be the lack of dialogue between academia and industry, a combination that can effectively inform and enhance programs in achieving desired outcomes (Roodhouse, 2009). Students placed in decontextualized learning settings that are isolated from real-world practice report a lack of motivation to engage in creative collaboration and problem-solving (De Graaf & Kolmos, 2003; Herrington et al., 2004; Leung & Bentley, 2017).

One response to these problems originates from *situated learning*, a theory which supports that knowledge cannot materialize out of the context—be it conceptual, social, technical or professional—it is meant to apply to (Brown et al., 1989). Communities of Practice (CoPs), a model originating from the same theory, suggest that groups of people can collectively create knowledge and competency as *socially situated* members of a common

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

practice in a particular domain (Lave & Wenger, 1999; E. Wenger, 1998). In the same vein, we propose that collaboration and creativity in learner teams can be bolstered through social participation in real-world industry-academia (cross-organizational) CoPs. We base this on what we currently know through existing research on the positive contribution of CoPs in learning (DeChambeau, 2017; Fegan, 2017; J. Y. Park, 2015; Pharo et al., 2014; Power & Armstrong, 2017; Tight, 2015). As the majority of the abovementioned work takes an intra-organizational approach (i.e. by focusing only on education), what we currently lack is research on the CoP-mediated role of industry in education, and the effects of this interaction on learning. There is also much scope to analyze the learning phenomena that occur within CoPs in a specific discipline (Smith et al., 2017).

This work reports on the collaboration processes and outcomes of HE students as participants in cross-organizational CoPs in the field of design. The study takes place in a blended learning setting, therefore the role of technology is deemed crucial for both *team-based* and more importantly, *community-wide* collaboration, as it can help bypass the geographical and temporal obstacles posed by the heterogeneity in the CoP membership (academic and industrial members). By recruiting two groups of learners—an experimental and a control group—the study first aims to compare the CoP’s impact on the creative outcomes of students. It then proceeds to analyze the emergent CoP collaboration processes, and more specifically the *feedback*.

The purpose of the analysis is thus to understand the nature of the cross-organizational feedback in Design studies and in turn, how it is experienced and processed by learners in the CoP (Cummings et al., 2016; Popescu, 2014). Feedback is significant also due to the fact that it’s strongly associated with the practice of design and related disciplines (i.e. architecture, engineering, HCI), where critiquing and reviewing is fundamental in the development of creative works (Adams et al., 2016; Huet et al., 2007). This study is thus guided by the following research questions (RQs):

1. What are the effects of participation in a cross-organizational CoP on the creative *outcomes* of learners?
2. What is the nature of the feedback that typically emerges in cross-organizational CoPs in the field of design and related domains?

3. How is *community-wide collaboration* experienced and processed by the learners in the CoP?

This work aims to form a well-rounded understanding of the collaboration phenomena and resulting outcomes, in respect of feedback. Through its findings, it seeks to contribute useful insight and direction for educators, designers and researchers who wish to implement, participate in or evaluate the HE cross-organizational CoP model, with a special focus on feedback, for the purposes of enhancing learning and outcomes for students.

The following sections outline important work relating to CoPs, creativity, collaboration and feedback in education. Next, we describe the methods employed in the study and proceed to analyze the various outcomes, triangulating and drawing connections between quantitative and qualitative results. Finally, the key findings are outlined in the discussion and conclusion sections.

## **2. Literature review**

### **2.1. Communities of Practice (CoPs)**

CoPs can emerge organically in any social group sharing a common passion and goals in a given field (Eckert, 2006); alternatively, they can be intentionally designed and maintained by a CoP “steward” (E. Wenger et al., 2009). The steward—mainly associated with virtual CoPs (VCoPs) - is also responsible for tailoring technology to the specific needs of the community (Dolmans et al., 2015).

At its core and drawing from cognitive apprenticeship and situated learning theories, the existence of a CoP presupposes multi-level knowledge and skills (ranging from novice to expert) from its members, who interact to strengthen their competencies and attain their goals within a domain (Vaughan & Dornan, 2014; E. Wenger et al., 2002). Learning can occur through a process termed as Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP), which involves varying levels of social participation (from full to partial), observation and imitation of more competent others (Brown et al., 1989; Fegan, 2017; E. Wenger, 1998). A CoP’s main constituents include a joint enterprise (common goal), mutual engagement (motivation and participation) and a shared repertoire (i.e. vocabulary, resources and methods that are gradually developed overtime) amongst its members.

As indicated by research, CoPs can play a key role in learning: they encourage socially mediated learning through pragmatic knowledge networks (Allee, 2000; Gunawardena et al., 2009; Hildreth & Kimble, 2004; Schønheyder & Nordby, 2018), they

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

facilitate peer assessment and reflection (Rourke & Coleman, 2009) and they provide valuable support for novices through LPP (Johnston, 2016; Stone et al., 2017; Woo, 2015) across educational, industrial and governmental sectors (Bate & Robert, 2002; Khalid & Strange, 2016; Pattinson & Preece, 2014; Tight, 2015).

Technology-supported or virtual CoPs (Nistor & Fischer, 2012) have also been widely adopted over the past two decades. VCoPs make use of configurations that accommodate certain CoP activities by bundling different platforms and software tools (Khalid & Strange, 2016; E. Wenger, 2009). By transcending space and time and often moderating cultural limitations, technology is an ideal means by which remote members of a cross-organizational CoP can collaborate.

### 2.2. Creativity

Guildford's (1967) contribution to creativity research was key in aiming to provide a concrete definition (Batey, 2012; Kurtzberg & Amabile, 2001; Shneiderman, 2000). He stated that creativity is the sum of sub-constructs, namely, *originality, fluency, cognition & memory, flexibility* and *sensitivity to problems*. More contemporary designations of creativity refer to the individuals or the processes that lead to products that are appropriate for a purpose (Amabile, 1982; Furnham et al., 2011; Kaufman & Baer, 2005; Mumford, 2003; M. A. Runco & Okuda, 1988; Sternberg & Lubart, 1999).

Following an exhaustive, large-scale review of twenty-first century creativity literature, deemed as important by creativity researchers and theorists, Hennessey and Amabile (2010, p. 572) inferred that creativity research was fragmented, one of the reasons being the isolation of the multiple creativity sub-fields under investigation and the respective theoretical stances, methodological approaches and questions asked (Glăveanu, 2014). Nonetheless, they concluded that there was a degree of agreement in the definition of creativity with respect to two components, namely, *novelty* and *value* (or *appropriateness*). They specifically suggested that “creativity involves the development of a novel product, idea, or solution to a problem that is of value to the individual and/or the larger social group”.

Theorists apprehending the multi-dimensionality of the construct and focusing on the processes that can nurture creativity, posit that contextual affordances (physical, digital, social) are crucial in all creative activity; hence their relationships warrants a transformed approach in the investigation of creativity (P. B. Paulus & Nijstad, 2003; Plucker et al., 2004; Rhodes, 1990).

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

With respect to these directions, we focus on *social creativity*, which has received considerable attention over the past decades, as it was found to generate far greater results than the sum of individual creativities (D'souza & Dastmalchi, 2016; Meneely & Portillo, 2005; Sawyer & DeZutter, 2009; Wishart et al., 2011). Within the scope of a situated approach to learning that can foster creativity, research cannot afford to ignore the social or contextual dimensions of the creative processes and outcomes that ensue (Csikszentmihalyi & Hunter, 2003; Sawyer & DeZutter, 2009).

However, Paulus & Nijstad (2003) noted that while there is common understanding of the importance of such contextual (*social, cultural, organizational*) aspects of creativity, literature still lacks a systematic approach for the investigation of the processes that link to creativity. They offered four common themes as heuristics for the support of social or distributed creativity, these being: a) group *diversity* (functional, informational, cognitive) - versus homogeneity – for the creation of innovation, b) lower risks of group *motivation* and *coordination* loss, to augment creative potential c) treat the group *climate* as critical (i.e. trustful, critical, restrictive) for inhibiting or fostering divergent thinking and ensuing activity, and d) focus on the interaction between group and *environment* (i.e. social, cultural, organizational), as influential for the creative processes, as well as definitive for the *evaluation* of creativity within a specific domain (social judgement).

Following these lines, Glăveanu's (2014) later contribution in the theoretical expansion of *social* or *distributed* - creativity, was significant, through a dynamic conceptual framework that sees creativity as materializing through the entanglement of *social, material* and *temporal* dimensions; three respective *lines of distribution* were thus offered. Briefly explained, the *social* line refers to the *co-creation* (*direct* as in collaboration and *indirect* as in the intellectual contributions of others or social mark of tools and resources used) and *social construction* (awareness of others' 'voices' which defining the perceived *value* of the creative outcomes). The *material* line, takes into account the *agency* of objects and artifacts, and the overall affordances (i.e. intended ways of use) of the contextual environment, in supporting or resisting creative processes. Finally, the *temporal* line of distribution which considers the role of *time*, from a *cultural-historical* perspective (i.e. past contributions), the *individual trajectory* (creativity evolution over the creators' lifespan) and the *micro-temporal* aspect of 'creativity in the making', as in the run-time processes that allow for micro changes and adjustments.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

The evaluation of creativity has involved a number of different perspectives over the years (Cherry & Latulipe, 2014; Shneiderman et al., 2006). In an aim to capture the different facets of the construct, Batey (2012) proposed a three-dimensional taxonomic analytic framework. According to this, researchers need to define the *level* (i.e. team, organization, culture or individual), *facet* (i.e. trait, environment, process or outcomes) and *measurement* that is most efficient in collecting the required data (i.e. objective, self/external rating, subjective).

That said, research has so far been dominated by the focus on the *individualistic* perspective of creativity, asking the “big” questions grounded in personality traits, dispositions, inclinations and thinking styles (Crilly & Cardoso, 2017; Gough, 1979; Hennessey, 2017; N. K. Park et al., 2016; M. A. Runco, 2007) through self-reported psychometric or externally-rated tests (Plucker et al., 2004; M. A. Runco et al., 2014; Torrance, 1966). Some of the most prevalent scoring measures include the ‘*Torrance Test of Creative Thinking*’ (TTCT) (Almeida et al. 2008; Kim 2006; Torrance 1966), the ‘*Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale*’ (K-Docs) (Kaufman, 2006; Kaufman et al., 2009), and ‘*Runco’s Creativity Assessment Battery*’ (rCAB)©.

However, such tests have faced long-term criticism, based on the difficulty of not knowing what trait is actually being measured (Sawyer, 2011, p. 45); or lacking consistency across research variations such as gender, culture, or testing administration (K.-H. Kim, 2004; Sawyer, 2011; Swartz, 1988). Given the suggestions of researchers in the field, an important note to be made is that their results should be considered partial and should be verified and triangulated against scores from additional tests (K. H. Kim, 2006), or most importantly, combined with and integrated with the scope of interconnected research aims (Glăveanu, 2014; Mayer, 1999, pp. 449–460) that seek to derive more compound inferences on creativity. Likewise, Hennessey (2017) observes that research has over the past few years been reformulated to examine creativity as a ‘*system in action*’. According to this, researchers should see *creativity* as an inseparable *web* of different forces (social, cultural, temporal, psychological) and employ an integrative – rather than an isolated - approach to its investigation.

### 2.3. Feedback in education

Feedback is a primary component of social learning and CoPs (Cummings et al., 2016; Popescu, 2014). It is also strongly associated with processes in design and related areas (HCI, architecture, engineering) where real stakeholder participation, like user feedback,

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

evaluations, expert reviews and studio critiquing are integral elements in the work cycle (Adams et al., 2016; Huet et al., 2007; Østergaard et al., 2018).

Studies have provided evidence on both the positive and negative effects of feedback on learner performance (Boud & Falchikov, 2006; Harks et al., 2014; Knight, 2002; Schartel, 2012). Its role as part of a formative as well as an interventional approach to assessment is critical as it can offer timely guidance, promote reflection and metacognition and lead to higher academic accomplishments (Glăveanu, 2014, p. 88; Miller, 2009; Yorke, 2003). It has also been found to encourage divergent thinking and generative processing (i.e. inter-team stimulation that generates new insights) and in turn, to cultivate creative activity (Hoever et al., 2018).

Feedback can, however, also trigger undesirable effects in learning, particularly when it is expressed negatively. For instance, one study on written feedback (Weaver, 2006) deduced that comments that were predominantly negative were deeply discouraging to university students. Likewise, other work posited that quantitative or competitive feedback in the form of scoring not only posed a negative emotional load on learners, but also hindered their perceived epistemic abilities (Bower, 2005; Tekian et al., 2017). The repercussions of harsh feedback on learners' *self-belief* and *motivation* are well documented in literature (Hyland & Hyland, 2001; Irvine, 2018; Jonsson, 2013; Price et al., 2010). This is expected as evaluators typically tend to overelaborate on the negative points, while “scratching the surface” of the positive ones (Värlander, 2008).

Related work on self-beliefs can guide our understanding of learning phenomena (Ames, 1992; Bandura, 1991; Irvine, 2018). Particularly, two types of self-belief: a) *self-efficacy*, which involves beliefs about one's capabilities and b) *self-concept*, which focuses on the self-appraisal of one's worth as influenced by socio-cultural variables, i.e. what other people—whose opinions we care about—believe about us (Pajares & Schunk, 2001; Wang & Neihart, 2015).

The interaction between feedback and learner self-beliefs is also present in modern instruction methods. A study by Gormally et al (2009), for example, involved *inquiry* (experimental) versus *traditional* instruction (control) groups in HE. Findings indicated higher gains in content literacy and research skills, but decreased levels of self-confidence for students in the experimental condition. Inquiry-based learning involves ill-structured real-life problems, work-reasoning based on actual case studies and limited guidance from the instructor. In contrast, carefully controlled, traditional learning environments (control) do not include the challenges of dealing with the authentic

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

information and criticism that are often encountered in inquiry learning conditions (experimental). Interestingly, although these hindered students' *self-concept* and *self-confidence*, they still led to overall greater epistemic outcomes (Gehlbach et al., 2008).

Likewise, the importance of a situated approach to feedback (contextualized in real-life scenarios) in HE is highlighted in similar work (Boud & Falchikov, 2006; Harrison et al., 2015). Boud & Falchikov (2006) posited that such contextualized and constructive feedback can be effectively achieved (in self and peer form) through CoPs. Participation in a CoP can help students develop the aptitude to judge their own outcomes based on professional community standards and benchmarks, as opposed to solely academic ones (Gilbuena et al., 2015; Rodgers et al., 2014). Broad CoPs that include stakeholders such as industry experts, clients, prospective employers or government workers can offer much-needed diversity in the practice of feedback, which students can then use to mold their domain-level knowledge and competencies (Albats, 2018; Etzkowitz & Ranga, 2015; Price, 2005).

### 3. Material & methods

#### 3.1. Participants

The study involved 38 (26 female and 12 male) third-year Multimedia and Graphic Arts undergraduate students (in a four-year course). The students (age range from 21 to 24,  $M=22,4$ ) were enrolled in a Web Design and Development course (WDD) for a semester (13 weeks x 180-minute-lessons) and were divided—by registration—into two groups (Group1,  $N=21$  and Group 2,  $N=17$ ). The students put themselves in teams of around four people, totaling about five teams in each group. Both groups had previously attended identical programs and presented no statistically significant differences in their grades: Group 1 ( $M = 7,27$ ,  $SD = ,91$ ) and Group 2 ( $M = 7,26$ ,  $SD = ,56$ ),  $t(36) = -,07$ ,  $p = ,17$ ).

#### 3.2. Research design and procedure

The study employs a mixed-method design, using multiple methods of data collection and analysis, including quasi-experimental design, to compare the creative outcomes of the two groups, and qualitative data to explain and support these. Group 1 formed the experimental and Group 2 the control group. Both groups shared identical curricula and assignments in the course of the study. A total of five authentic projects were assigned by industrial mentors, who were invited to participate as “clients.” Each project

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

(essentially, the design and development of a website) was implemented twice: once by a team in the experimental condition and once by a team in the control condition, independently. However, only the experimental group teams a) participated in the CoP and interacted with the industry members and b) used collaborative online tools to support their community-wide collaboration. Teams in the control condition were limited to ordinary university-wide exchanges that took place as part of a traditional curriculum.

### 3.3. The CoP model and collaboration technology configuration

The CoP was designed and steered by the course instructor (steward), as suggested by the framework for newly formed communities (E. Wenger, 2009). It comprised internal (academic) and external (industrial) stakeholders with diverse knowledge and experience in the field of design (see Figure 1). These were: a) the *instructor* of the course, b) the *floating facilitator*, i.e. a graduate student working as a TA to provide general support (Rodgers et al., 2014), c) *alumni mentors*, i.e. three alumni students with active industry experience, who provided systematic feedback on student work throughout the semester, d) *industrial mentors* (clients), i.e. five local organizations from various sectors who provided the requirements, project resources and regular feedback on the work in progress and finally, e) *industrial experts*, i.e. three professionals with a minimum of six years of professional expertise in the field, who evaluated the final student projects. The full details of the CoP model design are presented elsewhere (author's reference).

The recruitment of the *industrial* members to the CoP was crucial for the objectives of the study and did not present any significant difficulties. Graduate students with a genuine interest in advancing their studies volunteered to help as facilitators, taking the opportunity to deepen their knowledge and enrich their résumés with practical experience. This incentive also held true for alumni students (mentors), who were young designers in the process of building experience and establishing their professional status. Alumni members were also motivated by their positive academic experiences, a phenomenon that can often instigate subsequent acts of loyalty towards their alma mater (McAlexander & Koenig, 2001). Finally, industrial experts, who tend to hold key organizational positions in the domain, were interested in establishing and maintaining communication channels with the universities to give direction, influence outcomes and draw from a filtered graduate talent pool.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE




Figure 1. Community of Practice roles and levels of participation (adaptation from original model by Wenger, 1989)

The cross-organizational CoP was largely sustained by collaboration technologies for both *team-based* and *community-wide* interactions. The role of collaboration technology is critical in that it has the ability to connect geographically and temporally dispersed members, as well as to enable team-based (subgroup) collaboration to fulfill particular field-specific purposes (Castañeda, 2019; E. Wenger, 1998). The experimental group teams used Google Drive, Docs and Hangouts for collective analysis, documentation and generic productivity purposes, ConceptBoard, for brainstorming and experimentation, as well as Axure and Adobe's Photoshop, Illustrator and Dreamweaver, as creativity-support tools (CSTs) for the actual design tasks (Cherry & Latulipe, 2014). These tools collectively enabled team communication, productivity and project management (Nielsen, 1994).

Community-wide collaboration on the design work was mainly supported by Adobe's Behance, an online portfolio and social networking site and Hypothes.is, a browser-based annotation tool. Both supported public viewing, communication and feedback facilities for CoP members.

### 3.4. Instrumentation

#### 3.4.1. The Web Site Creativity Measurement Instrument (WSCMI)

The WSCMI instrument was developed by Zeng et al (Zeng et al., 2009) to evaluate the creativity of websites, based on seven key factors (totaling 28 items): aesthetic appeal,

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

interactivity, novelty & flexibility, affect, importance, commonality & simplicity and personalization (see Table 1 **Error! Reference source not found.**).

The instrument's *construct validity* relies on foundational literature (Zeng et al., 2009). Specifically, the WSCMI draws on four different theoretical areas of creativity:

- a) Generic creativity theory from a psychology perspective (Hennessey & Amabile, 2010; Sawyer, 2011)
- b) Product creativity, specifically targeted at traditional hardware products, driven by respective theoretical and empirical evidence (Amabile, 1982; Csikszentmihalyi, 1988; Horn & Salvendy, 2006, 2009). Explicitly, *affect*, *importance*, and *novelty* were integrated as factors from the validated Productivity Measurement Instrument Horn's & Salvendy's (2009) study.
- c) HCI and computational creativity which address the needs of more complex information technology products and computer-mediated environments that also cater for social co-creation processes (Hoffmann, 2016; Kantosalo & Toivonen, 2016; Karakaya & Demirkan, 2015; Shneiderman et al., 2006; Stephanidis et al., 2019; Zeng et al., 2012)
- d) Dynamic, website-specific creativity variables which relate to the *interactivity*, *usability*, *changeability*, *personalizability*, *aesthetic quality* and *appropriateness* dimensions as perceived by the end-user (Albert et al., 2004; Avouris et al., 2001; Garrett et al., 2016; Hassenzahl, 2018; White, 2006; Zeng et al., 2009). These involve the consideration of "both instrumental, pragmatic and non-instrumental, hedonic aspects" (Zeng et al., 2012) of the websites and the user experiences they generate.

The WSCMI employs a seven-point Likert scale with responses ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (7) for each item of the instrument. It was used at the end of the semester by experts, these being the industrial stakeholders of the CoP as well as graduate students and HCI researchers, to evaluate the final websites produced by student teams in both the experimental and control groups. All factors and items of the scale were thoroughly explained within the scope of website creativity, to evaluators in real-time collocated or online instructive sessions.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

Table 1. Web Site Creativity Measurement Instrument (WSCMI) by Zeng et al (2009)

1. Aesthetically appealing design	1. Artistic 2. Colorful 3. Energetic 4. Beautiful 5. Fascinating 6. Entertaining 7. Engaging 8. Attractive 9. Favorable 10. Desirable
2. Interactive design	11. Interactive 12. Animated 13. Multimedia-available 14. Dynamic
3. Novel and flexible design	15. Original 16. Appealing 17. Flexible
4. Affective design	18. Stimulating 19. Pleasing 20. Delighting 21. Exciting
5. Important design	22. Relevant 23. Important 24. Crucial
6. Common and simple design	25. Infrequent 26. Rare 27. Sophisticated
7. Personalized design	28. Personalized

### 3.4.2. Feedback coding scheme

Feedback is a key constituent of community-wide collaboration; our focus was thus on the nature of feedback that typically occurs in cross-organizational CoPs in the field of design and relevant domains. We began with an analysis of the feedback posted by CoP members on Behance, which was mainly made up of comments from industrial mentors and partners on various work deliverables.

We used the coding scheme by Cummings et al. (2016) to analyze the content of these posts as they aligned with our research objectives (design feedback). The scheme was developed by integrating earlier work: a) the scheme created by Marbouti et al (2014) that categorizes written feedback from peers on academic design projects and b) the typology espoused by Dannels and Martin (2008) that captures the genre of feedback in design critiques. The resulting scheme is presented in Table 2.

# DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

Table 2. Coding scheme by Cummings et al. (2016)

Domain	Category	Description
<b>Focus</b>	Form	Answers the question “what is it?” Typically a noun and could be an analogy to describe the feature
	Function	Answers the question “will it work?” Can typically be identified by verbs. Could also be identified by calculations and feasibility
	Representation	Feedback refers to writing and presentation of the design work
	No Code	Does not fit in any of the above sub-categories
<b>Type</b>	Judgment	When critics reacted to what they saw and rendered some assessment of its quality
	Process Oriented	When critics made statements or asked questions about the student’s design approach or process as process-oriented feedback
	Brainstorming	When critics essentially asked questions or made statements about future imagined possibilities for the design
	Interpretation	When critics reacted to what they saw and tried to make sense of the concept or product
	Direct Recommendation (Visual)	When critics gave specific advice about a particular aspect of design using sketching or other visual means
	Direct Recommendation (Verbal)	When critics gave specific advice about a particular aspect of design verbally
	Investigation	When critics requested information
	Free Association	When critics made reactive, associative statements about the design
	Comparison	When critics contrasted the design or design process with something else
<b>Tone</b>	Identity Invoking	When critics made statements or asked questions to suggest that students consider the larger picture of themselves as designers in a future professional community
	Positive	Praise and no suggestion for change. Feedback complimenting the team or design work
	Neutral	Feedback states a fact without any explicit evaluation of work or need for change
	Negative	Feedback implies the design work needs to be changed

## 3.5. Data collection

As CoPs are complex units that call for multiple perspectives of analysis (social relationships, processes and outcomes), we collected data from various sources in order to capture, understand and triangulate the learning phenomena that emerged, guided by the research questions. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected throughout the 13-week semester. The following methods were employed: a) 15 during and after-class focus group sessions supplemented by the instructor’s field notes (5 teams x 3 sessions, semester-weeks 3-13, time N=444 minutes of recordings), b) 10 post-intervention interviews with team representatives at week 13 to extract individual views in an effort to

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

eliminate team bias (10 participants, time N=253 minutes of recordings) (Gill et al., 2008), and c) a WSCMI evaluation of the final websites (week 13) by the 10 industrial members of the CoP (alumni and industrial mentors, and industrial experts) as well as 24 graduate students and 4 HCI researchers, to ensure sufficient diversity and objectivity in the evaluations and d) feedback that was posted on Behance throughout the semester (N=132 posts, 9,977 words,  $M=75$  words per post).

Permission to run the study was obtained from the university and data collection sessions were approved by participants through consent forms.

### 4. Results

We present findings in the following order to facilitate a better, more structured understanding for the reader with regard to the objectives of the study.

#### 4.1. RQ1: website creativity evaluation (WSCMI) scores

A total of 317 *website evaluation* ratings were analyzed in order to derive findings as to the creative value of the websites produced by teams in the experimental versus the control conditions (RQ3). We initiated this by investigating the internal consistency of the scale. Cronbach's coefficient alphas for each of the seven factors of the scale ranged from 0,87 to 0,97, which suggests high internal consistency.

Independent t-tests resulted in statistical differences with medium and large effects (Cohen, 1992). Overall, creativity ratings for the experimental group's websites ( $M=4,17$ ,  $SD=1,34$ ) were significantly higher than the control group's ( $M=3,23$ ,  $SD=1,64$ ) after Bonferroni correction for Type 1 error (i.e., alpha level set to  $.05/7=0.007$ ) (see

Table 3). This provides evidence that social participation in the cross-organizational CoP produced significantly better creative outcomes for learners in the experimental condition.

Table 3. Comparison of website creativity evaluations - independent samples t-test for control and experimental groups

	Control			Experimental (CoP)			t	d.f.	P	Cohen's d
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.				
Aesthetically appealing design	143	2,97	1,60	167	3,89	1,28	-5,46	271,03	<0,001	0,628
Interactive design	144	3,30	1,51	173	4,30	1,20	-6,37	270,15	<0,001	0,727

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

Novel and flexible design	144	2,97	1,50	173	4,00	1,27	-6,52	281,67	<0,001	0,742
Affective design	144	2,73	1,60	170	3,76	1,30	-6,21	274,80	<0,001	0,710
Important design	143	3,47	1,61	173	4,22	1,17	-4,66	253,58	<0,001	0,535
Common and simple design	144	2,81	1,34	172	3,45	1,31	-4,23	301,63	<0,001	0,478
Personalized design	143	3,28	1,72	173	4,01	1,52	-3,91	286,39	<0,001	0,444
Overall mark	144	4,34	2,26	173	5,77	1,67	-6,31	258,22	<0,001	1.223

### 4.2. RQ2: Feedback in community-wide collaboration

For research question 2, we looked at the nature of the feedback that emerged in the CoP. Feedback posts submitted over the 13-week semester were downloaded and imported in NVivo for content analysis (RQ2). Two researchers analyzed the data using priori coding (Saldaña, 2015) based on the coding framework (see Table 4); a random sample (12%) of the data was screened for inter-rater reliability, producing a “substantial” level of agreement of  $k = 0,76$  based on Cohen’s Kappa coefficient, according to Viera & Garrett (2005).

The recorded units were defined by the meaning of each statement (sentence or paragraph) and employing a continuous approach (allowing for multiple classifications of text in more than one code when the data required more than one interpretation), rather than a dichotomous one (mutually exclusive) (Weber, 1990). Overall, the process resulted in a total of 1,235 references, split into the categories of *Focus*, *Type* and *Tone*. No new codes emerged as the data was fully described by the scheme. The prevailing category codes were ‘Form’ (Focus category), ‘Direct Recommendation - verbal’ (Type category) and ‘Negative’ (Tone category) (see Figure 2).

Table 4. Feedback coding frequencies

	Instances	Percentage
<b>FOCUS</b>	376	30,4%
FOCUS\Form	252	20,4%
FOCUS\Function	115	9,3%
FOCUS\No Code	4	0,3%
FOCUS\Representation	4	0,3%
<b>TYPE</b>	517	41,9%
TYPE\Brainstorming	41	3,3%
TYPE\Comparison	19	1,5%
TYPE\Direct Recommendation – Verbal	240	19,4%

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

TYPE\Direct Recommendation – Visual	0	0
TYPE\Free Association	3	0,2%
TYPE\Identity Invoking	0	0
TYPE\Interpretation	32	2,6%
TYPE\Investigation	29	2,3%
TYPE\Judgment	151	12,2%
TYPE\Process Oriented	2	0,2%
<b>TONE</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>27,7%</b>
TONE\Negative	183	14,8%
TONE\Neutral	94	7,6%
TONE\Positive	65	5,3%
Total	1235	




Figure 2. Coding references hierarchy charts

### 4.3. RQ2: Interactions between creative outcomes (WSCMI) and feedback

Following findings from the website evaluations (WSCMI) and the feedback analysis, we were interested to uncover possible links. The scores from feedback were thus compared against those from the WSCMI for the teams in the experimental condition only (RQ2). A Pearson coefficient was computed to assess their relationships. No correlations were found between *positive* feedback and WSCMI scores (see Table 5). However, a significant negative correlation was found between *negative* feedback and WSCMI scores [ $r=-,859$ ,  $n=21$ ,  $p<,01$ ].

Table 5. Multiple correlations between feedback tone and website evaluation scores (WSCMI)

	Feedback positive	Feedback neutral	Feedback negative	WSCMI score
--	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

Feedback <i>positive</i>	Pearson Corr.	1	,414	-,161	-,318
	Sig.		,062	,485	,160
Feedback <i>neutral</i>	Pearson Corr.	,414	1	-,773**	,640**
	Sig.	,062		,000	,002
Feedback <i>negative</i>	Pearson Corr.	-,161	-,773**	1	-,859**
	Sig.	,485	,000		,000

Specifically, *negative* feedback appeared to be a significant predictor for decreased website creativity scores, while the reverse (*positive* feedback) was not applicable. This suggests that while the experimental teams' creative outcomes were higher (compared to the control group), they could have been improved following a more moderate versus a harsher approach to feedback from the expert CoP members. The data also indicates that *neutral* comments, the majority of which fall under the 'Direct Recommendation' type (see

Table 6), were positively correlated with WSCMI scores ( $r=,640$ ,  $n=21$ ,  $p=,002$ ). This indicates that constructive reviews and expert advice delivered in plain (rather than negative) tones have the potential to yield improved outcomes.

Table 6. Coding frequencies based on feedback type and tone

Tone	Negative		Neutral		Positive		Total
	instances	%	instances	%	instances	%	
1. Direct Recommendation	140	27,3%	77	15,0%	23	4,5%	240
2. Judgment	93	18,2%	8	1,6%	50	9,8%	151
3. Brainstorming	13	2,5%	18	3,5%	10	2,0%	41
4. Interpretation	19	3,7%	7	1,4%	6	1,2%	32
5. Investigation	14	2,7%	14	2,7%	1	0,2%	29
6. Comparison	13	2,5%	4	0,8%	2	0,4%	19

### 4.4. RQ3: Perceptions of feedback in community-wide collaboration

As previously mentioned, feedback in this study was found to emphasize the visual attributes of the student work; it also tended to come in the form of direct recommendations expressed in a negative tone. We were interested to understand and triangulate these findings by examining the qualitative data from the focus-groups and the post-intervention interviews with students, as well as the supplementary notes from the instructor.

The data was analyzed, using inductive thematic analysis, based on a 'reflexive' approach, which focuses on extracting the essence of meaning, with the primary aim to

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

draw substantial conclusions (Braun et al., 2019). Specifically, we looked for mentions of their community-wide *collaboration*, *feedback* and perceptions of their creative outcomes as well as the possible interactions between these. Following multiple rounds of reviewing and data saturation, the analysis yielded three main themes: a) *Feedback volume, time pressure & learning regulation*, b) *Feedback tone, self-concept & renegotiation of learning & achievement* and c) *Feedback focus, complexity & metacognitive activity*. The structure of each of these themes is based on the a) *causes* (the interactions of collaboration incidents), b) *effects* (how these were perceived), and c) *actions* (generated by the teams as a result). The themes are discussed in the following sections.

### 4.4.1. Theme 1: Feedback volume, time pressure and learning regulation

The majority of student comments on the feedback provided by external CoP members mentioned the element of time-pressure. The learners felt somewhat overwhelmed by the reviews; they had to dedicate time and effort to understand and process the feedback and then actively address it:

Team B PM:	They gave as a lot [of feedback], you need a lot of time, at least three hours each time to analyze what they say (...) it's like 2000 words!
Team B member:	You get lost [in managing the volume of feedback] at some point...
Team C member:	He [alumni mentor] gave us too many comments!

Inevitably, the large volume of comments forced team members to engage systematically with the project and be more accountable, allowing less room for “free-riders” (Saghafian & O’Neill, 2018). Students actually commented on their increased motivation to improve in response to the feedback:

Team D member:	[after receiving extensive feedback that required many changes] (...) within a couple of days, we all worked on it much more and we changed it completely!
Team B member:	[commenting on the extensive feedback] If you get to the point that you can manage the comments – it’s really very good for us.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

While highly valued by students, feedback gradually became burdensome. The projects advanced into phases with complex deliverables, which in turn generated lengthier and more elaborate revisions from the external CoP members. The students' receptivity to feedback dropped during these stages and there were noticeable signs of friction between team members all trying to balance their workload against new requirements. The effect on their schedules was perceived as hindering the teams' creative performance:

Team C PM:	I believe that if we didn't have so much time pressure [as a result of the feedback], we would be much more creative.
------------	---

Nevertheless, despite perceptions of compromised creativity, feedback and time constraints did in fact spark collaborative amendments that led to the creative outcomes (i.e. the websites) being assessed as significantly better (Biskjaer et al., 2019). This aligns with existing literature which confirms that moderate time-pressure and tension are precursors to effective collaboration, as they lead to deeper engagement, better negotiations and improved creative problem-solving practices (DeChambeau, 2017; E. C. Wenger & Snyder, 2000). Likewise, students reported action-taking incidents, to fine-tune and regulate their work processes in order to counteract such feedback-induced delays:

Team C PM:	Three of us worked independently, in parallel with the other two until now [referring to the more advanced project stages], but now we need to break the [roles and tasks] down even further I think...
Team C member:	Yes we don't have any other option now (...) it's also easier to communicate and reach consensus with two people [rather than three or more, following the delay from the extensive feedback].

Other than reconfiguring roles and tasks, students also explored tools that could help them achieve their goals faster without compromising the desired quality of the design deliverables (Schoenfeld, 2016):

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

Team C member: The tool that we used to plan the schedule saved us an unbelievable amount of time compared to Excel [they searched for different software to speed their work processes up in response to the feedback-induced delays].

Clearly, the amount of feedback resulted in squeezed timeframes, which pushed teams to revisit their work practices and enforce new, ‘just-in-time’ judgments as part of an enhanced co-regulated learning process (Garrison & Akyol, 2015).

### **4.4.2. Theme 2: Feedback tone, self-concept, transformed learning and re-negotiation of achievement**

Feedback, by nature, tends to be negative more often than not: its objective is to identify parts of a work that warrant attention and propose means of improvement (Hyland & Hyland, 2001; Värlander, 2008). In this study, feedback came mostly in the form of ‘direct recommendations’ (process-oriented), rather than plain ‘judgements’ (task-oriented). Direct recommendations may have been used as a good mitigation strategy for “sugar-coating” negative remarks (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). The analysis indicated that some of the student work was subject to harsh criticism, which often reflects the culture of real-world practice in the field of design and its related domains (Flynn, 2005; Hokanson, 2012). Team members were thus concerned and became invested in resolving the issues mentioned in the feedback. When they sought the instructor’s opinion, they were prompted to make their own judgments and follow up with actions. As such, the teams had to act autonomously. They researched theories to verify the credibility of the negative reviews or to support counter propositions. Such theoretical sources might have otherwise been overlooked or learned by rote for the purposes of formal assessment (i.e. exams). In this case, students were investigating the theories with a genuine interest to support their design prerogative:

Team C PM: The theory we went through yesterday about complementary colors? He [the alumni mentor] commented on that and we thought “oh... we should have thought about that; we should have done this ourselves!”  
[Instructor’s notes: students then proceeded to investigate the matter further to understand and act according to the feedback instructions.]

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

(...) We now wrote these as guidelines down and we really hope they will help us again in the upcoming project phases.

While critical feedback may have produced a lot of corrective activity, it also brought the work's weaknesses and gaps into focus. As a result, students often questioned their self-worth. This was also clear through their self-assessment, which at times veered towards the critical:

Team C PM:	[Following negative feedback] It is discouraging when you spend all this effort to design and set it all up (...) it is not the best result that we could produce, but we did all we could.
------------	---

It became apparent that the new, demanding criteria delivered in a negative tone by the external members of the CoP forced the teams to reform their self-concepts and re-negotiate their perceptions of achievement accordingly:

Team C member :	We see how it is now [in terms of achievement and success based on real industry criteria] when we'll leave university... not how we imagine it but how it actually is in reality.
-----------------	--

Team C PM:	[In the absence of the CoP's feedback] I would not have been able to do everything on my own, and I would have had the illusion that I am doing well!
------------	---

Additionally, one of the key ways in which the feedback resonated was that students identified themselves with its originators. As the majority of the posts were submitted by alumni mentors who moved along similar trajectories to theirs, the students

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

perceived their comments to have value:

Team D member : [The feedback] really matters when you have the same background [as the alumni mentors], you think alike and the difference just lies in their professional experience.

Overall, these incidents denote that the learners' self-concept was pragmatically negotiated through their CoP membership, which exposed them to real-world practices. Lacking experience, learners would typically judge their performances more leniently, as a form of "naïve, over-confidence" (Gehlbach et al., 2008; Gormally et al., 2009). Instead, the CoP feedback triggered a degree of disillusionment in the learners, who renegotiated the meaning of achievement with regards to the wider community (industry).

### 4.4.3. Theme 3: Feedback focus, complexity and metacognitive activity

Collaboration with external CoP members often involved inconsistent and ambiguous feedback. This was to be expected, as the members came from different practices, with varying degrees of knowledge and expertise and different personal expectations from their CoP membership (Culver & Bertram, 2017). The impact of receiving feedback, which was at times unhelpful, was twofold. Some learners took this as a chance to make decisions more autonomously, while others raised objections, saying the feedback was too difficult to follow (Zajonc, 1980). While the feedback was broad, in that it focused on diverse dimensions of the work (i.e. visual, technical, usability, marketing/promotional), it often lacked structure, coherence and specificity.

Its ambiguous nature at times gave a sense of freedom and the opportunity to engage in enhanced creative activity:

Team D PM : You can have better creative results if you are not pressured [through client feedback] and they give you more space (...). But when he is lecturing all the time and micro-manages you, at this point you just do the work mechanically in order to get it done.

Team A [When students were asked to comment on how creative they were] The client's requirements were poor so this gave us flexibility to design the prototypes (...) and take initiative!

At other times, such feedback was somewhat disorienting, particularly when it contained contradictory comments. This is, in fact, an authentic phenomenon which is highly representative of real-world practice, especially in the case of professional teams who follow a user-centered design approach. Opinions from multiple stakeholders (i.e. users, clients, management) may be conflicting, and yet need to be critically judged and factored into the work, following collective assessment and informed decision-making (Marcolino et al., 2014). The students expressed concerns over the impact this had on their team creativity:

Team B PM:	Creativity is compromised by conflicting opinions (i.e. when one likes it and the other doesn't), in the course of development as these disturb [the creative] momentum.
Team E member:	(...) it's confusing. They had totally opposing opinions... one of the mentors told us that it [the website prototype] was quite good, in terms of layout (...) while the other told us that she got lost, she had no idea where she was and what she could do [on the website]!

The provision of feedback also elevated the degree of complexity in the collaboration. As a result, the students dedicated extra effort to understand and decide what to do in response. They meticulously scrutinized the body of feedback and communication and closely reflected on and compared it against newer developments in their work. As in theme 2, they again researched theoretical and empirical sources (i.e. forums), to form judgments and decide on next steps. This indicated a deep form of collective meta-

cognitive activity, which aims to assess the team's understanding, their contributors' opinions, the value of the work produced and the respective decisions and propositions about the subsequent course of actions (retain, reject or aggregate opinions) (Garrison & Akyol, 2015; Veenman et al., 2006).

## 5. Discussion & conclusion

This study reported on three key variables in HE students' participation in a cross-organizational CoP; the types and content of feedback provided by community members as part of the social collaboration, the perceived effects of this feedback on the learners, and as a result, the creative outcomes that the latter went on to achieve. We deemed necessary to organize this section into two parts, specifically, *creativity* and *feedback* related discussion of findings.

### 5.1. Theoretical and empirical inferences from a *creativity* perspective

Following the bibliography's emphasis on *novelty* and *value*, as predominant indicators of creativity, we deem important to clarify how these were reflected in the instrument's structure and respective findings. We therefore discuss these within the scope of the WSCMI (RQ1) and highlight associations between them, as well as with other WSCMI criteria that produced similar scores in the experimental group's evaluation results (*see 4.1*).

*Novelty*, as critical for creativity, constitutes one of the three major factors integrated in the WSCMI from Horn's & Salvendy's (2006, 2009) earlier work on the measurement of hardware creativity. It is reflected in the '*Novel and flexible design*' factor of the instrument. In website-creativity terms, *novelty* was understood and explained to evaluators, as the *striking* and *engaging* design with respect to its *aesthetic* (i.e. graphical-user-interface) as well as *interactive* dimensions (functionality/usability), both reportedly crucial in user perceptions of *value* (Ahmad & Khan, 2017; Avouris et al., 2001). The fact that these two items (novelty and importance) fell very close in their respective scores in the WSCMI evaluations, was hence an anticipated outcome in the study (*see 4.1*). The *flexibility* dimension (continuous updates of website content and interaction) also contributes to this, by sustaining the website's perceived *novelty* over time. The evaluation team was thus provided further information on how each website catered for such prospective updates prior to evaluation.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

Another definitive criterion for creativity, *value (appropriateness)*, was explicitly and implicitly measured by the WSCMI. Firstly, the website's *value* was defined through "the product's level of *relevance, importance* and *cruciality* measured in the 'Importance' factor" (Zeng et al., 2009). Results with respect to this dimension made a significant contribution to the overall WSCMI evaluation, by scoring as the second highest in the scale (*see 4.1*).

Nonetheless, *value* was also implicitly represented in additional factors. Specifically, *interactivity (Interactive Design factor)* in websites, is a key criterion for creativity, as it encourages users to engage in creative exchanges with the site (Kuan et al., 2005; Shneiderman & Plaisant, 2010; Zeng et al., 2009, 2012). *Interactivity* generates *meaning* and *enjoyment* in the dialogue between the user and website, strengthening in this way its perceived *effectiveness*; it is thus central in the overall user-defined *value* of the website. WSCMI findings confirm that *interactivity* was in fact the primary contributor in the overall creativity scores, surpassing criteria such as *novelty* and *importance (value)* (*see 4.1*).

Finally, *personalization*, surfaced as the third highest criterion for creativity in the WSCMI findings. This is explained as the degree to which the website can automatically or manually be configured to offer customized content, structure and presentation according to user preferences (Canali et al., 2005). As explained to evaluators, as this feature empowers users in becoming active 'designers', it also augments *interactivity*, and leads to better website *value* as a result (Benlian, 2015; Desai, 2016). The close relationships between these key creativity criteria (importance, interactivity, personalization) were observable through their similar scores in the WSCMI evaluations (*see 4.1*).

Overall, Zeng et al (2009) posit that the sum of WSCMI factors augment the *value* of websites as aesthetically *appealing, interactive* and *novel* products, that are *flexible* of *adjusting* to individualized preferences and evoke positive *affective* responses from users. As results from this study, find these criteria at the top of its score list as the key determinants of creativity, they confirm their role and connections found in underlying theory and contribute towards the validation of *website creativity* within the scope of the WSCMI.

The *appropriateness* or *value* of a product can be defined, based on *social judgement* with respect to a given domain (Amabile, 1982; P. B. Paulus & Nijstad, 2003; Sawyer, 2011). The perception of creativity in this sense lies in the *eyes of the beholder*; based on

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

his/her specific *societal* and *historical* characteristics (background, purpose, needs, limitations) and the ways these shape the user experience at the *time* of interaction (Csikszentmihalyi, 1988; Horn & Salvendy, 2006).

This study recruited a diverse range of expert stakeholders to assess the creativity of websites produced by students; hence their own individual and often, quite different characteristics, were constitutive of their decisions, expanding in this way the breadth of *social judgment* in the measurement of website *value*, under the lens of creativity. An additional point to be made is that the CoP membership opened a window into the teams' project development processes for the majority of the expert evaluators. This generated opportunities to formatively review the teams' activities (especially those related to *feedback*) ~~and hence~~ construct a rounded understanding of their creative processes, guided by key contextual information (social, material, timing), and hence linking these back to creative outcomes. We argue that this practice constitutes a fundamental contribution of the cross-organizational CoP model towards HE. The evaluation of learning and outcomes – with *creativity* being a primary variable - was not restricted to the summative, single-assessor (instructor) approaches that limit traditional pedagogy (Boud & Falchikov, 2006; Carless & Boud, 2018; Loizides et al., 2019). Instead, it diversifies the degree of *social judgment* – *in* measuring creativity objectively and authentically, in both *formative* and *summative* ways.

This research thus coincides with evolved theoretical perspectives that do not attempt to isolate creativity as a mere attribute of *people, products or processes* alone. Instead, the higher creative outcomes inferred (**RQ1**) were analyzed against connected process-related findings that help explain their significance. The purpose of this study was hence to investigate creativity as *entangled* and *distributed* in the interactions of CoP members, dealing with various *artifacts*, at the intersection of *cultural contexts* and along a continuum as part of an integrative research approach (Glăveanu, 2014; Hennessey, 2017).

### 5.2. Theoretical and empirical inferences from a *feedback* perspective

The feedback submitted by expert CoP members over a 13-week period was content-analyzed and categorized under the dimensions of *focus, type* and *tone* (**RQ2**). The findings indicated that the prevalent codes were: a) *Form* (in the *Focus* category) which refers to the visual design attributes of the work, b) *Verbal Direct Recommendation* (in the *Type* category), which refers to advice and suggestions for work enhancements, and c)

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

*Negative* (in the *Tone* category), which refers to the tonality of the reviews. In relation to this, qualitative data from student focus-groups and interviews as well as instructor notes informed the study with the learners' experiences of CoP-wide collaboration and hence, the *feedback* that ensued (**RQ3**). Evidence indicated that *feedback* (positive or negative) was the underlying cause for better creative outcomes (**RQ1**) as it caused team breakdowns and hence created motive for enhanced *learning regulation*, *meta-cognition* and the *renegotiation of learning & achievement* for learners. From a learning perspective, this finding is consistent with previous work, positing that such perceived barriers can urge learners to reconsider their progress and regroup accordingly (Fischer & Bell, 2004).

Specifically, the analysis inferred that a) extensive feedback of b) a particularly negative *tone* and c) an ambiguous or conflicting *focus*, imposed considerable time-pressures, raising the degree of complexity and reducing the students' self or collective concept as a result. This finding agrees with previous work on self-beliefs, suggesting that exposure to unfamiliar, demanding circumstances and harsh feedback (i.e. based on industry-level expectations) can challenge learner beliefs around their abilities and outcomes (Chong & Ma, 2010; Gehlbach et al., 2008; Tierney & Farmer, 2002). Conversely, teams who lack such challenging experiences (i.e. in typical classroom conditions) tend to perceive their aptitude and performance "quite positively" (P. Paulus, 2001). This also aligns well with our findings which suggest that the link between feedback and self-beliefs in *industry-academia CoPs* is an important aspect that warrants further investigation.

This is not a negative result; in fact, it's a rather promising one. As suggested by learners themselves, gaining familiarity and knowledge of industry practice constitutes an intrinsic trigger which leads to a valuable experience, even if it feels frustrating while it's happening. From this aspect, we see how the *industry-academia CoP* experiences informed the learners' perceptions, who will graduate and become young professionals capable of tackling messy real-world problems (Albats, 2018; Grohs et al., 2018). Through *legitimate peripheral participation* in the CoP, students were gradually exposed to critical information about the real-world practice and generally, the conditions, criteria and prospects of the broader domain, while still at university. The meaning of achievement was repeatedly questioned and negotiated throughout their membership, following the paradigmatic trajectories and accomplishments of more competent others from the professional sphere (E. Wenger, 1998). In this study, we deduce that this is a

process of pragmatic realization or '*grounding*' that reformulates the identity. It seems to occur when knowledge of a subject and its domain expands based on influences from the broader community, a fact that enables novices to pragmatically position themselves within it and set renegotiated goals as a result. This awareness of the self in relation to the domain constitutes a key 21<sup>st</sup> century skill of "living in the world" (Binkley et al., 2012). It is therefore apparent that the cross-organizational CoP model can offer significant contributions in the area of Design Studies and related fields in HE and hope that this work will guide further CoP-related research and practice in HE settings.

## 6. Limitations & future work

This study is limited by both the small number of participants and the localized nature of its sample; the students were recruited from a single department of a local university and grouped in two cohorts by means of academic registration (convenience sampling). Although its findings cannot easily be generalized to a wider and more diverse audience, the study provides evidence and guidance of its replicability with regard to the design of the technological, epistemic and more importantly, the social infrastructure of the model. The participation incentives for various external roles that are crucial for cross-organizational adaptation in particular have been thoroughly explored.

Additionally, based on methodological concerns over the use of score-based tests, with respect to construct and predictive validity (Sawyer, 2011) and given the multi-dimensionality of creativity, the results extracted through the administration of the WSCMI, cannot assist in drawing definitive and objective conclusions as to the creativity of student outcomes as a standalone method. A proposed amendment is to employ additional evaluation tests and research methods. In this study we attempted to do so, through the analysis of qualitative data from focus-groups and interviews with students, with a focus on the role of feedback in the team processes. We should also mention that these *creativity* findings correlate with additional *epistemic* results and are further supported through the analysis of other data on interrelated contextual factors (technology/physical settings, social phenomena) in this research, that help explain and augment the results on creativity. However, as these fall out of the scope of this study they are therefore reported in parallel work (author reference).

The next step following this work is to generate guidelines based on the findings for the benefit of educators, designers or researchers who wish to leverage the potential of

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

bridging the academic and industrial spheres, in order to improve learning with a focus on creativity in the field of Design studies and related domains.

### References

- Adams, R. S., Cardella, M., & Purzer, Ş. (2016). Analyzing design review conversations: Connecting design knowing, being and coaching. *Design Studies*, 45, 1–8.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2016.03.001>
- Ahmad, A., & Khan, M. N. (2017). Developing a website service quality scale: A confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 16(1), 104–126.
- Albats, E. (2018). *Facilitating university-industry collaboration with a multi-level stakeholder perspective*. Acta Universitatis Lappeenrantaensis research series number 798.
- Albert, T. C., Goes, P. B., & Gupta, A. (2004). GIST: A model for design and management of content and interactivity of customer-centric web sites. *MIS Quarterly*, 161–182.
- Allee, V. (2000). Knowledge networks and communities of practice. *OD Practitioner*, 32(4), 4–13.
- Almeida, L. S., Prieto, L. P., Ferrando, M., Oliveira, E., & Ferrándiz, C. (2008). Torrance Test of Creative Thinking: The question of its construct validity. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 3(1), 53–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2008.03.003>
- Amabile, T. M. (1982). Social psychology of creativity: A consensual assessment technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(5), 997.
- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(3), 261.
- Avouris, N., Tselios, N., Fidas, C., & Papachristos, E. (2001). Website evaluation: A usability-based perspective. *Panhellenic Conference on Informatics*, 217–231.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 248–287.
- Bate, S. P., & Robert, G. (2002). Knowledge management and communities of practice in the private sector: Lessons for modernizing the National Health Service in England and Wales. *Public Administration*, 80(4), 643–663.
- Batey, M. (2012). The measurement of creativity: From definitional consensus to the introduction of a new heuristic framework. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24(1), 55–65.
- Becker, S. A., Cummins, M., Davis, A., Freeman, A., Hall, C. G., & Ananthanarayanan, V. (2017). *NMC horizon report: 2017 higher education edition*. The New Media Consortium.
- Benlian, A. (2015). Web personalization cues and their differential effects on user assessments of website value. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 32(1), 225–260.
- Binkley, M., Erstad, O., Herman, J., Raizen, S., Ripley, M., Miller-Ricci, M., & Rumble, M. (2012). Defining twenty-first century skills. In P. Griffin, B. McGaw, & E. Care (Eds.), *Assessment and teaching of 21st century skills* (pp. 17–66). Springer.
- Biskjaer, M. M., Frich, J., MacDonald Vermeulen, L., Remy, C., & Dalsgaard, P. (2019). How Time Constraints in a Creativity Support Tool Affect the Creative Writing Experience. *Proceedings of the 31st European Conference on Cognitive Ergonomics*, 100–107.
- Botma, Y., Van Rensburg, G. H., Coetzee, I. M., & Heyns, T. (2015). A conceptual framework for educational design at modular level to promote transfer of learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 52(5), 499–509.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

Boud, D., & Falchikov, N. (2006). Aligning assessment with long-term learning. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(4), 399–413.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930600679050>

Bower, M. (2005). Online Assessment Feedback: Competitive, Individualistic, or... Preferred Form! *The Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching*; Austin, 24(2), 121–147.

Braun, V., Clarke, V., Hayfield, N., & Terry, G. (2019). Thematic analysis. *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences*, 843–860.

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated Cognition and the Culture of Learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32–42. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1176008>

Canali, C., Casolari, S., & Lancellotti, R. (2005). Architectures for scalable and flexible Web personalization services. *First International Workshop on Advanced Architectures and Algorithms for Internet Delivery and Applications (AAA-IDEA '05)*, 50–57.

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>

Castañeda, L. (2019). Debates regarding Technology and Education: Contemporary pathways and pending conversations. *RIED. Revista Iberoamericana de Educación a Distancia*, 22(1), 29–35.

Cherry, E., & Latulipe, C. (2014). Quantifying the creativity support of digital tools through the creativity support index. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)*, 21(4), 21.

Chong, E., & Ma, X. (2010). The Influence of Individual Factors, Supervision and Work Environment on Creative Self-Efficacy: INDIVIDUAL FACTORS, SUPERVISION

DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY  
IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

AND WORK ENVIRONMENT. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(3), 233–

247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00557.x>

Crilly, N., & Cardoso, C. (2017). Where next for research on fixation, inspiration and creativity in design? *Design Studies*, 50, 1–38.

Cropley, D. H. (2015). Promoting creativity and innovation in engineering education. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 9(2), 161.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1988). Society, culture, and person: A systems view of creativity. In *The nature of creativity: Contemporary psychological perspectives*. (pp. 325–339). Cambridge University Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Hunter, J. (2003). Happiness in Everyday Life: The Uses of Experience Sampling. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 4(2), 185–199.  
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024409732742>

Culver, D. M., & Bertram, R. (2017). Learning Value and Identity Formation: Social Learning and the Graduate Studies Experience. In *Implementing Communities of Practice in Higher Education* (pp. 347–372). Springer.

Cummings, A., Tolbert, D., Zoltowski, C. B., Cardella, M., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2016). A Quantitative Exploration of Student-Instructor Interactions Amidst Ambiguity. In *Analyzing Design Review Conversations*. Purdue University Press.

Dannels, D. P., & Martin, K. N. (2008). Critiquing critiques: A genre analysis of feedback across novice to expert design studios. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 22(2), 135–159.

De Graaf, E., & Kolmos, A. (2003). Characteristics of problem-based learning. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 19(5), 657–662.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

DeChambeau, A. (2017). The Practice of Being a Student: CoPs and Graduate Student

Success. In A. Cater-Steel (Ed.), *Implementing Communities of Practice in Higher Education* (pp. 395–422).

Desai, D. (2016). A Study of Personalization Effect on Users' Satisfaction With E-Commerce Websites. *Sankalpa: Journal of Management & Research*, 6(2), 51.

Dolmans, D., Michaelsen, L., Van Merriënboer, J., & van der Vleuten, C. (2015). Should we choose between problem-based learning and team-based learning? No, combine the best of both worlds! *Medical Teacher*, 37(4), 354–359.

D'souza, N., & Dastmalchi, M. R. (2016). Creativity on the move: Exploring little-c (p) and big-C (p) creative events within a multidisciplinary design team process. *Design Studies*, 46, 6–37.

Eckert, P. (2006). Communities of practice. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2(2006), 683–685.

Edmondson, G., Valigra, L., Kenward, M., Hudson, R. L., & Belfield, H. (2012). *Making Industry-University Partnerships Work—Lessons from successful collaborations / praxisunico.org.uk*. Science|Business Innovation Board AISBL.

<http://www.sciencebusiness.net/Assets/94fe6d15-5432-4cf9-a656-633248e63541.pdf>

Etzkowitz, H., & Ranga, M. (2015). Triple Helix systems: An analytical framework for innovation policy and practice in the Knowledge Society. In *Entrepreneurship and Knowledge Exchange* (pp. 117–158). Routledge.

Fegan, S. (2017). Imagining the World: Creating an Artistic Community of Practice in an Academic Environment. In *Implementing Communities of Practice in Higher Education* (pp. 131–156). Springer.

Fischer, G., & Bell, A. G. (2004). Social Creativity: Turning Barriers into Opportunities for Collaborative Design. *In*, 152–161.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

Flynn, P. (2005). *Critting the crit in the education of architects: From Bauhaus to Bolton Street*.

Furnham, A., Batey, M., Booth, T. W., Patel, V., & Lozinskaya, D. (2011). Individual difference predictors of creativity in Art and Science students. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 6(2), 114–121.

Garett, R., Chiu, J., Zhang, L., & Young, S. D. (2016). A literature review: Website design and user engagement. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 6(3), 1.

Garrison, D. R., & Akyol, Z. (2015). Toward the development of a metacognition construct for communities of inquiry. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 24, 66–71.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2014.10.001>

Gehlbach, H., Brown, S. W., Ioannou, A., Boyer, M. A., Hudson, N., Niv-Solomon, A., Maneggia, D., & Janik, L. (2008). Increasing interest in social studies: Social perspective taking and self-efficacy in stimulating simulations. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33(4), 894–914.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2007.11.002>

Gilbuena, D. M., Sherrett, B. U., Gummer, E. S., Champagne, A. B., & Koretsky, M. D. (2015). Feedback on professional skills as enculturation into communities of practice. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 104(1), 7–34.

Gill, P., Stewart, K., Treasure, E., & Chadwick, B. (2008). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: Interviews and focus groups. *British Dental Journal*, 204(6), 291.

Glăveanu, V. P. (2014). *Distributed creativity: Thinking outside the box of the creative individual*. Springer.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

- Gormally, C., Brickman, P., Hallar, B., & Armstrong, N. (2009). Effects of inquiry-based learning on students' science literacy skills and confidence. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 16.
- Gough, H. G. (1979). A creative personality scale for the adjective check list. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(8), 1398.
- Grohs, J. R., Kirk, G. R., Soledad, M. M., & Knight, D. B. (2018). Assessing systems thinking: A tool to measure complex reasoning through ill-structured problems. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 28, 110–130.
- Guilford, J. P. (1967). Creativity: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 1(1), 3–14.
- Gunawardena, C. N., Hermans, M. B., Sanchez, D., Richmond, C., Bohley, M., & Tuttle, R. (2009). A theoretical framework for building online communities of practice with social networking tools. *Educational Media International*, 46(1), 3–16.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09523980802588626>
- Harks, B., Rakoczy, K., Hattie, J., Besser, M., & Klieme, E. (2014). The effects of feedback on achievement, interest and self-evaluation: The role of feedback's perceived usefulness. *Educational Psychology*, 34(3), 269–290.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2013.785384>
- Harrison, C. J., Könings, K. D., Schuwirth, L., Wass, V., & van der Vleuten, C. (2015). Barriers to the uptake and use of feedback in the context of summative assessment. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 20(1), 229–245.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-014-9524-6>
- Hassenzahl, M. (2018). The thing and I: Understanding the relationship between user and product. In *Funology 2* (pp. 301–313). Springer.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112.
- Hennessey, B. A. (2017). Taking a systems view of creativity: On the right path toward understanding. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 51(4), 341–344.
- Hennessey, B. A., & Amabile, T. M. (2010). Creativity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61(1), 569–598. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100416>
- Herrington, J. (2009). *Authentic e-learning in higher education*.
- Herrington, J., Reeves, T. C., Oliver, R., & Woo, Y. (2004). Designing authentic activities in web-based courses. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 16(1), 3–29.
- Hildreth, P. M., & Kimble, C. (2004). *Knowledge networks: Innovation through communities of practice*. Igi Global.
- Hoeber, I. J., Zhou, J., & van Knippenberg, D. (2018). Different strokes for different teams: The contingent effects of positive and negative feedback on the creativity of informationally homogeneous and diverse teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(6), 2159–2181.
- Hoffmann, O. (2016). On modeling human-computer co-creativity. In *Knowledge, Information and Creativity Support Systems* (pp. 37–48). Springer.
- Hokanson, B. (2012). The design critique as a model for distributed learning. In *The next generation of distance education* (pp. 71–83). Springer.
- Horn, D., & Salvendy, G. (2006). Product creativity: Conceptual model, measurement and characteristics. *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science*, 7(4), 395–412.
- Horn, D., & Salvendy, G. (2009). Measuring consumer perception of product creativity: Impact on satisfaction and purchasability. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Service Industries*, 19(3), 223–240.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

- Huet, G., Culley, S. J., McMahon, C. A., & Fortin, C. (2007). Making sense of engineering design review activities. *Ai Edam*, 21(3), 243–266.
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 185–212.
- Irvine, J. (2018). A Framework for Comparing Theories Related to Motivation in Education. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 35.
- Johnston, D. H. (2016). ‘Sitting alone in the staffroom contemplating my future’: Communities of practice, legitimate peripheral participation and student teachers’ experiences of problematic school placements as guests. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(4), 533–551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2015.1069793>
- Jonsson, A. (2013). Facilitating productive use of feedback in higher education. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14(1), 63–76.
- Kantosalo, A., & Toivonen, H. (2016). *Modes for Creative Human-Computer Collaboration: Alternating and Task-Divided Co-Creativity*. 8.
- Karakaya, A. F., & Demirkan, H. (2015). Collaborative digital environments to enhance the creativity of designers. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 42, 176–186.
- Kaufman, J. C. (2006). Self-reported differences in creativity by ethnicity and gender. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 20(8), 1065–1082.
- Kaufman, J. C., & Baer, J. (2005). *Creativity across domains: Faces of the muse*. Psychology Press.
- Kaufman, J. C., Cole, J. C., & Baer, J. (2009). The construct of creativity: Structural model for Self-Reported creativity ratings. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 43(2), 119–134.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

- Khalid, M. S., & Strange, M. H. (2016). School Teacher Professional Development in Online Communities of Practice: A Systematic Literature Review. *ECEL 2016: 15th European Conference on e-Learning*, 605–614.
- Kim, K. H. (2006). Can We Trust Creativity Tests? A Review of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT). *Creativity Research Journal*, 18(1), 13.
- Kim, K.-H. (2004). *Cultural influence on creativity: The relationship between Confucianism and creativity* [PhD Thesis]. University of Georgia.
- Knight, P. T. (2002). Summative Assessment in Higher Education: Practices in disarray. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(3), 275–286.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070220000662>
- Kuan, H. H., Bock, G.-W., & Vathanophas, V. (2005). Comparing the effects of usability on customer conversion and retention at e-commerce websites. *System Sciences, 2005. HICSS'05. Proceedings of the 38th Annual Hawaii International Conference On*, 174a–174a.
- Kurtzberg, T. R., & Amabile, T. M. (2001). From Guilford to creative synergy: Opening the black box of team-level creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 13(3–4), 285–294.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1999). Legitimate peripheral participation. *Learners, Learning and Assessment, London: The Open University*, 83–89.
- Leung, L., & Bentley, N. (2017). Producing Leisured Laborers: Developing Higher Education Courses for the Digital Creative Industries. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 47(2), 148–160.
- Loizides, F., Jones, K., Girvan, C., De Ribaupierre, H., Turner, L., Bailey, C., & Lloyd, A. (2019). Crowdsourcing Real-World Feedback for Human–Computer Interaction Education. In *Macrotask Crowdsourcing* (pp. 233–252). Springer.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

- Lombardi, M. M. (2007). Authentic learning for the 21st century: An overview. *Educause Learning Initiative*, 1(2007), 1–12.
- Marbouti, F., Cardella, M. E., & Diefes-Dux, H. A. (2014). *Student peer feedback on design*. Frontiers in Education Conference, Madrid, Spain.
- Marcolino, L. S., Kolev, B., Price, S., Veetil, S. P., Gerber, D. J., Musil, J., & Tambe, M. (2014). Aggregating Opinions to Design Energy-Efficient Buildings. *MPREF@AAAI*.
- Mayer, R. E. (1999). 22 Fifty years of creativity research. *Handbook of Creativity*, 449.
- McAlexander, J. H., & Koenig, H. F. (2001). University experiences, the student-college relationship, and alumni support. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 10(3), 21–44.
- Meneely, J., & Portillo, M. (2005). The adaptable mind in design: Relating personality, cognitive style, and creative performance. *Creativity Research Journal*, 17(2–3), 155–166.
- Miller, T. (2009). Formative computer-based assessment in higher education: The effectiveness of feedback in supporting student learning. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(2), 181–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930801956075>
- Mourshed, M., Farrell, D., & Barton, D. (2013). *Education to employment: Designing a system that works*. McKinsey Center for Government.
- Mumford, M. D. (2003). Where Have We Been, Where Are We Going? Taking Stock in Creativity Research. *Creativity Research Journal*, 15(2–3), 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2003.9651403>
- Nguyen, V., Dang, H. H., Do, N.-K., & Tran, D.-T. (2016). Enhancing team collaboration through integrating social interactions in a Web-based development environment. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, 24(4), 529–545.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

- Nielsen, J. (1994). Guerrilla HCI: Using discount usability engineering to penetrate the intimidation barrier. *Cost-Justifying Usability*, 245–272.
- Nistor, N., & Fischer, F. (2012). Communities of practice in academia: Testing a quantitative model. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 1(2), 114–126.
- Oh, Y., Ishizaki, S., Gross, M. D., & Yi-Luen Do, E. (2013). A theoretical framework of design critiquing in architecture studios. *Design Studies*, 34(3), 302–325.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2012.08.004>
- Onsman, A. (2016). Assessing creativity in a ‘New Generation’ architecture degree. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 19, 210–218.
- Østergaard, K. L., Simonsen, J., & Karasti, H. (2018). Examining situated design practices: Nurses’ transformations towards genuine participation. *Design Studies*, 59, 37–57.
- Pajares, F., & Schunk, D. H. (2001). Self-beliefs and school success: Self-efficacy, self-concept, and school achievement. *Perception*, 11, 239–266.
- Park, J. Y. (2015). Student interactivity and teacher participation: An application of legitimate peripheral participation in higher education online learning environments. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 24(3), 389–406.
- Park, N. K., Chun, M. Y., & Lee, J. (2016). Revisiting individual creativity assessment: Triangulation in subjective and objective assessment methods. *Creativity Research Journal*, 28(1), 1–10.
- Pattinson, S., & Preece, D. (2014). Communities of practice, knowledge acquisition and innovation: A case study of science-based SMEs. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 18(1), 107–120.
- Paulus, P. (2001). Groups, Teams, and Creativity: The Creative Potential of Idea-generating Groups. *Applied Psychology*, 49(2), 237–262. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00013>

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

Paulus, P. B., & Nijstad, B. A. (2003). *Group creativity: Innovation through collaboration*.

Oxford University Press.

Pharo, E., Davison, A., McGregor, H., Warr, K., & Brown, P. (2014). Using communities of practice to enhance interdisciplinary teaching: Lessons from four Australian institutions. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(2), 341–354.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.832168>

Plucker, J. A., Beghetto, R. A., & Dow, G. T. (2004). Why isn't creativity more important to educational psychologists? Potentials, pitfalls, and future directions in creativity research. *Educational Psychologist*, 39(2), 83–96.

Popescu, E. (2014). Providing collaborative learning support with social media in an integrated environment. *World Wide Web*, 17(2), 199–212.

Power, C., & Armstrong, L. (2017). A facilitated community of practice: Enabling student success in the blended learning environment. In *Implementing Communities of Practice in Higher Education* (pp. 227–252). Springer.

Price, M. (2005). Assessment standards: The role of communities of practice and the scholarship of assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(3), 215–230.

Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J., & O'Donovan, B. (2010). Feedback: All that effort, but what is the effect? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(3), 277–289.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903541007>

Proctor-Thomson, S. B. (2013). Gender disruptions in the digital industries? *Culture and Organization*, 19(2), 85–104.

Rhodes, C. (1990). Growth from deficiency creativity to being creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 3(4), 287–299.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

- Rodgers, K. J., Marbouti, F., Shafaat, A., Jung, H., & Diefes-Dux, H. A. (2014). Influence of teaching assistants' motivation on student learning. *2014 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE) Proceedings*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE.2014.7044004>
- Roodhouse, S. (2009). Universities and the creative industries. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 39(3), 187–199.
- Rourke, A. J., & Coleman, K. (2009). An emancipating space: Reflective and collaborative blogging. *Ascilite*, 1–10.
- Runco, M. (n.d.). *Creativity Assessment Battery*. Retrieved November 22, 2019, from <https://www.creativitytestingservices.com/>
- Runco, M. A. (2007). A hierarchical framework for the study of creativity. *New Horizons in Education*, 55(3), 1–9.
- Runco, M. A., & Okuda, S. M. (1988). Problem discovery, divergent thinking, and the creative process. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 17(3), 211–220.
- Runco, M. A., Walczyk, J. J., Acar, S., Cowger, E. L., Simundson, M., & Tripp, S. (2014). The incremental validity of a short form of the Ideational Behavior Scale and usefulness of distractor, contraindicative, and lie scales. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 48(3), 185–197.
- Saghafian, M., & O'Neill, D. K. (2018). A phenomenological study of teamwork in online and face-to-face student teams. *Higher Education*, 75(1), 57–73.
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.
- Sawyer, R. K. (2011). *Explaining creativity: The science of human innovation*. Oxford university press.
- Sawyer, R. K., & DeZutter, S. (2009). Distributed creativity: How collective creations emerge from collaboration. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 3(2), 81.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

- Schartel, S. A. (2012). Giving feedback – An integral part of education. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Anaesthesiology*, 26(1), 77–87.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpa.2012.02.003>
- Schoenfeld, A. H. (2016). Learning to Think Mathematically: Problem Solving, Metacognition, and Sense Making in Mathematics (Reprint). *Journal of Education*, 196(2), 1–38.
- Schønheyder, J. F., & Nordby, K. (2018). The use and evolution of design methods in professional design practice. *Design Studies*, 58, 36–62.
- Shneiderman, B. (2000). Creating creativity: User interfaces for supporting innovation. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)*, 7(1), 114–138.
- Shneiderman, B., Fischer, G., Czerwinski, M., Resnick, M., Myers, B., Candy, L., Edmonds, E., Eisenberg, M., Giaccardi, E., Hewett, T., Jennings, P., Kules, B., Nakakoji, K., Nunamaker, J., Pausch, R., Selker, T., Sylvan, E., & Terry, M. (2006). Creativity Support Tools: Report From a U.S. National Science Foundation Sponsored Workshop. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 20(2), 61–77.  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327590ijhc2002\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327590ijhc2002_1)
- Shneiderman, B., & Plaisant, C. (2010). *Designing the user interface: Strategies for effective human-computer interaction*. Pearson Education India.
- Smith, U., Hayes, S., & Shea, P. (2017). A Critical Review of the Use of Wenger's Community of Practice (CoP) Theoretical Framework in Online and Blended Learning Research, 2000-2014. *Online Learning*, 21(1), 209–237.
- Stephanidis, C. C., Salvendy, G., Antona, M. of the G. M., Chen, J. Y. C., Dong, J., Duffy, V. G., Fang, X., Fidopiastis, C., Fragomeni, G., Fu, L. P., Guo, Y., Harris, D., Ioannou, A., Jeong, K. (Kate), Konomi, S., Krömker, H., Kurosu, M., Lewis, J. R., Marcus, A., ... Zhou, J. (2019). Seven HCI Grand Challenges. *International Journal of Human–*

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

*Computer Interaction*, 35(14), 1229–1269.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2019.1619259>

Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1999). The concept of creativity: Prospects and paradigms.

*Handbook of Creativity*, 1, 3–15.

Stone, S., Doyle, P., Donlon, E., Gormley, C., Walsh, E., O’Keeffe, N., O’Keeffe, M., Crean,

A., & Ferguson, P. B. (2017). Meitheal: An Irish Case Study in Building a Virtual Community of Practice in Transitional Times. In J. McDonald (Ed.), *Implementing Communities of Practice in Higher Education* (pp. 449–474). Springer.

Swartz, J. D. (1988). Torrance tests of creative thinking. In *Test Critique* (Vol. 7, pp. 619–622). Westport Publishers Inc.

Tekian, A., Watling, C. J., Roberts, T. E., Steinert, Y., & Norcini, J. (2017). Qualitative and quantitative feedback in the context of competency-based education. *Medical Teacher*, 39(12), 1245–1249.

Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2002). Creative Self-Efficacy: Its Potential Antecedents and Relationship to Creative Performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 45(6), 1137–1148. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3069429>

Tight, M. (2015). Theory application in higher education research: The case of communities of practice. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 5(2), 111–126.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2014.997266>

Torrance, E. P. (1966). *Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking: Normstechnical Manual: Research Ed. : Verbal Tests, Forms A and B : Figural Tests, Forms A and B. Flere materialer*. Personell Press.

[https://books.google.com.cy/books?id=\\_4dUYAAACAAJ](https://books.google.com.cy/books?id=_4dUYAAACAAJ)

Värlander, S. (2008). The role of students’ emotions in formal feedback situations. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 13(2), 145–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510801923195>

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

- Vaughan, S., & Dornan, T. (2014). Communities of practice. *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Health, Illness, Behavior, and Society*.
- Veenman, M. V. J., Van Hout-Wolters, B. H. A. M., & Afflerbach, P. (2006). Metacognition and learning: Conceptual and methodological considerations. *Metacognition and Learning, 1*(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-006-6893-0>
- Viera, A. J., & Garrett, J. M. (2005). Understanding interobserver agreement: The kappa statistic. *Fam Med, 37*(5), 360–363.
- Wang, C. W., & Neihart, M. (2015). Academic self-concept and academic self-efficacy: Self-beliefs enable academic achievement of twice-exceptional students. *Roeper Review, 37*(2), 63–73.
- Weaver, M. R. (2006). Do students value feedback? Student perceptions of tutors' written responses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(3), 379–394. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500353061>
- Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis*. Sage.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. (2009). *Communities of practice in health and social care*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Wenger, E. C., & Snyder, W. M. (2000). Communities of practice: The organizational frontier. *Harvard Business Review, 78*(1), 139–146.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R. A., & Snyder, W. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Harvard Business Press.
- Wenger, E., White, N., & Smith, J. D. (2009). *Digital habitats: Stewarding technology for communities*. CPsquare.
- White, B. (2006). How to "Webby-ize" your Web site-factors in award-winning design. *Third Latin American Web Congress (LA-WEB'2005)*, 2–pp.

## DESIGN STUDENTS MEET INDUSTRY PLAYERS: FEEDBACK AND CREATIVITY IN COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

Wijngaarden, Y., Hitters, E., & V. Bhansing, P. (2019). 'Innovation is a dirty word':

Contesting innovation in the creative industries. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 25(3), 392–405.

Wishart, J., Eagle, S., Romero, M., Barberà, E., Järvelä, S., Hyvönen, P., & Vuopala, E.

(2011). *CoCreat Research Plan. Internal report of the CoCreat project.*

Woo, D. (2015). Central practitioners' developing legitimate peripheral participation in a

community of practice for changing schools. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 31(2).

Yorke, M. (2003). Formative assessment in higher education: Moves towards theory and the

enhancement of pedagogic practice. *Higher Education*, 45(4), 477–501.

Zajonc, R. B. (1980). Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. *American*

*Psychologist*, 35(2), 151.

Zeng, L., Proctor, R. W., & Salvendy, G. (2012). User-based assessment of website

creativity: A review and appraisal. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 31(4), 383–400.

Zeng, L., Salvendy, G., & Zhang, M. (2009). Factor structure of web site creativity.

*Computers in Human Behavior*, 25(2), 568–577.