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ABSTRACT
Metaphors are important at multiple levels within design and society—from the specifics of interfaces, to wider societal imaginaries of technology and progress. Exploring alternative metaphors can be generative in creative processes, and for reframing problems strategically. In this pictorial we introduce an inspiration card workshop method using juxtaposition (or bisociation) to enable participants to explore novel metaphors for hard-to-visualise phenomena, drawing on a provisional set of inspiration material. We demonstrate the process through illustrating creative workshops in France, Portugal, Chile, and the USA, and reflect on benefits, limitations, and potential development of this format for use within interaction design.

A metaphor is:
“a device for seeing something in terms of something else. It brings out the thiness of that or the thatness of a this.”
Kenneth Burke, 1945 [14]

Below: How could BURNT TOAST be a metaphor for CLIMATE CHANGE? Could CRACKS IN THE PAVING be a metaphor for UNWRITTEN RULES, or a net a metaphor for ANXIETY?

This is the authors’ preprint version of this article. The final and definitive version will be published in the ACM Digital Library in June 2019.

Please cite this article as:
The 75 photographic ‘Thing 2’ (vehicle) cards from the draft New Metaphors collection are an arbitrarily chosen mixture of natural and artificial phenomena (and sometimes combinations of the two), illustrated through a single photograph for each (all by authors). The main criterion for inclusion is: “That could be an interesting metaphor for something else”. Of course, there is probably an infinite number of possible ‘Things’ which could be included.
The 75 textual ‘Thing 1’ (tenor) cards each represent “an abstract concept which is difficult to visualise, but which might be possible to do through using a metaphor”. They are drawn from the authors’ own noticings, and from concepts which have been suggested by students and workshop participants. The Thing 1 cards are optional (and potentially unnecessary) in the workshop format, if participants come with a ‘Thing 1’ for which they seek a metaphor.
METAPHORS OLD AND NEW

Much—perhaps all—interaction design employs metaphors, initially to introduce new approaches to interaction, structure, and display [4, 9]—a one-way semantic link between a familiar physical object and a new digital system” [34], but over time becoming so familiar that they perhaps are reified [9], no longer thought of as ‘metaphors’ any more [26]. Do we even notice the metaphorical component of desktops and windows and folders and files? What about blockchain, the cloud, feeds, threads, forums, “data is the new oil” [58], the net, browsers, the web, websites, or the notion of a ‘site’ itself? Interfaces, displays, and the structures of products and services themselves are often reliant on a relatively small set of metaphors; there are many phenomena where new metaphors could potentially enable new forms of understanding, sharing or changing mental models [54], or experiencing otherwise invisible processes in more interesting ways.

Novel or alternative metaphors are sometimes intentionally sought in design [55, 9], for example where a new product or technology offers new affordances which require some ‘anchoring’ (itself a metaphor) to a familiar concept [17, 34], as a problem-solving aid [15], or where problems or limitations have been identified with an existing metaphor which suggest the need for alternatives.

Reviewing HCI and design literature over the past decade gives examples including: a magic ‘barrier tape’ in virtual reality [18], shadows and sinking/ floating in augmented reality [42], sunflowers for visualising data as an alternative form of scatterplot [40], haunting as a metaphor for multisensory displays and objects in a living room [2], exploration of the notion of hybrids [21], new kinds of file formats for shared working [30, 41], pregnancy as a metaphor for new packaging design [16], robots and artificial intelligence as sidekicks rather than servants [12, 48], and alternative metaphors for networked products and services drawing on anxieties as inspiration [52].

Many challenges facing humanity today and in the future are complex, involving relationships, systemic intricacies, and timescales which are difficult to understand and represent in simple terms. As such, humans simplify; and those simplifications can have consequences which impede attempts to tackle problems. For example, the multiple feedback loops, scale and duration, uncertainty and non-linearity of climate change may be reduced by popular media discourse to ‘global warming’, a framing whose ‘validity’ (along with trust in science itself) is held open to question. Often, complex issues are rendered understandable through the use of metaphors and analogies, and indeed it has been argued that these are central to human reasoning, understanding, and creativity [10, 32], as well as the linguistic aspects of cognition itself [38]. (Here we use the term ‘metaphor’ in a broad, imprecise way, to refer to a variety of ways in which one thing can be understood in terms of another). One simple reason for metaphors’ prevalence is that by mapping features of an existing or familiar situation onto a new or unknown one, we are enabled to grasp it more quickly. Nevertheless, metaphors are not the thing itself—they are always an abstraction, a model of the situation (and in being brought into being, they become a third thing [9]). They can be a map to a territory, but should not be mistaken for the territory. All metaphors are wrong, but some are useful; they can become ‘enabling constraints’ [31] or a kind of disruptive improvisation [1, 46].

Metaphors beyond design and HCI

Artists and poets may be experts in creating new metaphors, but as well as within design practice, the intentional construction of metaphors to enable new ways of thinking has been proposed by people in many fields, ranging from anthropology (e.g. Margaret Mead and Mary Catherine Bateson [5]) to politics (e.g. George Lakoff [37]). In economics, studies have noted how the metaphor of ‘the national economy as a household budget’, or even ‘a container/ bucket/pot’ commonly employed by media and politicians, is a structural error in terms of many key features of the systems, such as fixation on ‘balancing the books’ or people in need being ‘a drain on the system’. This leads to specific policy decisions being made that arguably cause harm. How would political discourse on the economy be different if a different metaphor were used? We can imagine ideas such as THE ECONOMY IS A GARDEN OR THE ECONOMY IS A LOAF OF BREAD BEING BAKED; the New Economics Foundation and partners [50] tested new metaphors such as THE ECONOMY IS A COMPUTER THAT CAN BE REPROGRAMMED through surveys with the British public. (Indeed, the authors of this pictorial hosted a webinar for the Disruptive Innovation Festival 2018, run by circular economy charity the Ellen MacArthur Foundation, in which new metaphors were generated and discussed relating to circular economy issues, including ORGAN DONATION AS A METAPHOR FOR CIRCULAR BUSINESS MODELS, and LEAVES CHANGING COLOUR AS A METAPHOR FOR PRODUCT END-OF-LIFE.) From global issues to local ones (e.g. engagement with local government), right down to the personal level (e.g. mental health [49]), there is an opportunity for new metaphors to be generated, and adopted and adapted from other cultures, traditions, and contexts, and their effects on people’s understanding of issues investigated. As Schön [55] argued for the examination of generative metaphor in problem-setting in social policy, exploring the metaphors in use can condition the ways that problems are approached, and generating different metaphors can enable new perspectives.

We suggest that generating new metaphors could inspire creative approaches to designing novel interfaces, products, services, communication campaigns, ways of explaining ideas, and more widely, reframing of societal issues around technology and other issues of global importance, providing an expanded ‘conceptual vocabulary’ [43], and that a method for doing so could be a useful part of the designer’s toolbox.

Generating metaphors

The hunt for “defensible metaphors”, to use cybernetician Gordon Pask’s term [56], is not trivial, and while the role of ‘metaphor designer’ is emerging [24], there is little in the way of methods or structured approaches to generating relevant new metaphors given a particular issue or domain. There are computational approaches centred on structure-mapping [27], metaphors as “conceptual mappings wherein a concept from a source domain partially structures the understanding of a concept from a target domain” [7], along with systematic generation of analogies for suggesting solutions to engineering challenges. Generative creativity [20] is a growing area of current research in computer science, particularly enacted through bots, sometimes random and sometimes based around neural networks, and metaphors have made an appearance, for example with Katy Gero and Lydia Chilton’s Metaphoria [28] and Darius Kazemi’s Metaphor-A-Minute [35]. But amongst ‘human’ creativity methods
properties (e.g. confidence or a headache). We considered
relationships (e.g. power relations between people or even
to career paths [54]. These ranged from invisible system re-
and topics in previous projects ranging from energy use [13]
been suggested by students, previous workshop participants,
the authors' own noticings, and from concepts which have
possible to do through using a metaphor. They are drawn from
which may be difficult to visualise, but which might be pos-
tabulation—as described by Arthur Koestler, "the perceiving
of a situation or idea... in two self-consistent but habitually
incompatible frames of reference" [36]—or simple juxtapo-
sition of ideas as a provocation in the style of Edward de
Bono [11] or games such as Mad Libs [53] or Cards Against
Humanity [22] is a common feature of inspiration card
workshops [8] and is fast-paced, intended to be a creative
target method to generate multiple ideas quickly and then
enable subsequent evaluation and development. The work-
shop participants may come with their own specific domain
knowledge or a problem or issue for which they seek new
metaphors, or they may use the cards to address topics of
which they have little knowledge, but which can neverthe-
less provide a provocation for thinking differently.

The cards and workshop process

We produced two sets of cards, shown on pages 2 and 3 of
this paper. Thing 1 cards, solely textual, feature the names
of an assorted selection of phenomena and abstract concepts
which may be difficult to visualise, but which might be pos-
tible to do through using a metaphor. They are drawn from
the authors’ own noticings, and from concepts which have
been suggested by students, previous workshop participants,
and topics in previous projects ranging from energy use [13]
to career paths [54]. These ranged from invisible system re-
lationships (e.g. POWER RELATIONS BETWEEN PEOPLE OR EVEN WIFI SIGNALS) to intangible emotions, feelings or personality
properties (e.g. CONFIDENCE OR A HEADACHE). We considered

that each of these phenomena was something we would be
interested in seeing (or otherwise experiencing) an inter-
face or display for, or a rethink of how it was explained or
presented. The Thing 1 cards—in metaphor terminology, the
tenor—are ‘optional’ for the workshop process, in the sense
that participants may already have problems or issues for
which they seek new metaphors. Some of the workshops
we have run have explicitly asked participants to come with
domain-specific issues themselves.

Thing 2 cards show a photograph and the name of a
phenomenon in the world which could potentially be an
interesting metaphor for some of the Thing 1s—an arbitrarily
chosen mixture of natural and artificial phenomena (and
sometime combinations of the two). The examples were
partly drawn from sensory or synaesthesia-inspired ideas
[39], such as SWEETNESS, and partly from everyday phenom-
ena that seemed interesting as potential ‘design’ material—
particularly drawing on work around qualitative interface
design [45], indexical visualisation [51] and data physicalisa-
tion [33]—FROM THE HUM OF A FRIDGE TO THE ARRANGEMENT

of your desktop. The angle between two walls, odd as
it seems, was a reference to a question once asked by J.G.
Ballard, who wrote and spoke extensively on metaphors [3].

In total, 75 Thing 1 and 75 Thing 2 cards were included in
the set—giving 5,625 possible combinations of “Thing 2 as a
metaphor for Thing 1”. (It is worth noting that some of the
Thing 1s could also work as metaphors for the Thing 2s).
Blank card templates were also included, to prompt users
of the cards to suggest their own Thing 1s or Thing 2s. Of
course, the 150 cards are provisional: while there can never
be a ‘complete’ set of these, we aim to continue expanding
the library and there is the potential for more focused
domain-specific subsets. The current set is available as a
Creative Commons-licensed download from
http://imaginari.es/new-metaphors

The next few pages of this pictorial illustrate the four stages
of the workshop process, including how participants, in
groups, used the cards and worksheets to generate new met-
aphors and then concepts for new products, services, inter-
faces, and reframings. (We briefly discuss a few interesting
ideas emerging.) The images featured are drawn from New
Metaphors workshops run with design (mainly interaction
and user experience) and futures practitioners, and students,
in France (workshops at IxDA Interaction 18, Lyon, and the
Plurality University Network’s Portes Ouvertes, in Paris, both
with practitioners), Portugal (workshop at the UX Libson
2018 conference, with practitioners), Chile (workshops at
the Universidad del Desarrollo in Santiago and Concepción,
both with students), and the USA (workshops at the Google
SPAN 2017 conference, with practitioners, and the Swartz
Center for Entrepreneurship at Carnegie Mellon University,
with students). We have used industry conferences and
events as venues for running the workshops, with the aim
of getting insights from practitioners who may be a target
audience for the method. In total, the workshops illustrated
here included around 180 participants, usually working in
groups of 4–6 people, and usually with 20–45 minutes to
run through the stages. We have, in addition, explored using
variants of the workshop method and cards for teaching
within conventional classroom and studio settings, and in
workshops at academic conferences (e.g. [1]), and in digital
versions, although this pictorial concentrates on the seven
workshops listed above.
Stage 1 of the workshop (right) involves participants exploring and discussing, in groups, essentially serendipitous juxtapositions of a selection of Thing 1 and Thing 2 cards to see whether any combinations ‘fit’ in terms of being interesting or appropriate metaphors. If participants already have a ‘Thing 1’ of their own, then only the Thing 2 cards are used.

In Stage 2, participants use worksheets (see next page) to map characteristics of Thing 1 & 2 pairings they find interesting, and identify commonalities that could be developed further.

In some versions of the workshop, variants of the worksheet (immediate right two images) or no worksheets at all (furthest right image—labels in Portuguese) are used to explore the mappings.
Examples of how participants have used simple worksheets to list, and then find connections, commonalities, or mappings between, characteristics of a particular Thing 1 and Thing 2—essentially, how could this work as a metaphor? In the worksheet shown left, characteristics of TRIPADVISOR COMMENTS and FACIAL EXPRESSIONS were mapped; in the example on the right, ONLINE DISCUSSION and REFLECTIONS.

The use of the (Virginia Water) totem pole image to represent facial expressions has been reviewed and the next iteration of the cards uses an alternative facial image.

Two variant worksheets for particular participant groups. A version for a business school entrepreneurship class (above left) added the line ‘Can you spot an opportunity?’ while a more comprehensive redesign (above right, and right) for a meeting of futurists and science fiction writers focused on rethinking existing metaphors around ‘An issue facing us now, and in the future’, selecting a new metaphor from the Thing 2 cards, and mapping similarities and differences between the two metaphors’ characteristics. The example here contrasts existing metaphors for THE END OF WORK (including DEATH, PARADISE, HELL, and FREEDOM) with a new metaphor, FINDING A NICHE.
In Stage 3 (above six images), participants generate ideas for a new interface, product, service, communication campaign, way of explaining an idea, or other development, based around the new metaphor they choose.

They then present them to the group in Stage 4 (right eight images). Here we see sketches of ideas including: an app for shoppers using plant growth as a metaphor for the back-story of a product; 'Taxcraft', Minecraft-esque tax software using patterns in brickwork as a metaphor for doing your tax return; a spatial redesign of wireless network strength indication using a flock of birds as a metaphor for wi-fi signals; and finding a niche as a metaphor to help society think more strategically about the end of work.
‘Overgrown’ (above) used plant growth as a metaphor for overwhelmedness. The idea is a possible extension to productivity, task management and to-do list software: an interface representing tasks through a garden in which some tasks grew of their own accord to overwhelm or shade out others (and needed tending to, or weeding out), while others needed careful nurture to grow and bloom or bear fruit.

Some related existing metaphors were also worked into the concept—‘thorny’ issues, bugs on plants but also as elements which ‘bug’ you; processes of (at)tending to tasks to prevent them becoming overwhelming.

‘Lights Out’ (left) used room lighting as a metaphor for personal data security—ambient lighting would dim if the user were in a situation where there was more risk to their data, indicating the need to be careful (or to take action). Different lighting patterns indicate types of risk.

The ways two groups (in different workshops) addressed power relations between people make an interesting comparison. One group focused on shadows as a metaphor (below left), envisaging an augmented reality display which would enable people within an organisation to ‘see’ the influence or power that people had over each other, via simulated shadows cast from one person to another.

Another group (below) used adaptors as a metaphor—already ‘transforming power’ in a different way—but here used as the starting point for exploring a new kind of model for planning a team within an organisation, using adaptable (foldable, reconfigurable) shapes as a kind of construction kit to represent people with different skills, roles, and fit. The idea was to be able to see how teams fit together, and how different components (people) transform power in different ways to achieve the end result. Other electrical components such as resistors and capacitors were discussed—how metaphorical is someone with the ‘resistor’ role?
As a contrast, here are two ways in which groups (again, in different workshops) used the same Thing 2 (Waves) as a metaphor for different Thing 1s—once as a metaphor for the balance of flavours in a meal, and once as a metaphor for people’s accents.

‘Tastebuddies’ (above left) is a concept for an app which people can use to track and plan experiences of trying new cuisines at restaurants, and match up with potential dining ‘buddies’ based on a wave-like visualisation of flavours and ingredients over time—which sometimes co-incide and sometimes diverge.

‘Deflection Pool’ (left) is a concept for a language learning interface particularly focused on pronunciation, using visualisations of waves in a pool reinforcing or interfering with each other to represent coincident or different pronunciations. Characteristics discussed in the development of the concept included mappings such as loudness of speech to the size of wave, cadence to frequency of wave, warmth of tone to the texture of the wave, and looking at how geographic distribution of languages could be mapped visually onto a ‘pool’ representing the whole world, or a particular area.

‘Virtual University’ (right) uses different coloured windows as a metaphor for finding it difficult to make a decision, applying the idea in the context of students or early-career professionals trying to decide what to study, or whether to go back to college/university or online to study further. The concept is a virtual reality experience which offers ‘alternative perspectives for e-learning’, using different ways of viewing the ‘sea of knowledge’ (another metaphor) through windows representing particular subject-based worldviews (art, engineering, law).

‘Birdconomy’ (left) uses a flock of birds as a metaphor for the country’s economy, proposing a form of data visualisation dashboard (and potentially trend forecasting) in which the ‘mass’ of consumers, and other market participants, acting in certain ways, changing direction, and so on, is expressed through patterns of ‘flocking’ behaviour around particular nodes, or away from or towards certain elements in the economy. The group who created this were inspired partly by a description one member recalled of the ways in which citizens of an eastern European country changed their consumption behaviour after the fall of the Berlin Wall, as western consumerism spread.
DISCUSSION AND FURTHER WORK

Short workshops such as those illustrated here are inevitably constrained by their format as a way of exploring the potential of new methods; the open-ended nature of the process, with nothing important ‘riding on’ (note: metaphor) the ideas generated, must have some effects on the ways in which participants use the methods. What works well for idea generation in a workshop setting does not necessarily translate into something which can become part of a designer’s everyday workflow—there is potentially a large jump from these ideas to more specific ‘solutions’-oriented application.

Nevertheless, in the New Metaphors workshops the 180 participants validated the feasibility of the Thing 1–Thing 2 juxtaposition as a generative metaphor process for inspiring new concepts: they generated ideas which (even if just assessed subjectively by their unusualness) were, presumptively, unlikely to have occurred without the prompts of the cards (we did not carry out any kind of ‘expert’ assessment of the novelty [23], reasoning that with the sheer breadth of ideas, and the arbitrariness of the source material, this was unlikely to provide useful insights). Very few groups ‘failed’ in the sense that they didn’t generate any ideas; there were some ideas that perhaps used a more direct not-so-metaphorical approach (for example, a group used the cards TREER BARK and VIRUSES, BACTERIA AND DISEASES to generate the idea for a hospital treatment room with a ‘nature’ ambience and plants and trees in it—weil illustrated and thought through as an idea, but not using the tree bark as a metaphor so much as a direct inspiration). Others took initial inspiration from the metaphor but developed their ideas further, away from it. Again, this is not necessarily a problem, if the primary aim is to foster creativity rather than to stick rigidly to a particular metaphor.

With a more focused procedure, there is potential for incorporation of a ‘metaphor search stage’ into design processes; alternatively, there is still potentially value in treating this as a kind of fun creative thinking exercise in itself, to help open up new ways of thinking, even if the concepts generated are not developed further. Participants’ comments included insights around how the process had worked in practice—some groups had set themselves the challenge to work with whatever juxtaposition was chosen (even semi-randomly), while others had worked through many different combinations to find ones that ‘worked’ in terms of structural similarity, or even in being a ‘problem’ that interested the group. The mapping worksheet had been useful to some groups in working through the characteristics of the phenomena being considered, but other groups had leapt straight to a concept. Some participants and others in their teams have subsequently used the method themselves on projects (e.g. [57]).

One direction for further in-depth research here could be an analysis of how the backgrounds and experience of the participants (which we did not explicitly assess) related to the kinds of ideas generated, or whether particular combinations or attributes of Thing 1 and Thing 2 could apply to certain domains better than others. This work could lead to a much more structured, guided form of ideation process.

The card format

In this pictorial we have not explicitly discussed cards as a format [29; 44]: it is not necessarily obvious that they are the ‘right’ format here, but their affordances (one idea per ‘unit’, easy to mix-and-match, easy to rearrange, easy to display) and specifics of the way we did it (A4/Letter size card, larger than usual ‘card deck’ format, to make group work easier) were relatively easy design choices for us to make. Nevertheless, it would be worth exploring other formats, including variants of image/text combinations. For example, the Zaltman Metaphor Elicitation Technique [59] (used in marketing research) uses images without text, to enable participants to read different interpretations into the image. We are, in parallel, exploring digital versions (see the Twitter and SMS bots on page 5 of this paper) and the potential of these as part of a wider field of ‘casual creators’ [19].

Future directions

There are at least two directions this research could go. One is to use the New Metaphors method and cards (suitably expanded or reorganised in content) to generate and iterate more targeted design concepts for new interfaces, products, services, communication campaigns, ways of explaining an idea, or other developments for particular situations and domains, for example new metaphors for interface design around energy use [13], mental health [49], or careers [54]. We are interested in the potential for new metaphors to influence and support decision-making, behaviour change and new practices through enabling new forms of understanding, as an aid to help people explore their own and each other’s thinking, and specifically to help people understand their relationships and agency with the systems around them. Practically, we are taking this forward with student projects where the goal is the design, and the New Metaphors method is simply part of the process of getting there.

Another direction is to apply the idea of generating new metaphors to bigger situations beyond design: to engage with reframing social, political, or technological issues, involving stakeholders and domain experts from specialist policy and non-profit organisations, or even to use a variant of the method with teams or community groups as part of a co-design process, surfacing existing metaphors and mental imagery, and helping explore the possibilities of transitioning to different ones [43].

In the anthropologist and cyberneticist Gregory Bateson’s words, metaphor is a “pattern that connects” [6] two concepts. In some ways, a ‘forced connection’ method such as New Metaphors is a kind of intentionally disruptive improvisation process [1], a creative exercise in finding patterns where maybe none exists, but treating it as if one does—a kind of ‘apophenia as method’ [46]. People could build their own personal collections of interesting or resonant metaphors, part of a creative journaling practice, and share them with others. Developing ideas along these lines may provide further value for creativity research.
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