than a particularly effective tool in the competition for gaining markets.

However, although Seitz's thesis is convincing, a sense of incompleteness lingers at the end of the story. A sense of flaw that will particularly affect STS scholars. Many of the ingredients of this story are familiar to them: ethnography, the emphasis on the materiality of non-humans, the use of practice theory, the sociology of translation. However, as you enter the text, the feeling grows that a conceptual toolkit has been borrowed from the STS without having read the user manual. Flaws start cropping up when concepts should be aptly used to give accuracy to the interpretation of field data. It then becomes clear that the author is acquainted with practice theory exclusively in Robert Schmidt's account (*Soziologie der Praktiken,* 2012). The contributions of Schatzki, Shove, Turner, Warde are overlooked. The whole debate about the agency of objects is missing, although it would markedly enrich the book's understanding of materiality in design-thinking activities. As a matter of fact, Latour is often referenced, but the lack of a general understanding of the actor-network theory produces a series of blatant misunderstandings of his thinking, e.g. regarding the concept of script or the relationship between researcher and social actors. Taking into account *Reassembling the Social* would have helped avoiding part of those misunderstandings. Finally, the sociology of translation is summed up in isolation from the discussion that derived from its elaboration.

Some books produce dis-pleasure. I mean that you do not just dislike them, e.g. because they are obscure, incomplete or badly argued. They appear to be lost opportunities. They miss the opportunity (and the urgency) to fill an empty space in shared knowledge that they have been able to recognize. When a book fails to grasp this opportunity, when it does not keep a promise that seemed exciting, it is not just disappointing, it actively produces a destruction of potential pleasure, it severs an anticipated fulfillment. In fact, it produces dis-pleasure. It is with this feeling that I finished reading *Design Thinking und der neue Geist des Kapitalismus.*

<p style="text-align:center">✳ ✳ ✳</p>

Sarah Pink, Kerstin Leder Mackley, Roxana Morosanu, Val Mitchell and Tracy Bhamra
Making Homes. Ethnography and Design, London, Bloomsbury, 2017, pp. 176

Alvise Mattozzi *Free University of Bozen-Bolzano*

Any academic essay is a node in a network of knowledges and researches that we can retrace mainly, but not only, through citations. *Making home. Ethnography and Design* is a portal. Not only a node in a network of other knowledges and researches, but a platform that works as an entry point and a synthesizer for a research project, its results and its further branchings.

The research to which this book provides access and insight is *LEEDR* (*Low Effort Energy Demand Reduction*), an interdisciplinary project drawing together anthropologists, engineers and designers in order to achieve a deeper understanding of how energy and media consumption fit into everyday practices and habits in home life.

The LEEDR research was based at Loughborough University and ran between 2010 and 2014, with the collaboration of the Design Research Institute of the RMIT University. RMIT University is, indeed, the seat of Sarah Pink, first author of the book, who has provided the general epistemological, theoretical and methodological framework for the research in terms of "sensory ethnography" (Pink 2009), as well as connections to other related research projects. The other authors of the book are, tellingly, two social scientists, Kerstin Leder Mackley (cultural and media studies) and Roxana Moroşanu (anthropology), and two designers, Val Mitchell (user experience design) and Tracy Bhamra (sustainable design).

The first node to which *Making Homes* provides access and insight is the internet site *Everyday and Digital Living* (http://energyanddigitalliving.com), which complements the book – there, all the videos to which the book refers are stored and the design outcomes of the research – still in concept form – are introduced with a much greater detail. However, the Internet site is not just a repository of materials referenced in the book. It has its own autonomy and provides an overview to the research, by displaying in a summarized way the theoretical-methodological framework, some stories of everyday living in homes, design inspirations and design concepts resulting from the research.

The book, instead, provides a deeper reflection on the theoretical-methodological framework of the research, illustrating it through various empirical example from the LEEDR research fieldworks, as well as from other researches. It addresses the issue of how to best research, understand and design for change in and through the home.

Thus, the book and the Internet site are two complementary ways of introducing a research, which however, can be actually grasped in all its details and developments only by following the various links to the various publications, reports and design projects.

The fact that it is "just" a theoretical-methodolgical introduction to a research project, written, moreover, "in an accessible form for interdisciplinary researchers" (p. 6), thus, without articulated theoretical-epistemological discussions – a fact highlighted by the absence of notes –, does not mean, however, that the book is not worth reading, especially if you are

interested in issues related to everyday life, design, sustainability and change from a STS point of view or, more in general, from a social point of view.

Indeed, the book is ambitious and challenges STS in various ways. In between the lines, we can read an introduction to a whole research program, not just to a research project. It, delving on, but also going beyond, the material culture researches on homes, like those carried out by Daniel Miller, lays the foundation for a different approach to issues tackled by the various strands of the theory of social practices, as well by Actor-Network Theory and by other STS related approaches. In doing so it provides a clear framework for the emerging and variegated field of "design anthropology", here however addressed only as "design ethnography".

Besides the first introductory chapter, the book is divided into three parts: an introduction to the framework of the research project; an introduction to the research methods used to engage with homes and to collect information and data; a conclusive part, where also the design outputs of the projects are touched upon.

Whereas the second and third part take only one chapter each, the first part is much more articulated and unfolds across three chapter (Chs. 2-4). Each chapter introduces "a conceptual theme concerning researching and designing for homes and everyday life in homes: temporalities, environments, and activity and movement" (p. 19).

As underlined in the introductory chapter, "[e]ach theme", emerged also through various researches that have predated LEEDR, "represents a set of engagements between research and design in and about homes and theoretical understandings" (p. 19).

In "Temporalities" (Ch. 2), various temporalities related to homes and everyday life, but also to the disciplinary approaches of ethnography and design, are interrogated, looking at the way they coalesce in the practice of design ethnography of homes.

On the on hand, the chapter questions the "ethnographic present", i.e. the crystallization of people, culture and societies into a moment set in a specific present. Such "ethnographic present", through which most of ethnographic research has characterized itself, is clearly at odds with design, which is future oriented, as well as with the way people live their homes, future oriented too. On the other, the chapter provides various example of the intertwining of temporalities in homes' everyday life. These, for the most part, are future oriented: the home is perceived as an incomplete or not yet completed project, activities are run through various forms of timings and various forms of planning.

One of the results of this attention to temporalities is the fact that homes needs to be considered always as processes. This feature also characterizes "environments" (Ch. 3). In the book, they are considered as continuously constituted through the entanglements of diverse processes, among which human activities, part and constitutive of environments. Environ-

ments are considered as material, digital, sensory and affective and ana-
lyzed mainly through the kind of atmosphere they enjoy, thus through the
way they are perceived and felt. Taking into account various temporalities
and environments as atmospheres are interesting and productive moves. In
so far as they are innovative, they are not groundbreaking and pursue, as
acknowledged, various threads of contemporary social, aesthetic and de-
sign research. On the contrary, the choice of focusing on "Activity and
movement" (Ch. 4) – and, especially movements – is introduced as break
away from contemporary social research, focused on the concurring no-
tions of behaviors and practices.

For the book, movements allow focusing on what people do, without
providing too strict categorizations into more or less coherent, discrete and
a priori established practices. Moreover, movements, which unfolds con-
tingently and improvisationally in relation to the affordance provided by
the environment and in relation to what takes place next, allow focusing
on the tension between present and future. Therefore, the research has fol-
lowed movements in homes, mapping them in various ways, and looking
at how various activities are articulated through various movements.

Through the examples provided in the book, we can see that the frame-
work outlined in *Making Homes* allows attending details and features of
homes, which sound actually relevant and not previously considered, as
well to thematize homes as felt process, which seems productive.

In this way, the research seems able to provide grounds to understand
how homes can or cannot be sites of sustainable practices, as well as of
human well-being and happiness. Through such insights, it is also able to
provide indications for design interventions that would allow to foster sus-
tainability and well-being.

In any case, as I have said, this is just an introduction – though a prom-
ising introduction. Therefore, in order to actually understand, if the appro-
ach used in LEEDR is as productive and innovative as the book paints it,
we will need to consider the research thoroughly, by looking at articles as
well as at the details of the design outcomes.

As for now, I cannot but notice few things which can provide a sort of
guideline for possible weaknesses to prove, while considering the research
thoroughly.

Firstly, in the conclusive part, where designing and its outcomes are
actually addressed, the book touches upon the fact that the LEEDR de-
signers had the need to propose and explore a further methodology to
gather data: PORTS (People, Objects and Resources through Time and
Space). PORTS, thus, seems a sort of redoubling of a work already done
through the design ethnography. Therefore, it seems that there is a sort of
division of labour between a sensory ethnography – which however should,
then, not be called "design ethnography" anymore –, which provides only
"inspirations" to designers (as acknowledged in the Internet site) and an-

other kind of more behavioral observation which provides the actual information designers can work with. If it is so, the results of the LEEDR project in terms of dialogue between social sciences and design would be very weak, not adding much to existing attempt of dialogue between social sciences and design. Moreover, if the proper ethnographic part is only tasked with providing inspirations, there is no need to carry out sensory ethnographies anymore, since inspirations related to improvisation, how the house is felt and movements (see http://energyanddigitalliving.com/design-inspirations/) have been already provided. What needed for further projects would then only be observations using the PORTS methodology carried out by the designers alone.

Secondly, it does not seem to me that the outcomes of the observations are more future oriented than usual research result. Considering future, expectations, hope, what to do next, etc. in order to produce analyses of activities and movements does not make these analyses more future oriented: the resulting analysis or descriptions cannot but freeze a certain moment – just look at the results of PORTS or other methodologies used in order to collects data like Tactile Time collage (p. 120). Despite the interesting reflections emerged within design anthropology about the future orientation of design and the past-present orientation of sciences – I would say sciences more in general, not just social sciences –, in my opinion it is not an issue of what is considered in the observations, but of what Latour (2013) would call "modes of existence" of sciences and of organizations. Recovering the classic STS notion of "*script*", Latour (2013) shows how organizations are future oriented, because they are based on "*scripts*", inscribed in verbal agreements or in technologies, that tell what to do next. Sciences instead pertain to another mode of existence, where inscriptions beget other inscriptions, which only allow to recover, backwards, the first source of these inscriptions.

Thirdly, among these future oriented elements there are, then, "*scripts*", as classically elaborated by Akrich and Latour and recently recovered in a proper future oriented framework (Latour 2013). Thus, *description*, as proposed by Akrich and Latour, can provide the adequate categories to *de-scribe* and analyze movements, as proposed in the book, taking into account their future orientation. This would maybe provide directly usable insight for designers, not in form of general "inspirations", but almost in forms of specific guidelines. This is actually what proposed also in the book through an analysis of the affordances (p. 78) – notion strictly related to the one of *script*. However, such cited analysis of the affordances has not been carried out within the LEEDR research project, but in another project, by a completely different team, which does not seem to have anything to do with LEEDR (Paay et al. 2015).

Making Homes sets a promising perspective for the dialogue between social sciences and design – and because of that it is worth reading, especially for those interested in the issue. However, such promises are clearly

future oriented, since at the moment the book provides inspiring ideas more than empirical evidences.

References

Latour, B. (2013) *An Inquiry into Modes of Existence.* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Paay, J., Kjeldskov, J. and Skov, M. (2015) *Connecting in the Kitchen: AnEmpirical Study of Physical Interactions while Cooking Together at Home*, in *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing, CSCW '15*, New York, ACM, pp. 276–87.

Pink, S. (2009) *Doing Sensory Ethnography*, Thousand Oaks, CA., Sage.

✳ ✳ ✳

Damon Krukowski
The New Analog. Listening and Reconnecting in a Digital World, Cambridge MA, MIT Press, 2017, pp. 240

Paolo Magaudda *University of Padova*

The New Analog: Listening and Reconnecting in a Digital World is a book by the musician, journalist and poet Damon Krukowski, focused on the implications of the shift from analog to digital technologies in music production and circulation. Although this is not a book rooted in science & technology studies, but an essay for a wider and non-academic, it anyway offers several relevant points of interest for a STS audience interested in music and sound technologies. This is especially true for those of us involved in the field of *sound studies*, which is the way STS has approached, in the last fifteen years, the role of technology in relation to music, sound and the acoustic environment – a field distinctively leaded, among others, by prominent STS scholars such as Trevor Pinch and Karin Bijsterveld (Pinch and Bijsterveld 2003; 2012).

Before entering more deeply into the issues *The New Analog* raises for STS-oriented sound studies scholars, let me quickly present what the book is about and its major thesis. First of all, *The New Analog*'s author, Damon Krukowski, is a musician (drummer for the late '80s alternative rock band Galaxy 500) and journalist (for major music magazines like "The Wire"