



This is an electronic reprint of the original article. This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Núñez-Pacheco, Claudia; Rosén, Anton Poikolainen

Articulating Felt Senses for More-Than-Human Design – A Viewpoint for Noticing

Published in: DIS '24: Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference

DOI: 10.1145/3643834.3661554

Published: 01/07/2024

Document Version Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published under the following license: CC BY-NC-SA

Please cite the original version: Núñez-Pacheco, C., & Rosén, A. P. (2024). Articulating Felt Senses for More-Than-Human Design – A Viewpoint for Noticing. In A. Vallgårda, L. Jönsson, J. Fritsch, S. F. Alaoui, & C. A. Le Dantec (Eds.), *DIS '24: Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference* (pp. 1029-1043). (DIS '24: Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference). ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/3643834.3661554

This material is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.



Claudia Núñez-Pacheco Department of Informatics, Umeå University Umeå, Sweden claudia.nunez.pacheco@umu.se

ABSTRACT

To rigorously approach the more-than-human world in design research, we need to become more receptive and better equipped to describe the complexities of relationality. In response, this paper advocates for the articulation of the felt sense -or tacit knowledge residing in our bodies- as a viewpoint for noticing. Assisted by micro-phenomenological interviews, we carefully described our felt senses from our experiences with a telepresence robot and smartphone photography. We illustrate how this viewpoint allowed us to access our pre-judgemental dimension, the vivid liveliness in our experiences with technologies, and the porosity of our sense of self. We contribute the felt sense as a viewpoint for noticing to design researchers interested in integrating their somatic sensibilities into their work with the more-than-human, allowing them to attune to, describe and share with other researchers the normally unattended dimension of our experiences, including aspects concerning the felt dimension of ethics.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Human-centered computing \rightarrow Interaction design theory, concepts and paradigms.

KEYWORDS

More-than-human design, micro-phenomenological interview, interaction design, noticing, felt sense.

ACM Reference Format:

Claudia Núñez-Pacheco and Anton Poikolainen Rosén. 2024. Articulating Felt Senses for More-Than-Human Design – A Viewpoint for Noticing . In Designing Interactive Systems Conference (DIS '24), July 01–05, 2024, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 15 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3643834.3661554

1 INTRODUCTION

Given the environmental crisis, there is an increased interest in more-than-human design and its focus on interdependent relationships between humans, technologies and other organisms – including animals, plants, fungi, and microbes [2, 14, 14, 18, 21, 32, 64, 88,

*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike International 4.0 License

DIS '24, July 01–05, 2024, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark © 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0583-0/24/07 https://doi.org/10.1145/3643834.3661554

Anton Poikolainen Rosén*

Södertörn University, Department of Media Technology Stockholm, Sweden. Aalto University, Department of Design, Helsinki, Finland anton.poikolainenrosen@aalto.fi

97, 106]. Several studies have identified that to design for and with the more-than-human world, there is a need for methods that notice and articulate our experience of relationships within inherently complex and multifaceted interdependent systems [52, 53, 57, 84]. For instance, noticing may involve intentionally observing the colouration of a leaf and being able to interpret the plant's health; how this connects to broader socio-political entanglements such as pollution or water access [26] while identifying the nuances of how this information influences your intellect and senses.

In this paper, we advocate for the articulation of inner experience as one of many necessary paths for accessing nuanced qualities in our relationships with the more-than-human world. This is because our bodily knowing or felt sense [28] is shaped and co-constituted by our environment in a process that creates our experience of the world [1]. The felt sense is a concept coined by the philosopher Eugene Gendlin [28], and can be defined as a bodily feeling encapsulating the complexity of knowing something without explicit representational content; in other words, a presence of embodied knowledge, yet without straightforward language to define it [28]. By turning to how our bodies notice our interactions while carefully finding words and metaphors resonating with our felt senses, we can uncover nuanced aspects in our experiential relationship with the environment that are difficult to access through mere observation or analysis. Although articulating the felt sense can be challenging -generally requiring someone to assist the noticer during the process- there are existing methods for unearthing such tacit knowledge [87], such as focusing [28] and micro-phenomenology [81], and others used in HCI by a growing community of researchers [74, 83, 90]. The concept of felt sense has been studied before in interaction design through the application of the Focusing method with a human-centred focus [75], but to our knowledge, it has not been used explicitly to articulate our entanglements with morethan-human entities in interaction design.

Our paper is informed by micro-phenomenological interviews we –the two authors of this paper– conducted with one another over one year of regular meetings. The method foregrounds somatic examination by exploring lived experience very finely [79] and is thus suitable for articulating the felt sense. From these explorations, we present two examples that show how felt sensing can provide an in-depth understanding of more-than-human relationships: (1) photographing mushrooms with a smartphone and (2) interacting with a telepresence robot. We focus on identifying and articulating the felt senses in these experiences and discuss how they inform our understanding of our experiences of the more-than-human world and, by extension, how we could design for it.

We contribute to more-than-human design by introducing the felt sense as a viewpoint for noticing. In terms of design relevance, we illustrate how this viewpoint has sensitised us to access somatic and reflective qualities of relationality that are relevant for the design of more sensory-rich [58] and caring interactions that consider the ethics in our entanglements with others, including more-than-humans [26]. The way we approach felt sensing focuses on uncovering sensory qualities that connect us with the more-thanhuman world through our bodies and words, revealing aesthetic content previously inaccessible to our immediate consciousness. We have identified a research gap, offering an alternative position to the dominant HCI view where language appears as disembodied and abstract [43]. Instead, we advocate for language articulation as an embodied tactic to heighten our sensory engagement with more-than-human worlds [1]. In doing so, we foreground the importance of developing our somatic sensibilities to make visible the ethics in our relationality processes [26]. Recognising the holistic nature of the more-than-human research field, we see the value of focusing on the experiential aspect in our relations with the more-than-human world as a starting point to understand how technologies affect these experiences of relating. By acknowledging this perspective, we recognise our position as being part of nature instead of separated from it, which resonates with calls to identify the relevance of the subjective dimension to ecological concerns [35].

By examining our micro-phenomenological interviews through the lens of the felt sense, we present two detailed vignettes of experiences that act as an example of the richness and detail that can be attained through our articulation process. We discuss how, in our studies, turning to the felt sense has proven generative and helpful, for example, to (1) access our pre-judgemental selves, uncovering frictions with our human primordial urges, (2) identify qualities of vivid liveliness in our inner experience of the more-than-human world, and (3) illustrate how our sense of self is porous and receptive with the environment. We discuss design opportunities illustrating how identifying qualities of the felt sense could inform and inspire design by sensitising the designer to detailed and sometimes even unexpected phenomena. We claim that developing our skills in articulating the felt sense can make us more attentive to the small shifts in the more-than-human world, and how they affect our experiences and interactions and, in turn, influence our design decisions. In this regard, designers interested in integrating their somatic sensibilities into their work with more-than-human design will benefit from attuning, describing and sharing their felt senses with other design researchers, informing their work with an approach that uncovers the unseen, including aspects concerning the felt dimension of ethics [26].

2 BACKGROUND

This paper builds on the broad and emergent area of methods and tactics for noticing and articulation in more-than-human design research. We start by contextualising our research within morethan-human design and then offer an overview of what others have contributed to the notion of "noticing" in this area. Then, we introduce the felt sense as an introspective viewpoint for noticing, and finally, we link language construction with somatic knowledge as informed by more-than-human literature.

2.1 More-than-human design

More-than-human design is rooted in posthumanism, which takes on a relational perspective seeking to undermine traditional boundaries and dualities such as nature-culture, mind-body, or humantechnology while recognising the significance of the non-human contribution to our lifeworld [1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 20, 37, 38]. Here, the environment is observed as vibrant and active [8], rather than a passive object. Drawing on posthuman philosophy -particularly actor-network theory, agential realism and postphenomenology-Frauenberger [23] has advocated for these entanglement theories as instrumental in the shaping of fourth-wave HCI. Under this view, designers do not create things in isolation but rather re-configure networks of associations where humans, other beings and technologies constitute mutually. As pointed out by Wakkary [106], this shift implies that the designer is no longer a single human but an assembly of humans and non-humans. As designers, we can only "design with" these assemblages, not control and dominate. While this offers a humbling perspective on our control over the design process and its outcomes, it does not mean we should be renouncing our capacity for action. Quite the contrary, this has been interpreted as a motivation to engage with more-than-human design approaches, for example by studying the agency that resides in our relationships with technology [8, 32, 106]; how technologies mediate human experiences of the more-than-human world [52, 84]; identifying the more-than-human within our self [108]; mapping systemic relationships [105] and understanding the particular needs of other species through for example direct observation and using sensing devices [63]. Among these strands, in this paper, we focus on noticing how we experience more-than-human interdependence.

2.2 Methods for noticing in more-than-human design

One approach for considering the more-than-human world in design is by attuning to the sensory qualities that connect us with it, such as how we identify the presence of a blooming tree by its smell, or how the sound of a notification tempts us to use our phone. This particular type of attending to the world has been framed within more-than-human design research as "the arts of noticing", "noticing differently", or simply "noticing" [52–54, 57, 84]. As several other HCI researchers have pointed out, noticing is a rigorous practice [9, 55, 56, 67, 75] that requires intentionality, commitment over time and systematic documentation of what is noticed. Common for all methods of noticing is a first phase of sensory awareness and attuning and a second phase of articulating these sensations in language. However, everyday language is not always sufficient to capture the details of our sensory experience [81].

Noticing can be directed towards the present and the past. In some cases, noticing in the moment occurs mediated through sensors, chemical tests and scientific studies [52, 112]. In other instances, noticing requires researchers to attentively use their senses to attune to the environment as an act of conscious defamiliarisation; this way, perceiving *"the divergent, layered, and conjoined*"

projects that make up worlds" [102]. For example, Livio and colleagues [57] describe a series of exercises in their *methods for noticing notebook* inviting researchers to direct their awareness towards different phenomena. They outline a methodology suggesting the following steps: beginning to notice noticing, spatial and temporal noticing, embodied noticing, mediated noticing, noticing the unnoticeable, and developing one's own methods. These instructions draw inspiration from Oliveros' deep listening exercises [77], descriptions from Brinich-Langlois' book of hours ¹ and Tsing's Mushroom at the End of the World [102].

However, intentionally focusing on the present to notice is not a precondition for a rigorous examination of experiences. With the assistance of trained practitioners [96], "noticers" can reconnect with past experiences in detail, uncovering tacit information and qualities. Methods such as Focusing, for instance, [75] functions as a conversation between the interviewer and the "focuser", where the latter evokes felt-sensing qualities of past situations towards generatively unearthing new meaning. In addition, microphenomenological interviews uncover rich details of past experiences that might have been overlooked. This interview method is being increasingly adopted by HCI researchers interested in the study of experiences, including the perception of music and soundscapes [24, 50, 92], VR applications [91, 99], studies on textile perception [83, 111], autobiographical data collection of earthquake experiences [69] and the analysis of the vulnerability in design [89].

Interaction design research has also contributed with some methods to notice retrospectively with the help of drawing, photographs or material making. Some examples include sketching as a tool to hold conversations with oneself [25], participatory noticing through photovoice [59], and a method to elicit autobiographical themes through body maps [15] photographs and conceptual mapping [68]. In these works, the focus on the self is recognised to be strongly distributed, unearthing relational qualities inspired by others, including the more-than-human world.

2.3 The felt sense as a viewpoint for introspective noticing

Noticing implies that we direct our attention. In some cases, we might focus on the direct environment and how our bodies perceive their qualities of connection with their surroundings. In other cases, the attention can be directed inwards, which assists the noticer in positioning themselves in relation to the environment. Here, we claim the notion of *felt sense* helps provide a rich focus for introspective noticing.

The concept of felt sense is a type of tacit knowledge [87], and emerged first in the context of experiential psychology, when Carl Rogers and Eugene Gendlin realised that patients who engaged in a style of meaning-making involving their bodily awareness and appraisal were more successful in therapy [39]. This particular mode of embodied meaning-making or felt sense –which has also extensively informed research outside psychological therapy in the last two decades (see for example [3, 4, 46, 72, 101])–can be defined as a complex, fuzzy bodily sense of meaningfulness [16] or wholistic sense of a situation awaiting to be described [28]. Some examples of felt senses in everyday life are the unclear sensation inspired by a "familiar" face you cannot identify, the nagging feeling of forgetting something even when you know you have done everything or the very particular way a person makes you feel when you are in the same room. Our lives are full of felt sensing instances, but we do not always attend to them closely. It is important to note that such states are not fixed but change and move around our bodies –for example, if I remember what I forgot and was nagging me, I might feel relieved by my discovery. As such, noticing and articulating the felt sense can potentially unearth insights that are bodily verified and appraised.

By purposefully accessing the felt sense -by noticing nuance through our bodies-, we engage in an open dialogue with unformed thoughts, memories, feelings and sensations in their free, unconstrained ways, carrying implicit meaning with no specific language label [31]. Because we do not have straightforward language terms to easily explain how the felt sense manifests through our bodies, felt senses are not the same as emotions or feelings, as the latter ones can be easily labelled in everyday speech. For example, one knows how it feels to be anxious, angry, nervous, sad or enthusiastic, as these terms encapsulate a series of familiar sensations represented as these concrete words readily available from our language repertoire [28]. In addition, felt senses are neither affects or moods, as they are basic and immediate [7]. Instead, felt senses can be understood as a bodily sense of complexity; a sensory fingerprints unique to how a particular person, place, situation or interaction makes us feel. This implies that although felt senses are not the same as feelings, emotions, sensations or moods (or even reflections), they behave as 'sensory ecologies' that could contain all (or some) of these states in an entangled and holistic manner that is distinctively felt. Getting in contact with such complexity requires us to purposely notice what lies beyond surface-level feelings, sensations and assumptions, inviting us to immerse in them carefully before putting them aside to perceive what else remains. For example, if I explore my discomfort through the felt sense, I might start feeling it in my body, articulating its qualities and, at some point, put it aside to reveal what remains under the surface. The result of this type of introspective noticing tends to be translated into metaphors and evocative language, leading to discoveries and reflections that are felt as "making sense" intellectually and bodily [28]. Accessing the felt sense involves a mode of perceiving that requires defamiliarising our everyday mode of being [28], which is a prerequisite to notice rigorously. We will refer more specifically to how to recognise felt sensing language in our methodology, section 3.3.

2.4 Speaking the language of the felt sense in a more-than-human world

We have introduced more-than-human design and the concepts of noticing and felt sensing. In this section, we discuss how certain types of languaging represent a valid path to get closer to nuanced aspects of our experiences of relationality. This notion offers an alternative to current discourses that portray words as an obstacle to experience, with HCI presenting language as predominantly symbolic, abstract, and often disconnected from the sensory and bodily dimensions [43]. In methodologies such as soma design – which places the lived body at the centre of the design process– the

¹https://sites.uwm.edu/brinichl/books-of-hours/

scepticism for language-centric methods is manifested explicitly, as pointed out by Höök: "the qualitative shift required, [should transition] from a predominantly symbolic, language-oriented stance, to an experiential, felt, aesthetic stance permeating the whole design and use cycle". [43]. This reluctance for language-oriented approaches –and the call "start feeling and stop talking" [44]– is not entirely unjustified, as a disembodied view of the design process has historically permeated HCI theory and practice [109]. However, solely attuning to somatic experience is not enough to grasp the complexity of how we relate to others. Once we have experienced the world around us –by moving and perceiving with all our senses–, we need a particular type of languaging for defining and crystallising what makes our interactions rich and meaningful [41].

Nevertheless, as argued by Abram [1] there is a gap between how humans have built representational language around experience and the actual natural world of which we are part of. In his book "The Spell of the Sensuous - Perception and Language in a More-Than-Human World", Abram [1] explores the historical disconnection of the body from the natural world and how "the human mind came to renounce its sensuous bearings, isolating itself from the other animals and the animate Earth" [1]. Abram argues that language, once used to "enhance and accentuate the sensorial affinity between humans and the Earth" has evolved so that it no longer refers "to any sensible phenomenon", noting how this further widens the perceived gap between the senses and the more-than-human world. Arguably, bridging this gap to connect more meaningfully with the more-than-human world requires us to access more corporeal ways of generating language and meaning [1]. Here, the articulation of the felt sense as a viewpoint for noticing appears as a possible path to describe our sensory affinity with other beings.

As the body is central in language construction, our experience is always both embodied -this is, firmly grounded in our bodies and phenomenological experiences [29]- and relational - where meaning generation does not happen in the isolation of our minds, but is rather shaped by our interconnections with sociotechnical systems, nature and artefacts [1, 13, 42]. Thus, the focus on phenomenological experience does not exclude post-human relationality; it rather makes evident that our human mind is thoroughly dependent upon and influenced by our relation with its surroundings [1, 104]. Accordingly, our co-constitution with the environment, is always bodily, as our bodies do our living [27, 30]. One example of such co-constitution is combodying, a concept that frames embodiment as collective, where the body positions beyond itself, towards being united with the universe [45]. In combodying, the notion of liveness- or what Ikemi defines as "processing-generating of bodily living"- is constructed together with other beings. He uses a school of fish as an example where the identity of each sardine dilutes in the dance they perform to protect themselves from predators.

To sum up, we have given an overview of more-than-human design as a diverse area of research with many sub-interests. In this paper, we particularly focus on approaches for noticing our experience of the more-than-human world. Doing so we have situated noticing as a valid and rigorous practice. We then presented the felt sense as a viewpoint for noticing. Here, articulating the felt sense requires a specific type of language connected to bodily experience, which is not only individual but also relational and entangled with the more-than-human world. The application of these principles is foundational to our methodological choices, which we proceed to describe below.

3 METHODOLOGY

As mentioned previously, this research draws on posthumanism, which requires cultivating an attitude towards sensibility and adaptability, rejecting universalising perspectives such as generalisations [11, 19]. It is also grounded in phenomenological research [34], where we examine our lived experiences while purposely bracketing our preconceptions-in line with our approach to noticing. As such, our research is informed by our embodied and situated experiences [103]-and particularly, our felt sensing process- as a site to communicate experiences of relationality.

Our process is grounded on a reflexive analysis of micro- phenomenological interviews that we have conducted with one another. Initially, our meetings were motivated by our mutual goal of practising and refining our skills as micro-phenomenology practitioners. Our agenda was to explore our respective research interests unconditionally, which infused our sessions with a general sense of openness and curiosity. The topic of the interviews thus moved between the themes of our respective interests of encountering the more-than-human world and somatic empathy, which frequently overlapped. We met seven times over eight months, conducting fourteen micro-phenomenological interviews, totalling 579 minutes (9,65h). Each interview ranged from 40 to 74 minutes. The interviews were transcribed with the help of an automatic transcription tool. In addition to the interviews, we reflected on our discoveries, taking notes after each session. Although we are well aware of the effectiveness of well-conducted interviews, we were always surprised by the level of detail and candidness of our discoveries.

For this paper, we have selected two interviews involving interactions with a smartphone camera and a telepresence robot –both existing technologies we use as part of our practice as designerresearchers. Our intention in selecting examples that are mundane on the surface is to illustrate the complexity of our entanglements and relationships with technologies and other beings. Accordingly, the first example illustrates the use of technology directly engaging with nature, while the second example takes us to explore how technologies mediate human experience, blurring the boundaries of what is experienced as organic and inorganic; human or nonhuman.

We analyse our examples in light of several inclinations of morethan-human design research, such as the need to understand the agency that resides in our relationships with technology [8, 32, 106], how technologies mediate human experiences of the more-thanhuman world [52, 84] and identifying the more-than-human within our self [108] Accordingly, we are not focusing on other important aspects of more-than-human design such as understanding the particular needs of other species [63] or mapping systemic relationship [105]

3.1 About the researchers

We (Anton and Claudia) met in a one-week training course for micro-phenomenology practitioners entitled *Micro-phenomenology of Nature* facilitated by Claire Petitmengin and Marc Zischka. We are both early career researchers motivated by different reasons to

join this workshop. Anton works in more-than-human design with a focus on understanding the human relation to the world in a nonanthropocentric way (see for example [61, 65, 84–86, 93]). Claudia specialises in methods for understanding first-person experiences with a focus on the body and senses in design (see for example [68–71, 73, 75]), yet she is critical of some aspects of how HCI has interpreted posthumanism. Despite these tensions, we both identify a need to uncover and articulate the complexity of how we experience qualities in the entanglement between humans and the more-than-human world, including technologies. In addition, we come from different backgrounds in terms of ethnicity, culture, mother language, gender and sexuality and thus bring to this work quite different life experiences. We see this as a strength in exploring the opportunities of noticing through the felt sense.

3.2 Conducting micro-phenomenological interviews.

Now we turn to briefly describe how micro-phenomenological interviews are conducted. We have included a detailed protocol of our procedures as an appendix.

Micro-phenomenological interviews serve to obtain detailed recollections of subjective experiences that are difficult to access through traditional interviews, articulated as fine-grained descriptions of bodily sensations [80]. One of the features of this interview method is the focus on the "how" rather than the "why" of the experience, which naturally heightens the noticer's receptivity to their somatic awareness and memory [80]. These interviews are initiated by establishing a "contract" between the interviewer and interviewee [79]. The purpose of this contract is to establish trust and rapport, clarify the ethics of the interviewee (such as the right to refrain from diving deeper into certain topics), agree on the practicalities of the interview (such as length and structure), and make the purpose and topic of the interviewee clear for both interviewer and interviewee.

The interviewer puts the interviewee in an evocative state of re-living the experience by first asking questions focused on the senses (what do you see, feel, smell etc.). This state is indicated, for instance, by the slowing down of speech, eyes looking up, or gesturing to evoke phenomena as if they were in the room. The interviewer then acts as a mirror of these experiences by re-telling the experience as they have understood it. By listening to this re-telling, the interviewee is typically able to articulate their experience in greater detail. This articulation is also supported by asking content-free [79] questions such as "How did that feel?" or "How do you know that?". This process is repeated until a desired detail in the description is achieved, the time runs out, or the interviewee chooses to withdraw.

3.3 Analysis of the interviews.

Although we have used micro-phenomenological interviews to assess the felt sense, we actively decided *to not* analyse our data through the micro-phenomenological analysis method. This choice foregrounds our search for generativity over generalisability as more appropriate for design research [95]. For example, the micro-phenomenological analysis method involves discarding *satellite information* – or reflexive and contextual accounts that do not

directly describe the sensory experience. However, it was often the satellite information that provided a narrative context to the emergence of our felt senses, which is the reason why we chose to include such reflexive and contextual accounts in our analysis. The non-judgemental attitude we promote by adopting the felt sense as a viewpoint for noticing, involves open-mindedness and self-compassion; trusting the process of somatic examination and allowing our bodies to lead our search while recognising that deviations occur [16]. We see instances of more reflective articulations *unfolding within and fostered by* the evocation, as part of the generative process of arriving at meaning – rather than as an obstacle to it. We recognise this perspective might differ from traditional micro-phenomenological analysis views on the type of data that is considered relevant. [82].

We have used multiple analytical methods at different stages of analysis to explore how the data from micro-phenomenological interviews can inform and inspire design and design research. We first conducted a thematic analysis [12] of all interview transcriptions, where we openly assigned codes, themes and reflections to words, sentences or whole paragraphs. However, we quickly realised that the abstracting and synthesising character of thematic analysis was not the right approach to exemplify how our elusive and sometimes profound bodily experiences were articulated during noticing. We thus decided to perform a concept-driven analysis [33], elaborating an analytical framework to focus on the presence of felt senses [28], which we describe below in 3.3.1, and then exemplify with vignettes based on two interviews. In the last step of our analysis, we returned to our thematic analysis of the entire corpus, crafting general themes further expanded in the discussion using examples from the two interviews.

3.3.1 Analytical framework: Bodily ways of knowing by identifying felt senses. Our analytical framework uses the notions of felt sense [28] as lenses to examine our experiences. Based on Gendlin's description of how the felt sense manifests, Nuñez-Pacheco[66] described a set of criteria to recognise the presence of felt senses:

- Points to the area around the body where the felt sense is perceived. During interviews, these become evident as bodily gestures.
- Use of expressions such as 'it feels like...', 'it is like' or 'it is similar to...'.
- Slowing down of speech, as described by Petitmengin [82]
- The use of metaphors to describe complex sensations and emerging concepts.
- Presence of uncommon wording/vocabulary.
- Mostly unstructured narrations.

Figure 1 shows how felt senses are on the edge of our awareness and how attending carefully to our senses before assigning language makes a sense of "philosophical discomfort" explicit [51]. This characteristic of acting on the edge of our awareness makes the process of generative attending, searching and discovery rewarding and stimulates the emergence of rich experiential qualities. [28]. Sometimes, by seeking for language to articulate the felt sense, we experience "eureka" moments of sensemaking, perceived as a match between the bodily and the reflective dimensions. These moments are bodily perceived as a sense of lightness after finding what feels like "the right" terms to describe complexity in a similar way one finds relief after remembering a forgotten word. We consider felt senses in our analysis, as this type of languaging is aimed at accessing the core of our sensory experiences while suspending our natural attitude and predisposition to bring our judgment and preconceptions [82].

3.3.2 Crafting of vignettes. We use vignettes [48] to illustrate how felt senses form and change. We have crafted these vignettes using fragments of raw data organised under headlines. By presenting the data in its raw form, we aim to showcase the unfiltered candidness of our descriptions. We include quotes in both past and present tense. Speaking in the present tense is one of several indicators that an evocation state has been reached. However, if other indicators of evocation are present (see criteria in the section above) accounts in the past tense are often valid [82]. Creating these vignettes further requires some thoughtfulness, as the micro-phenomenological interview builds on repetition, in which the experience is recounted in detail. This implies that compiling vignettes that communicate the most comprehensive and detailed account of the experience involves consciously crafting together several asynchronous sections of the interview to one synchronous account, i.e order the account temporally, not as it was told during the interview, but as it was experienced by the interviewee. This process functions as part of the analysis since the most relevant parts of the interview are identified. In this process, we re-articulated our data as narratives from which meaning can be derived. In the same line as other HCI researchers who have used narratives as data [69, 100], we combine direct quotes from the interview with contextual information to help the reader connect with the complexity and richness of our discoveries. We highlight the felt senses we identified from the interviews with bold sub-headings.

It is important to consider that providing language to our felt senses (or "speaking the language of the senses" as recognised by Abram [1]) involves adopting an attitude of defamiliarisation [29]. When we adopt this perspective, we connect with our bodily selves before venturing to articulate meaning. This does not necessarily translate into only describing bodily sensations but also reflective accounts motivated by what is felt. In methods for introspective noticing such as Focusing, being in contact with the felt sense is described with a metaphor where the body and mind engage in a dialogue, but the body takes control of the pacing and focus of the conversation [75]. In this case, the steps in the microphenomenological method contribute to facilitating our disposition to connect more explicitly with our somatic dimension to foster our discoveries.

4 FINDINGS: OUR ILLUSTRATIVE EXPERIENCES

Next, we present the vignettes of our two experiences examined through noticing: (1) Colliding with a telepresence robot and (2) photographing mushrooms (See Figure 2). Figures 3 and 4 summarise the felt sensing processes in each experience. We then analyse and synthesise both these vignettes in the following section 5.

4.1 Experience 1: Photographing mushrooms

Context: Anton is having a stroll outside at a house in the countryside when he sees a group of mushrooms. He is delighted by their rich multi-sensory appearance and is overflown by an urge to touch them. However, he does not want to get dirty fingers and instead takes out his smartphone and takes two pictures of the mushrooms. He then puts back the smartphone in his pocket and continues the walk. The following excerpts summarise this event, particularly focusing on the conflicting urges Marcus experiences as the actions unfold. The process is illustrated in Figure 3.

An urge of picking. Anton describes how the act of taking pictures is preceded by the identification of "nice" qualities in the mushrooms that result in a feeling or urge of wanting to collect a mushroom by picking it:

"It's sort of building up like 'This is nice. This aspect of the mushroom is' nice', like, 'oh, nice, nice, nice' and then there are just so many nice things spilling out. So you're like, I must document that. This is significant. /.../ Just before the moment when I'm deciding to take a picture and reach for my phone. I'm like, literally taking a mental picture of it. I'm like, kind of registering this experience as a moment, that is kind of a picture moment 'this is something to take a picture off'. And that kind of leaves a memory in my brain. So the memory is really enforced."

Anton describes this memory in more detail:

Vivid snappability. "It feels like you can really kind of snap the mushroom, so it's kind of porous, but kind of snappable. At the same time, it was dissolving from below. The mushroom was turning into this liquid ink that is kind of very black or dark. And it's a very interesting contrast that it can be dissolving liquid and at the same time a kind of very fleshy snappable thing. It is connected with the smell of a mushroom forest, but not the mushroom you would eat, it's more kind of poisonous feeling."

He then describes how the rich vivid qualities of the mushroom make him want to touch it:

An urge to touch the mess. "So I have this urge that I want to kind of interact with the mushroom. But I don't want to kind of put my whole self in it /.../ because If I would have messy fingers, I would not be able to use my phone./.../ I mean, it's really nice. If you just get into it is like playing with dirt with clay, like, almost childlike, that is really nice at the moment. But then you know, like, afterwards you come out of it you will be like, 'oh, now I'm all messy'. And the moment is gone. 'Was it worth it?'.../ So that's a very strong argument for not causing this mess. And that's also something that led me to the thought of the phone [as it would allow interaction with the mushroom without direct physical contact]."

The partial satisfaction of taking a picture. Anton describes how his felt sense changes as he picks up his smartphone and starts to focus on taking a picture:

"And then suddenly, I'm only seeing the screen and the mushroom. And it's kind of flat, the experience is flattened. So this image down here is kind of vivid 3D (points at where the mushrooms would be) but here it is flatter (points at where he would hold the phone)//.../. So I interact with the mushroom through my phone [by taking a picture]. So that is partly satisfying. But I also have this sensation of not like fully living in the moment."

Finally, Anton describes how the urge was not only about physical touching but also a more abstract sense of collecting:

The urge of a collecting research mind. "There is an aspect of collecting as well. I mean, you collect mushrooms. That is something you do with mushrooms. And I wanted to pick it up like just because of

DIS '24, July 01-05, 2024, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark



Figure 1: The process of language articulation when attending the felt sense.

how it would feel, but also because picking mushrooms is something you do [as a common practice of foraging]. But instead of picking it, I can kind of pick it, picture it, with my phone. So that partly satisfies the urge or kind of collecting? Not fully, but partly. /.../ So there my kind of research mind started. Like this is something with significance or usefulness or like, if I gather information about my environment, I could use it later. So it was this kind of analytical thing, or like 'it should have a purpose'. Which was nice, but also kind of removed me from this more childlike feeling. Like 'I want to touch it, I want to play with it'. So there are two very different parts of my being: something very childlike, who wants to get messed up, and this kind of adult researcher who is thinking like "you're going to produce something, it has a purpose, it's going to be kind of delivered, you're going to show it to others' - and that was a contrast to this 'I want to sit here, I'd like to make a mess'. But I am this adult researcher, stopping myself from being this kind of child. Then I do that adult thing, which is to take a photo of it."

4.2 Experience 2: Colliding with a telepresence robot

Context. Claudia was attending a workshop investigating the somatic qualities of colliding with several robots [62], including a telepresence robot illustrated in Figure 2 (a). As part of her explorations, she wrapped a leash around what she perceived to be the robot's "neck", allowing for safe collisions and minimising the risk of damaging it. As she started pulling the leash towards her body, she soon discovered that the robot displayed some aesthetic qualities that made collisions pleasurable and rewarding but, at the same time, conflicting and strange. The following vignette summarises part of the micro-moment of colliding and the felt senses of this inner conflict. The process is illustrated in Figure 4

Animalistic joy. Claudia first describes how she is enjoying playing with the telepresence robot and the sensations of her provoked collisions:

"I would say that one of the things I enjoyed the most was crashing with the robot. So I was pulling this robot towards me and... this leash was practically connected to like... this "neck" area of the robot /.../ So I would pull this leash towards me, and I could feel part of the heaviness and fluidity of the robot. So I could feel that the wheels were moving faster and a 'whiplash' when pulling the leash towards me /.../ So, when I am saying, "I'm super childish", I'm playing; I'm not thinking... I am just "Hahaha! Boing boing boing!". That is so human that... is even animal. I was playing animalistically. No, I don't know if that's a word, but I was playing like a little animal, like a kid. And I was playing with a toy; with an object which happened to be a robot, but this robot wasn't responding to me in a human-like way. It didn't have any kind of agency."

Part of the joyful qualities in Claudia's play were related to the contrasting sensation between the flat screen crashing against the chest and the bounciness of her body.

"Yeah, I could feel it on my chest very... I could feel the flatness really present /.../ the softness is like an iPad and I can feel that here (indicates the sternum area on the upper torso). And I felt a little bit as if I were a football player [stopping a ball with the chest]. But the flatness... I know that both [body and ball] are not flat; my body is curved."

Simulated liveness. However, when re-focusing on the particular moment of bouncing back, Claudia nuances her initial claim that the robot did not have any agency:

"But there is a brief moment of time where it bounces back, and it returns this little gesture or resistance that is kind of simulating agency. And then it becomes like... 'this being', something that has agency and... liveness, therefore, it's like... there is this resistance because it could not just keep moving. The only reason why it's returning is because of the leash. And that movement is really imperative."

The hunter's conflict. As Claudia has identified agency and aliveness in the bouncing back and resistance of the leash, she begins to identify a tension between the felt sense of playful hunting triggered by these qualities and a felt moral obligation to treat the robot with care: DIS '24, July 01-05, 2024, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Núñez-Pacheco and Poikolainen Rosén





Figure 2: The central artefacts in our examples (a) a photo taken of mushrooms (©Anton Poikolainen Rosén) and (b) an illustration of a telepresence robot. This representation shows a leash wrapped around the robot's rod, which was not captured in photos. (©Claudia Núñez-Pacheco)

"I feel like I should feel guilty that I'm forcing this thing to come towards me, defying his agency, but right now, it's a bloody toy. Therefore I don't care, and perhaps there's another layer of enjoyment in that sort of transgressing. It's like a prey thing. So the hunter in you sees that something's moving, therefore, perceives some liveness. And as a human, if I see that something wants to escape from me, I would allow it to escape. Because that's what humans, like 'civilized humans' do, just leave the thing to move. You're not /.../ you're not forcing animals to do things. You're caring. But then, this is not an animal. So there is like this kind of like... this tension there that you're doing something that's wrong, but it's not wrong. It's actually not prohibited because it's inorganic. But then again, I'm confronting this duality between 'Is it alive, is it? Is it not?'. It's not. Therefore, I can pull it towards me. And, of course, the leash also has like ... some connotations of like ... dominance. And that's very important. Like this exercise of dominance. Which is not that mean because, again, this is not a real thing."

Affording aggression. Claudia continues to focus on the felt sense of exercising dominance and connects this to the material qualities of the telepresence robot. She identifies these qualities as problematic, given that the mappings between the mediated body and the artificial presence have not been carefully considered, threatening the dignity of the mediated presence.

"This stick, it feels as if you were holding a neck [when transporting it]/.../Obviously, it's not the same as working with a person. So seeing my hand, like holding this stick, and the face of a person/.../the whole situation is very awkward, like the social barriers, start diluting/.../ It's inviting you to, like... push certain social boundaries. It's like... it affords aggression./.../ And the really unethical thing is that the person on the other side is not aware that it's in a device that affords aggression. So everybody else in the room can see this, but the person is not aware of it. It's really awkward. Like that is the part where you [the human] lose dignity."



Figure 3: A high-level view of photographing mushrooms, including noticed felt senses throughout the different stages of the experience.

Although the robot is operated remotely, when its displacement becomes too difficult or slow due to obstacles, it is not uncommon for people to grab the robot from the stick and lift it to move it around. After re-reading the interview, Claudia recalled this situation happening a few times during the workshop, along with a subtle sensation of awkwardness when witnessing this. Although she evoked herself holding the robot during the interview, later, she could recount how others were doing this too.

5 FEATURES OF ACCESSING THE FELT SENSE AS A VIEWPOINT FOR NOTICING

The practice of noticing the felt sense–exemplified through vignettes from two micro-phenomenological interviews– renders visible the complexity of our entanglements with the more-thanhuman world. In this section, we illustrate the generativity of articulating the felt sense by discussing three themes we found evocative when we analysed our examples. These themes focus on what the approach reveals, uncovers and recognises in our relationships with the more-than-human world.

5.1 The felt sense puts us in contact with our pre-judgemental dimension

Attending to our felt senses opens up a space to get in contact with an unfiltered, pre-judgemental dimension of our encounters with the world. Since we argue for noticing through the felt sense –which Abrams identified as a forgotten dimension in our interconnection with nature [1]– we find particularly relevant those examples rendering visible our urges as human beings to rebel against our social restrictions. As some of these revelations might appear controversial –generating discomfort in the reader and the researcher– noticing through the felt sense demands vulnerability, honesty and openness to expose those rough edges. For instance, in our interviews, we found many references to childishness and primal urges (e.g. "I'm super childish; I'm playing. I'm not thinking?" and " It's like a prey thing"). We are aware that notions such as "going back to the primal" or "animalistic" might suggest some links with biological essentialism, which we do not advocate. In addition, some of those terms have been used historically to "othering" and discriminate against particular groups of humans [49]. Nevertheless, instead of discarding the emergence of qualities related to such urges, we prefer to embrace the frictions they generate, examining them closely and critically. Although references to the primal are loaded, we can also reflect on how these illustrate our non-exceptionalism among other living beings or how rendering these qualities visible allows us to consider more closely the ethical aspects of the affordances we design.

In light of these frictions, the identification of urges uncovers ethical tensions that usually remain unexamined in our everyday awareness. For example, when describing Anton' encounter with the mushroom, he first wants to touch its ink. However, this urge is resisted since Anton does not want to get messy, especially since this would hinder the interaction with his phone. In an attempt to neutralise the urge, taking a picture replaces the interaction of touching it, reframing the first urge of wanting to touch the mushroom to an urge to collect information about the mushroom so that it could be accessed later. However, this is only experienced as *"partly satisfying"* as Anton describes a split between a more analytical, thinking self and a more feeling, reacting self *"I am this adult researcher, stopping myself from being this kind of child."* The experience thus exemplifies an interplay of urges and conscious efforts to resist these urges.

In Claudia's experience with the robot, her urges were associated with metaphors tied to play, dominance, control and hunting. In particular, the hunting metaphor was used to describe a state of a heightened sense of attention and focus on the robot, which is taking the role of the "prey." Claudia describes how identifying movements in this prey triggered the hunter in her. These metaphors can be seen as an indication that she is connecting with a more foundational, primal and instinctive aspect of herself. The metaphors connote experiences outside "civilised" social and cultural processes and behaviours that are well-mannered. She debates between perceiving the robot as an inanimate toy and a lively presence reminiscent of a prey animal. As guided by the repetitive



Figure 4: A high-level view of colliding with a telepresence robot, including noticed felt senses throughout the different stages of the experience.

movement created by pulling the leash, her felt sense positions the robot as never fully alive or fully inanimate. Hence, her framing of the experience is never stabilised as either fully playful or fully violent. The whole experience is more complex as a real human being is "inside" the robot. This person sees through the camera of the robot and navigates the robot in the room while ultimately being restrained by the leash. The ethical implications of Claudia's insights are ambiguous, as the telepresence robot does not fit neatly as either human, animal or technology in her felt sense. As the experience unfolds on the boundary of what is human and morethan-human, it also unfolds on the boundary of what is ethical and socially acceptable.

In sum, these examples illustrate how the uncovering of our pre-judgemental urges points to how qualities in our environment — be it living beings or technologies-- urge us to act in certain ways that can be multiple, ambiguous or even conflicting. The qualities of these urges are not always conscious or intentional, at least not initially. Abram [1] describes this as a "silent conversation" or "wordless dance always already going on" that we carry on with things, a continuous dialogue that unfolds far below – or even independent of – our verbal awareness. It is an improvised duet between our animal body and "the fluid, breathing landscape that it inhabits." [1]. Being aware of this aspect of experiences is a central skill of interaction designers, who aim to orchestrate experiences by consciously utilising qualities that urge us to behave in certain ways.

5.2 The felt sense foregrounds the vivid liveliness of the more-than-human world.

As we carefully focus on sensing and evoking and then articulating [28], the act of noticing helped us access incredibly rich details of our sensory experiences, foregrounding the vibrant materiality of the more-than-human, including the inorganic [8]. Historically, our sensory perception has been deemed as unreliable [60], but

noticing practices challenge the notion of technologies as always being reliable proofs of experience given the volatility of our senses. When Anton describes his experience of photographing a mushroom, the mushroom becomes "Vivid 3D", but then the opposite is described as "the experience is flattened" once attention moves from the actual mushroom to its representation on the smartphone screen. Interestingly, this flattening of experiences was re-enacted after the interview when we looked up the picture taken during the experience (See Figure 2 (b)). We both felt an odd sense of disappointment as the image was not as vibrant as the description of the mushroom during the interview. This example illustrates how images are limited devices for capturing the fullness of experience and that evocation of the felt sense can be a rich complement to other forms of documentation, such as pictures and field notes. In the case of Claudia's experience with the telepresence robot, a whole set of complex tensions and sensations emerged from an instance of interaction that might have lasted five seconds-as she pulled the leash with the robot, it collided with it, bouncing back and forth. Arguably, outside observations, video recordings, or user evaluation forms would not have captured these detailed recollections.

5.3 The felt sense renders visible the porous boundaries of the self.

Taken together, our experience of being micro-phenomenologically interviewed uncovered our sensemaking as relational, not only located within our "selves" but in constant correspondence with our surroundings. The experiences we present illustrate how we experience the felt sense as ephemeral and porous; it blends and merges with external qualities of the environment, changes shape and moves across senses in synaesthetic ways. One example of this from our experiences is the vivid impression of seeing-smelling how the mushroom would be poisonous and "snappable", even if it was not touched or tasted. Here, the senses of vision and smell produce sensations related to touch and taste. In other words, the senses are

experienced as one in what Abram calls synaesthetic encounters [1]. In such encounters, we do not distinguish between the senses or even the self and the environment. This kind of porous perceptual boundaries aligns with more-than-human philosophy that resists boundaries such as nature-human and mind-body [36]. Again, this points to the need to move away from ontologies that emphasise the difference between humans and "the other" towards those that do not discard the importance of *sameness*, or the existence of a vibrant materiality connecting us with more-than-humans [8].

In such experiences, the mutual inscription of others in our experience, and ours in theirs, interweaves into a single phenomenal world or solid "reality." As noted by Abram [1], this experienced solidity is sustained by the continual encounter with other embodied subjects, other centres of experience. This can be a point of departure from which to view one's "self" as part of the environment and as responsible for what is going on in the world – a starting point for care.

In sum, we have presented three themes that speak of the generativity of the felt sense based on the analysis of our interviews as exemplified through our two vignettes. In the remaining part of the discussion, we will briefly reflect on our human positioning and the role of the felt sense while offering some notes on the relational and affective aspects of our process.

6 DISCUSSION

In this section, we reflect more broadly on important considerations when applying felt sensing as a lens to noticing the more-thanhuman world. We illustrate the applicability of the approach by discussing design opportunities based on the overall insights we gained through analysing each experience. Finally, we offer some reflections on the limitations of our approach.

6.1 The personal and systemic

As our position as humans is inescapable, we argue that becoming more attuned and sensitive to external influences further motivates our commitment to advocate for the representation of more-thanhuman epistemologies. This commitment comes from a space of care, not as a moral mandate but as a condition for our survival [17]. By speaking the language of the senses, we also become less prone to be influenced by external influences -including ideologies of domination [40], opening up for the provision of candid, unfiltered accounts of how more-than-human entities influence our being in the world. This works since methods such as micro-phenomenology -and others grounded in awareness-cultivation through the somaallow us to become attentive to our entanglement with the environment in ways that generally go unnoticed in our everyday mode of awareness [79]. In practical terms, when your interview partner helps to articulate your sensory perception of the situation, they are asking you to situate yourself in relation to others and the surrounding environment: "And how was it? What does the place look like around you? How is the lighting? Temperature? Are there any smells? Are you by yourself, or are there other presences around you?" Accordingly, the felt sense is never only about the "self" but about how the "self" is in correspondence with the surrounding environment.

This position has some implications for the notion of anthropocentrism. More-than-human approaches are often hampered by critiques about anthropocentrism [22]. However, as experienced noticers, we claim that the examination of more-than-human worlds from the standpoint of inner experience does not equate to selfish self-contemplation. Instead, we see our tactic a is a way to attune to environmental challenges from a somatic perspective that has also been neglected by mainstream academia, currently permeated by modernist values [1, 76]. In this way our view aligns with work that has found how systemic change often stems from the inner transformation of individuals, who then act for a more sustainable society, following their new insights [35].

6.2 Some notes on the sameness and vulnerability of the sentient.

Beyond the theoretical discussions supporting our understanding of the felt sense as relational, an affective quality of togetherness surfaced during the interviews. In the co-creative process of noticing and articulating unfiltered meaning, we felt involved, connected and invested in each other's experiences. Although we speak a common -human-language, noticing brought us back to access a primordial quality of human sameness transcending our cultural and epistemological differences, as in combodying [45]. As we consider ourselves part of the natural world [8] -and therefore, non-exceptional in our role as designers and humans - we claim that felt sensing brings us closer to a more raw, unfiltered version of ourselves where we enact in correspondence with the environment [47]. For the same reason, it is also important to note that dropping the certainties of our everyday language can foreground our vulnerabilities [89] -as in the example where Claudia could perceive affordances of aggression in the design of the telepresence robot. Her ambivalent and fragmented process of articulation -facilitated through the interview process-revealed a strong feeling of inner conflict and guilt. These conflicts position us in different frames of reference, going back and forth between the child and the researcher. We do not see this ambivalence as binary but rather as reinforcing the complexities of our entanglements with the world.

6.3 Design opportunities through the lenses of felt sensing features

As described in section 5, making space for our felt senses uncovered a series of features and qualities we find helpful for design, namely (a) The felt sense puts us in contact with our pre-judgemental dimension, (b) The felt sense foregrounds the vivid liveliness of the more-than-human world and (c) The felt sense renders visible the porous boundaries of the self. These features have sensitised us to particular aspects of our experiences we could potentially design for. Here, we venture to suggest potential design opportunities for future work based on this sensitisation. These design opportunities are primarily intended to illustrate the applicability of articulating the felt sense to prompt and inform concrete design considerations.

The example of photographing mushrooms teaches us how the smartphone camera application encourages and affords acting as a "rational researcher," documenting the mushroom with a picture while discouraging acting as the "messy child" squeezing the tempting lure of the sticky mushroom. Although the phone affords interaction with the mushroom, such interaction is somewhat distant (compared to touching, smelling and squeezing). This points to an opportunity to design environmental sensing and documentation technologies for the "childlike" urge instead of the "adult" urge by emphasizing a more multi-sensory engagement with the environment through explicit prompts or material affordances that highlight other senses than vision. Accessing our pre-judgemental positioning captured through the felt sense invites us to drop our preconceptions of how a smartphone camera should be, providing us with new viewpoints where our design intent [94] –this is, shaped by the worlds and futures we want to design– open up for vivid, lively and vibrant [8] ways of crafting new perceived agencies.

Further, the ethical tensions revealed in the case of the telepresence robot made us ask how to design autonomous systems that mediate presence in dignified ways. This question resonates with existing human-centric concerns around how to design for ethical artificial intelligence [110], including feminist human-robot interaction (HRI) [107]. However, a more explicit focus on somatic qualities of dignity might be more difficult to identify when designing these technologies. Our concern around dignity comes from a felt sensing quality where the porosity of our boundaries with the environment became exposed by introspectively examining Claudia's interactions with a telepresence system.

By acknowledging our felt senses as a starting point, we need to reconsider the design of an artificial body that is functional but affords aggression – to a gestalt that affords care and empathy, enhancing the experience of all the parties involved in the interaction. As a first step, new design proposals could consider how the screen connects with the wheeled section of the robot, envisioning ways of manipulating and carrying it in ways that do not involve grabbing the robot's "neck", therefore promoting a more respectful approach to both the artefact and the mediated presence.

6.4 Limitations.

We have illustrated how a focus on the felt sense is a generative viewpoint for noticing, but also a methodological decision. Although we can get in contact with our felt senses in everyday life, this approach requires specialised tools to facilitate evocation [75], self evocation [98], or a partner with reflective listening skills [28]. This is to help the noticer to drop into their bodily awareness and guide them to stay in the evocation state long enough to explore as many qualities as possible. Instead of seeing this need for assistance as a limitation, we consider it as a manifestation of our combodied condition [45], as language does not exist outside sociality. In particular, having a partner to notice helps us to crystalise further thoughts after the interviews, bringing our evocation into more concrete implications.

We found that evoking vivid memories, even from distant pasts, is surprisingly rewarding with the support of micro-phenomenology. However, it is important to acknowledge that individuals may vary in their ability to evoke and articulate felt senses meaningfully. We are both skilled in introspective practices as part of our research, therefore the approach suited us. Further, an inescapable limitation is the challenge of describing non-lingual phenomena such as the felt sense, using language, especially when language barriers are present. In our case, we are both non-native English speakers relying on a common language we are comfortable with, but that is still not completely "ours". Previous research on emotion and language has suggested less embodied activation when speaking a second language compared to the first [78]. Despite this, we observed that embodied aspects of interviews could transcend cultural and language differences, bringing a sense of interconnectedness during the interviews.

Another limitation arises from the difference in perspective between the interviewee and other readers of the text. For the interviewee, the transcribed words recall their felt senses directly, while the interviewer and readers rely on these words as gestures to explain experiences they have not personally felt. This underscores the benefit of including the interviewee in the analysis - as we did - and cultivating empathy to bridge these gaps - we may use similarities in our general experience of 'being human in a more-than-human world' to approach the experience of others. Finally, while we have illustrated how our one-to-one approach has effectively enhanced our sensitising capacities, there is potential to explore the felt sense of more-than-human phenomena by including more participants in our design process. This could be translated, for instance, into conducting micro-phenomenological interviews of multiple users of an artefact, or uncovering qualities of relationality within a design team, integrating a diversity of viewpoints.

7 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we introduced the felt sense as a viewpoint for noticing the more-than-human world rigorously, providing considerations for design research and practice. Through this research, we aim to showcase the generativity of our approach and sensitise designers to approach language from a somatic viewpoint. Overall, we have shown how the articulation of felt senses -in this case through micro-phenomenological interviews- has helped us to become more attentive to experiences and identify small shifts in interactions that affect the experience of relationality. The paper contributes to more-than-human HCI research by using the felt sense as a viewpoint for noticing, articulating and communicating our experiences of relationality, contributing to a crescent area of research bringing together somatic experiencing and more-thanhuman design. In addition, we have advocated for a specific type of language as an embodied practice in its own right, a possibility that tends to be dismissed in mainstream HCI, including body-oriented epistemology [44]. By discussing our examples, we show how, by systematically examining our felt senses around more-than-human experiences, we come in contact with a primordial sense of belonging where the social boundaries existing between self and others become more fluid. As a result, we drop many of our preconceptions, inspiring a more candid examination of such boundaries. Developing our skills in articulating the felt sense helps us to become more sensitised designers, attending to the small shifts in the more-thanhuman world, how they affect our experiences and interactions, and how we, in turn, affect the more-than-human world through our actions. Such sensitivities are crucial if we are to create designs that are attuned to our ecologies and the human condition of being part of them.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the Mixed Reality Lab at the University of Nottingham for hosting the workshop on human-robot collisions described through Núñez-Pacheco's particular experience. Her research has been supported by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program – Humanities and Society (WASP-HS) funded by the Marianne and Marcus Wallenberg Foundation.

REFERENCES

- David Abram. 1997. The Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More-Than-Human World (1st vintage books ed edition ed.). Vintage, New York.
- [2] Yoko Akama, Ann Light, and Takahito Kamihira. 2020. Expanding Participation to Design with More-Than-Human Concerns. In Proceedings of the 16th Participatory Design Conference 2020 - Participation(s) Otherwise - Volume 1 (PDC '20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1145/3385010.3385016
- [3] Jane Bacon. 2007. Psyche moving:"Active imagination" and "focusing" in movement-based performance and psychotherapy. Body, Movement and Dance in Psychotherapy 2, 1 (2007), 17–28.
- [4] Janet Banfield. 2016. Critiquing Explicatory Techniques. , 125-136 pages. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-60440-8_7
- [5] Karen Barad. 2003. Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter. Signs 28, 3 (2003), 801–831. https://doi.org/10. 1086/345321 Publisher: The University of Chicago Press.
- [6] Karen Barad. 2007. Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning. Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina, USA.
- [7] Lisa Feldman Barrett and Eliza Bliss-Moreau. 2009. Affect as a psychological primitive. Advances in experimental social psychology 41 (2009), 167–218.
- [8] Jane Bennett. 2010. Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things. Duke University Press.
- [9] Heidi R. Biggs, Jeffrey Bardzell, and Shaowen Bardzell. 2021. Watching Myself Watching Birds: Abjection, Ecological Thinking, and Posthuman Design. In Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Yokohama, Japan) (CHI '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 619, 16 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445329
- [10] Ian Bogost. 2012. Alien Phenomenology, or What It's Like to Be a Thing. Univ. Of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816678976.001.0001
- [11] Rosi Braidotti. 2019. A Theoretical Framework for the Critical Posthumanities. Theory, Culture & Society 36, 6 (Nov. 2019), 31–61. https://doi.org/10.1177/ 0263276418771486 Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- [12] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative research in psychology 3 (2006), 77–101. Issue 2.
- [13] Andy Clark and David Chalmers. 1998. The extended mind. analysis (1998), 7–19.
- [14] Rachel Clarke, Sara Heitlinger, Ann Light, Laura Forlano, Marcus Foth, and Carl DiSalvo. 2019. More-Than-Human Participation: Design for Sustainable Smart City Futures. *Interactions* 26 (May 2019), 60–63. https://dl.acm.org/authorize? N673076
- [15] Karen Anne Cochrane, Lian Loke, Naseem Ahmadpour, Thecla Schiphorst, Andrew Campbell, and Claudia Núñez-Pacheco. 2021. A comparison design study of feedback modalities to support deep breathing whilst performing work tasks. *Work* 68 (2021), 1187–1202. Issue 4. https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-213448
- [16] Ann Weiser Cornell and Barbara McGavin. 2005. The radical acceptance of everything: Living a focusing life. Focusing Resources, Berkeley, CA.
- [17] Maria Puig de La Bellacasa. 2017. Matters of care: Speculative ethics in more than human worlds. Vol. 41. U of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN, USA.
- [18] Markéta Dolejšová, Sjef van Gaalen, Danielle Wilde, Paul Graham Raven, Sara Heitlinger, and Ann Light. 2020. Designing with More-than-Human Food Practices for Climate-Resilience. In Companion Publication of the 2020 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference (DIS' 20 Companion). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 381–384. https://doi.org/10.1145/ 3393914.3395909
- [19] Francesca Ferrando. 2012. Towards a posthumanist methodology. A statement. Frame Journal For Literary Studies 25, 1 (2012), 9–18.
- [20] Laura Forlano. 2017. Posthumanism and Design. She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation 3, 1 (March 2017), 16–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. sheji.2017.08.001 Publisher: Elsevier.
- [21] Marcus Foth and Glenda Amayo Caldwell. 2018. More-than-human media architecture. In Proceedings of the 4th Media Architecture Biennale Conference (MAB18), Beijing, China – November 13 - 16, 2018. ACM, Beijing, China, 66–75. https://dl.acm.org/authorize?N673075

DIS '24, July 01-05, 2024, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark

- [22] M. Foth, Monique Mann, L. Bedford, Walter Frieuw, and R. Walters. 2020. A capitalocentric review of technology for sustainable development: The case for more-than-human design. Global Information Society Watch (GISWatch). (2020). https://www.semanticscholar. org/paper/A-capitalocentric-review-of-technology-for-The-case-Foth-Mann/dc7ec4f2610c046742a77a598589226b5e240324
- [23] Christopher Frauenberger. 2019. Entanglement HCI the next wave? ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction 27 (2019). Issue 1. https://doi.org/ 10.1145/3364998
- [24] Emma Frid, Claudio Panariello, and Claudia Núñez-Pacheco. 2022. Customizing and Evaluating Accessible Multisensory Music Experiences with Pre-Verbal Children—A Case Study on the Perception of Musical Haptics Using Participatory Design with Proxies. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction* 6 (7 2022), 55. Issue 7. https://doi.org/10.3390/mti6070055
- [25] Mafalda Gamboa. 2022. Conversations with Myself: Sketching Workshop Experiences in Design Epistemology. In *Creativity and Cognition* (Venice, Italy) (*C&C* '22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 71–82. https://doi.org/10.1145/3527927.3531450
- [26] Rachael Garrett, Kristina Popova, Claudia Núñez Pacheco, Thorhildur Asgeirsdottir, Airi Lampinen, and Kristina Höök. 2023. Felt Ethics: Cultivating Ethical Sensibility in Design Practice. In Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Hamburg, Germany) (CHI '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 1, 15 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3580875
- [27] Eugene Gendlin. 1962. Experiencing and the creation of meaning. Free press of Glencoe New York.
- [28] E. Gendlin. 1978. Focusing. Bantam Books, New York, NY.
- [29] Eugene T Gendlin. 1978. Focusing. Random House Digital, Inc., New York, USA.
- [30] Eugene T Gendlin. 1982. Focusing. Bantam.
 [31] Eugene T Gendlin. 1996. Focusing-oriented psychotherapy: A manual of the experiential method. Guilford Press, New York, USA.
- [32] Elisa Giaccardi and Johan Redström. 2020. Technology and More-Than-Human Design. Vol. 36. Design Issues Autumn 2020.
- [33] Graham R Gibbs. 2008. Analysing qualitative data. Sage.
- [34] Amedeo Giorgi. 1975. An application of phenomenological method in psychology. Duquesne studies in phenomenological psychology 2 (1975), 82-103.
- [35] Kirsi Hakio and Tuuli Mattelmäki. 2023. Turning inwards for change The role of inner conditions in transformative co-design. *The Design Journal* 0, 0 (Aug. 2023), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/14606925.2023.2247272 Publisher: Routledge _eprint: https://doi.org/10.1080/14606925.2023.2247272.
- [36] Donna Haraway. 1984. A Cyborg Manifesto. Socialist Review (US) (1984).
- [37] Donna Haraway. 2016. Staying With The Trouble. Duke University Press, Durham and London.
- [38] N Katherine Hayles. 2002. Flesh and metal: Reconfiguring the mindbody in virtual environments. *Configurations* 10 (2002), 297–320. Issue 2.
- [39] Marion Hendricks. 2009. Experiencing level: An instance of developing a variable from a first person process so it can be reliably measured and taught. *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 16, 10-11 (2009), 129–155.
- [40] Sjoerd Hendriks, Simon Mare, Mafalda Gamboa, and Mehmet Aydin Baytas. 2021. Azalea: Co-experience in remote dialog through diminished reality and somaesthetic interaction design. *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - Proceedings.* https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445052
- [41] Kristina Höök. 2010. Transferring Qualities from Horseback Riding to Design. In Proceedings of the 6th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Extending Boundaries (Reykjavik, Iceland) (NordiCHI '10). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 226–235. https://doi.org/10.1145/1868914. 1868943
- [42] Edwin Hutchins. 1995. Cognition in the Wild. MIT press.
- [43] Kristina Höök. 2018. Designing with the Body: Somaesthetic Interaction Design. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA.
- [44] Kristina Höök, Steve Benford, Paul Tennent, Vasiliki Tsaknaki, Miquel Alfaras, Juan Martinez Avila, Christine Li, Joseph Marshall, Claudia Daudén Roquet, Pedro Sanches, Anna Ståhl, Muhammad Umair, Charles Windlin, and Feng Zhou. 2021. Unpacking Non-Dualistic Design: The Soma Design Case. ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction 28 (2021), 1–36. Issue 6. https: //doi.org/10.1145/3462448
- [45] Akira Ikemi. 2014. Sunflowers, sardines and responsive combodying: three perspectives on embodiment. *Person-Centered and Experiential Psychotherapies* 13 (2014), 19–30. Issue 1. https://doi.org/10.1080/14779757.2013.870924
- [46] Akira Ikemi and Shinya Kubota. 1996. Humanistic Psychologyaq in Japanese Corporations: Listening and the: Small Steps of Change. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 36, 1 (1996), 104–121.
- [47] Tim Ingold. 2020. Correspondences. John Wiley & Sons.
- [48] Alice Juel Jacobsen. 2014. Vignettes of interviews to enhance an ethnographic account. Ethnography and Education 9, 1 (Jan. 2014), 35-50. https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2013.828475 Publisher: Routledge _eprint: https://doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2013.828475.

DIS '24, July 01-05, 2024, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark

- [49] Gopinaath Kannabiran. 2023. Post-Post-HCI. Interactions 30, 1 (jan 2023), 19–21. https://doi.org/10.1145/3573207
- [50] Ozgun Kilic Afsar, Yoav Luft, Kelsey Cotton, Ekaterina R. Stepanova, Claudia Núñez Pacheco, Rebecca Kleinberger, Fehmi Ben Abdesslem, Hiroshi Ishii, and Kristina Höök. 2023. Corsetto: A Kinesthetic Garment for Designing, Composing for, and Experiencing an Intersubjective Haptic Voice. In Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Hamburg, Germany) (CHI '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 181, 23 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581294
- [51] David Michael Levin. 1994. Making sense: The work of Eugene Gendlin. Human Studies 17 (1994), 343–353. Issue 3. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01322974
- [52] Jen Liu, Daragh Byrne, and Laura Devendorf. 2018. Design for Collaborative Survival: An Inquiry into Human-Fungi Relationships. In Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '18). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 40:1–40:13. https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173614
- [53] Szu-Yu Liu, Shaowen Bardzell, and Jeffrey Bardzell. 2019. Symbiotic Encounters: HCI and Sustainable Agriculture. In Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '19). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 317:1–317:13. https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300547 event-place: Glasgow, Scotland Uk.
- [54] Szu-Yu (Cyn) Liu. 2021. Posthuman Interaction Design: Designing With, Through and For Human-Nature Interaction. Ph. D. Dissertation. Indiana University.
- [55] Szu-Yu (Cyn) Liu, Jen Liu, Kristin Dew, Patrycja Zdziarska, Maya Livio, and Shaowen Bardzell. 2019. Exploring Noticing as Method in Design Research. In Companion Publication of the 2019 on Designing Interactive Systems Conference 2019 Companion (San Diego, CA, USA) (DIS '19 Companion). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 377–380. https://doi.org/10.1145/ 3301019.3319995
- [56] Maya Livio and Laura Devendorf. 2022. The Eco-Technical Interface: Attuning to the Instrumental. In Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (New Orleans, LA, USA) (CHI '22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 101, 12 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3501851
- [57] Maya Livio, Jen Liu, Kristin Dew, SzuYu Liu, and Patrycja Zdziarska. 2019. Methods for Noticing.
- [58] Lian Loke and Claudia Núñez-Pacheco. 2018. Developing somatic sensibilities for practices of discernment in interaction design. *Senses and Society* 13 (2018), 219–231. Issue 2. https://doi.org/10.1080/17458927.2018.1468690
- [59] Alex Jiahong Lu, Shruti Sannon, Cameron Moy, Savana Brewer, Jaye Green, Kisha N Jackson, Daivon Reeder, Camaria Wafer, Mark S. Ackerman, and Tawanna R Dillahunt. 2023. Participatory Noticing through Photovoice: Engaging Arts- and Community-Based Approaches in Design Research. In Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference (Pittsburgh, PA, USA) (DIS '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2489–2508. https://doi.org/10.1145/3563657.3596041
- [60] Ellen Lupton and Andrea Lipps. 2018. The Senses: Design Beyond Vision. Chronicle Books.
- [61] Jonas Löwgren. 2013. Annotated portfolios and other forms of intermediate-level knowledge. *interactions* 20 (2013), 30–34. Issue 1.
- [62] Joe Marshall, Paul Tennent, Christine Li, Claudia Núñez Pacheco, Rachael Garrett, Vasiliki Tsaknaki, Kristina Höök, Praminda Caleb-Solly, and Steven David Benford. 2023. Collision Design. In Extended Abstracts of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (<conf-loc>, <city>Hamburg</city>, <country>Germany</country>, </conf-loc>) (CHI EA '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 411, 9 pages. https: //doi.org/10.1145/3544549.3582734
- [63] Daniel J. Metcalfe. 2015. Multispecies Design. phd. University of the Arts London and Falmouth University. https://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/id/eprint/13351/
- [64] Greg Nijs, Giulietta Laki, Rafaella Houlstan, Guillaume Slizewicz, and Thomas Laureyssens. 2020. Fostering More-than-Human Imaginaries: Introducing DIY Speculative Fabulation in Civic HCI. In Proceedings of the 11th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Shaping Experiences, Shaping Society (NordiCHI '20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–12. https: //doi.org/10.1145/3419249.3420147
- [65] Maria Normark, Anton Poikolainen Rosén, and Madeleine Bonow. 2021. Articulating and Negotiating Boundaries in Urban Farming Communities. In C&T '21: Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Communities & Technologies -Wicked Problems in the Age of Tech (C&T '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 296–308. https://doi.org/10.1145/3461564.3461565
- [66] Claudia Núñez-Pacheco. 2018. Designing aesthetic experiences from the body and felt-sense.
- [67] Claudia Núñez-Pacheco. 2018. Reflection through Inner Presence: A Sensitising Concept for Design. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction* 2 (2018), 5. Issue 1. https://doi.org/10.3390/mti2010005
- [68] Claudia Núñez-Pacheco. 2022. Dialoguing with Tangible Traces: A Method to Elicit Autoethnographic Narratives. In TEI '22: Sixteenth International Conference on Tangible, Embedded, and Embodied Interaction Proceedings. ACM, Daejeon, Republic of Korea, 1–14.

- [69] Claudia Núñez-Pacheco and Emma Frid. 2023. Sharing Earthquake Narratives: Making Space for Others in our Autobiographical Design Process. In Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. ACM, Hamburg Germany, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3580977
- [70] Claudia Núñez-Pacheco and Lian Loke. 2014. Crafting the body-tool: a bodycentred perspective on wearable technology. Proceedings of the 2014 conference on Designing interactive systems, 553–566.
- [71] Claudia Núñez-Pacheco and Lian Loke. 2017. Tacit Narratives: Surfacing aesthetic meaning by using wearable props and focusing. In TEI 2017 - Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Tangible, Embedded, and Embodied Interaction. ACM, Yokohama, Japan, 233–242. https://doi.org/10.1145/3024969.3024979
- [72] Claudia Núñez-Pacheco and Lian Loke. 2018. Towards a technique for articulating aesthetic experiences in design using Focusing and the Felt Sense. *Design Journal* 21 (2018), 583–603. Issue 4. https://doi.org/10.1080/14606925.2018. 1467680
- [73] Claudia Núñez-Pacheco and Lian Loke. 2018. Towards a technique for articulating aesthetic experiences in design using Focusing and the Felt Sense. *The Design Journal* 21 (7 2018), 583–603. Issue 4. https://doi.org/10.1080/14606925. 2018.1467680
- [74] Claudia Núñez-Pacheco and Lian Loke. 2022. Focusing for Interaction Design: An Introspective Somatic Method. In CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (New York, NY, USA). ACM, New Orleans, USA, 1–18. https: //doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3501978
- [75] Claudia Núñez-Pacheco and Lian Loke. 2022. Focusing for Interaction Design: An Introspective Somatic Method. In CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. ACM, New Orleans LA USA, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1145/ 3491102.3501978
- [76] Vanessa Machado de Oliveira. 2021. Hospicing Modernity: Facing Humanity's Wrongs and the Implications for Social Activism. North Atlantic Books. Google-Books-ID: MFeXzQEACAAJ.
- [77] Pauline Oliveros. 2005. Deep listening: A composer's sound practice. IUniverse.[78] Aneta Pavlenko. 2012. Affective processing in bilingual speakers: Disembodied
- [78] Aneta Favienko. 2012. Anetrive processing in biningual speakers: Disembodied cognition? International Journal of Psychology 47, 6 (2012), 405–428.
- [79] Claire Petitmengin. 2006. Describing one's subjective experience in the second person: An interview method for the science of consciousness. *Phenomenology* and the Cognitive Sciences 5, 3 (Dec. 2006), 229–269. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11097-006-9022-2
- [80] Claire Petitmengin. 2006. Describing one's subjective experience in the second person: An interview method for the science of consciousness. *Phenomenology* and the Cognitive Sciences 5 (2006), 229–269. Issue 3-4.
- [81] Claire Petitmengin. 2021. Anchoring in Lived Experience as an Act of Resistance. Constructivist Foundations 16, 2 (2021), 172–181.
- [82] Claire Petitmengin, Anne Remillieux, and Camila Valenzuela-Moguillansky. 2019. Discovering the structures of lived experience: Towards a microphenomenological analysis method. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 18 (2019). Issue 4. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-018-9597-4
- [83] Bruna Beatriz Petreca. 2016. An understanding of embodied textile selection processes & a toolkit to support them. Ph. D. Dissertation. Royal College of Art.
- [84] Anton Poikolainen Rosén. 2022. Noticing nature : exploring more-than-humancentred design in urban farming. (2022). https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn: nbn:se:umu:diva-199076 Publisher: Umeå University.
- [85] Anton Poikolainen Rosén. 2022. Relating to Soil: Chromatography as a Tool for Environmental Engagement. In *Designing Interactive Systems Conference (DIS* '22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1640–1653. https://doi.org/10.1145/3532106.3533503
- [86] Anton Poikolainen Rosén, Maria Normark, and Mikael Wiberg. 2022. Towards more-than-human-centred design : Learning from gardening. *International Journal of Design* 16, 3 (2022), 21–36. https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se: umu:diva-199159 Publisher: Chinese Institute of Design.
- [87] Michael Polanyi. 1967. The tacit dimension. Garden City, New York 217 (1967).
- [88] Serena Pollastri, Rupert Griffiths, Nick Dunn, Paul Cureton, Christopher Boyko, Adam Blaney, and Elisabeth De Bezenac. 2021. More-Than-Human Future Cities: From the design of nature to designing for and through nature. In *Media Architecture Biennale 20.* Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 23–30. http://doi.org/10.1145/3469410.3469413
- [89] Kristina Popova, Rachael Garrett, Claudia Núñez-Pacheco, Airi Lampinen, and Kristina Höök. 2022. Vulnerability as an ethical stance in soma design processes. In CHI '22: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, New Orleans, LA, USA, April 2022. ACM, New Orleans, USA, 1–13.
- [90] Mirjana Prpa, Sarah Fdili-Alaoui, Thecla Schiphorst, and Philippe Pasquier. 2020. Articulating Experience: Reflections from Experts Applying Micro-Phenomenology to Design Research in HCI. In Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376664

DIS '24, July 01-05, 2024, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark

//doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376664

- [92] Courtney N. Reed, Charlotte Nordmoen, Andrea Martelloni, Giacomo Lepri, Nicole Robson, Eevee Zayas-Garin, Kelsey Cotton, Lia Mice, and Andrew McPherson. 2022. Exploring Experiences with New Musical Instruments through Micro-phenomenology. In *NIME 2022*. PubPub, New Zealand, NA. https://nime.pubpub.org/pub/o7sza3sq.
- [93] Anton Poikolainen Rosén, Vasanth Madhav Kamath, and Gopinaath Kannabiran. 2023. A Soil Dialogue. *Interactions* 30, 4 (June 2023), 34–39. https://doi.org/10. 1145/3600016
- [94] Marco C Rozendaal, Boudewijn Boon, and Victor Kaptelinin. 2019. Objects with intent: Designing everyday things as collaborative partners. ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI) 26, 4 (2019), 1–33.
- [95] EB-N Sanders. 2000. Generative tools for co-designing. In Collaborative design: proceedings of codesigning 2000. Springer, 3-12.
- [96] Thecla Schiphorst. 2011. Self-evidence: applying somatic connoisseurship to experience design. CHI'11 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 145-160.
- [97] Hira Sheikh, Kavita Gonsalves, and Marcus Foth. 2021. Plant(e)tecture: Towards a Multispecies Media Architecture Framework for amplifying Plant Agencies. In Media Architecture Biennale 20. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 87–99. http://doi.org/10.1145/3469410.3469419
- [98] Terje Sparby, Mira Leass, Ulrich W Weger, and Friedrich Edelhäuser. 2023. Training naive subjects in using micro-phenomenological self-inquiry to investigate pain and suffering during headaches. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology* 64, 1 (2023), 60–70.
- [99] Ekaterina R Stepanova, Denise Quesnel, and Bernhard E Riecke. 2019. Understanding AWE: Can a virtual journey, inspired by the overview effect, lead to an increased sense of interconnectedness? *Frontiers in Digital Humanities* 6 (2019), 9
- [100] Anna Ståhl, Madeline Balaam, Rob Comber, Pedro Sanches, and Kristina Höök. 2022. Making New Worlds – Transformative Becomings with Soma Design. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3502018
- [101] Les Todres. 2007. Embodied enquiry: Phenomenological touchstones for research, psychotherapy and spirituality. Springer.
- [102] Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing. 2015. The Mushroom at the End of the World. In The Mushroom at the End of the World. Princeton University Press.

- [103] Jasmine B. Ulmer. 2017. Posthumanism as research methodology: inquiry in the Anthropocene. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education 30, 9 (2017), 832–848. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2017.1336806 arXiv:https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2017.1336806
- [104] F Varela, E Thompson, and E Rosch. 1991. The embodied mind. Cognitive Science and Human Experience. The MIT Press.
- [105] Emilija Veselova and Idil Gaziulusoy. 2021. When a tree is also a multispecies collective, a photosynthesis process and a carbon cycle: A systemic typology of natural nonhuman stakeholders when designing for sustainability. In Proceedings of Relating Systems Thinking and Design (RSD10) 2021 Symposium. Systemic Design Association, 25–35. https://research.aalto.fi/en/publications/when-atree-is-also-a-multispecies-collective-a-photosynthesis-pr
- [106] Ron Wakkary. 2021. Things We Could Design: For More Than Human-Centered Worlds. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA.
- [107] Katie Winkle, Donald McMillan, Maria Arnelid, Katherine Harrison, Madeline Balaam, Ericka Johnson, and Iolanda Leite. 2023. Feminist human-robot interaction: Disentangling power, principles and practice for better, more ethical HRI. In Proceedings of the 2023 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction. 72–82.
- [108] Nadia Campo Woytuk and Marie Louise Juul Søndergaard. 2022. Biomenstrual: More-than-Human Design of Menstrual Care Practices. *Temes de Disseny* 38 (July 2022), 116–131. https://doi.org/10.46467/TdD38.2022.116-131 Number: 38.
- [109] Peter Wright, Mark Blythe, and John McCarthy. 2006. User Experience and the Idea of Design in HCI. In *Interactive Systems. Design, Specification, and Verification,* Stephen W. Gilroy and Michael D. Harrison (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1–14.
- [110] Wei Xu. 2019. Toward human-centered AI: a perspective from human-computer interaction. interactions 26, 4 (2019), 42–46.
- [111] Jing Xue, Bruna Beatriz Petreca, Christopher Dawes, and Marianna Obrist. 2023. FabTouch: A Tool to Enable Communication and Design of Tactile and Affective Fabric Experiences. In Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Hamburg, Germany) (CHI '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 476, 16 pages. https: //doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581288
- [112] Heyu Yin, Yunteng Cao, Benedetto Marelli, Xiangqun Zeng, Andrew J. Mason, and Changyong Cao. 2021. Soil Sensors and Plant Wearables for Smart and Precision Agriculture. Advanced Materials 33, 20 (2021), 2007764. https://doi.org/10.1002/adma.202007764 _eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/adma.202007764.