

Designing for Sustainable Development: a case study of takeaway culture in Serbia

Dragan Čalović

Faculty of Contemporary Arts, Belgrade, Serbia

ORCID: 0000-0003-1072-3256, e-mail: calovicdragan@gmail.com

DOI: 10.14595/CP/03/001

Abstract: Since contemporary culture, in its diversity of forms, includes special forms of design, the analysis of connections between design and different patterns of life is imposed as one of the important tasks of theoretical thinking. Due to its involvement in everyday practices, and a certain permeation with life activities and processes, but also due to a specific connection to daily visions of life, designing is not *just* an artistic activity, but also the activity that changes / creates our patterns of life. In its analysis, the author uses the capability approach. Within this approach, development is seen as the expansion of human capability to lead more worthwhile and more free lives (Sen, 1999). This approach makes a clear distinction between what people are free to do to improve their well-being ('capabilities') and what they actually choose to do ('functioning'). Therefore, to understand and improve design (and our lives), we should understand and improve our choices. The author analyses the connections between the choices and designing for sustainable development. Our assumption is that design, in order to be responsible, must offer opportunities that lead to expected and (yet) unsuspected choices with a long-term justification, regardless of the short-term utilitarian nature of such choices. The aim of this analysis is to determine the degree of variety of the offered possibilities and the causal connection between the offered possibilities and choices, i.e. the perception of the offered choices and their understanding. This is a preliminary analysis done on a smaller representative sample with a focus on design of the machines and the process of offering drinks to go and takeaway food.

Key words: CAPABILITY APPROACH, CRITICAL THEORY, DESIGN, DEVELOPMENT, POPULAR CULTURE, SUSTAINABILITY, THEORY OF ART.

JEL: Q01, Q50, O14, O31, D91, D70

Introduction

Fast paced life, in the most economically developed societies, leads to the development of habits that, among other things, include more intensive use of machines and services that offer food and drinks to go. In the Republic of Serbia, this tendency has been especially intensified during the recent years. Currently, there is almost no higher education institution in which vending machines and devices for various soft drinks are not installed, and the situation is similar in many high schools, as well as in companies of different profiles. In addition, measures introduced to prevent the spread of the covid-19 pandemic over the past two years have intensified the practice of getting hot drinks to go, as well as the use of food delivery services. Until 2000, fast food restaurants were mostly of the traditional type, offering food in simple packaging (mostly paper packaging) and very rarely offering tap drinks in non-reusable packaging. Since the 2000s, there has been a tendency

for Western-style fast food restaurants to grow (regardless of whether they are foreign or domestic franchises), and in the last five years there has been an intensive growth of express restaurants offering cooked meals to take away. The growth of these services significantly intensifies the growth of packaging waste, contributing to negative tendencies that disrupt environmental stability. Despite a certain increase in environmental awareness among Serbian citizens, the degree of choice, or acknowledgement of alternatives when using these services, has been recognized as an important limiting factor in overcoming growing environmental problems. In the following text, the degree of choice is observed in direct relation to the development of responsible design.

Theoretical premises

Global communities are faced with escalating challenges to our eco system, which force us to re-think the choices we make. But our choices are always connected to the possibilities we have. Some of those are possibilities defined by design solutions. It means that we should start rethinking choices in connection to design. For that, we need a new approach to design. Heskett defined design as 'the human capacity to shape and make our environment in ways without precedent in nature, to serve our needs and give meaning to our lives' (Heskett, 2005). According to Thackara, many of the troubling situations in our world are the result of design decisions (Thackara, 2005). This is why designers should be sensitive to context, relationships and consequences (Thackara, 2005). Besides, we should also look at educational dimension of design. Through design we accept new patterns of life, we develop new choices and new forms of behavior. Designers learn to see the world from the point of view of their target-users, and to understand their motivations and aspirations. But they should also be pioneers, able to reimagine world, to force more responsible behavior and to support choices that are socially, ecologically and economically sustainable. Designers have the possibility to induce positive changes, but to do this they have to change their point of view. They have to reimagine their role, to think about solutions not just in order to make processes and services easier and more efficient, but above all, more responsible.

Methodology

In this analysis, we will use the capability approach. Explained by I. Robeyns, the capability approach is a broad normative framework for the evaluation and assessment of individual well-being and social arrangements (Robeyns, 2005). This approach is most prominently used in welfare studies and political philosophy. The core characteristic of this approach is its focus on people's capability. In its present form, the approach has been pioneered by Amartya Sen and further developed by Martha Nussbaum and other scholars. The important presumption of this approach is that people have the freedoms or valuable opportunities (capabilities) to lead the kind of lives they want to lead, and that once they effectively have these opportunities, they can choose the options that they value most (Robeyns, 2005).

Our assumption is that design, in order to be responsible, must offer opportunities that lead to expected and (yet) unsuspected choices with a long-term justification, regardless of the short-term utilitarian nature of such choices. The aim of this analysis is to determine the degree of variety of the offered possibilities and the causal connection between the offered possibilities and choices, i.e. the perception of the offered choices and their understanding. This is a preliminary analysis done on a smaller representative sample with a focus on design of the machines and the process of offering drinks to go and takeaway food.

For the purposes of the research, a questionnaire containing 55 questions was compiled, including 12 control questions with the primary goal of disqualifying incoherent answers. The survey involved 250 respondents, students (133 respondents – 53.2 %) and employees (117 respondents – 46.8 %) of young and middle age (from 25 to 50 years of age). Gender is not emphasized as important for the needs of the research, but in the structure of the respondents it was taken into account that 50% are female and 50% are male. All respondents, according to the average monthly expenses, belong to the middle and middle-upper financially influential group. The selection of the structure of the respondents was made on the basis of the assumption that the members of this group participate the most in the use of the surveyed services. The survey was conducted in the Republic of Serbia on the territory of the city of Belgrade, during January and February 2022.

Results

A total of 250 respondents participated in the survey, of which 233 questionnaires were considered, based on the analysis of control questions. Control questions are not shown in the table.

Table 1. Survey results

qs	QUESTION	
	ANSWER	RESULTS percentage of users (number of respondents) <i>percentage of respondents</i>
q1	How many times a week, at least once a day, do you buy takeaway food at fast food restaurants or express restaurants?	
	0	6 (14) 6
	1	12.87 (30) 12.87
	2	15.88 (37) 15.88
	3	18.45 (43) 18.45
	4	15.45 (36) 15.45
	5	12.02 (28) 12.02
	6	9.01 (21) 9.01
q1.1	Do you pick up food in your own container?	
	always	0 (0) 0
	never	88.58 (194) 83.26
	rare (up to 10% of cases)	3.65 (8) 3.43
	sometimes (11-30% of cases)	7.76 (17) 7.30
	moderately commonly (31-60% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	often (61-99% of cases)	0 (0) 0
q1.2	What is the reason you do not pick up food (more often) in your own container?	
	the food dispensing process does not provide that possibility	72.15 (158) 67.82
	it is simpler than carrying my own container	27.85 (61) 26.12
q1.2.1	Does the choice of ecological materials for the production of packaging in which the purchased food is packed influence the decision whether to buy it?	
	yes	3.65 (8) 3.43
	no	69.35 (211) 90.56
q1.2.2	Do you pick up food in returnable containers?	
	always	0 (0) 0
	never	100 (219) 93.99

**Proceedings of the 2022 IX International Scientific Conference Determinants
of Regional Development, No 3, Pila 27 - 28 October 2022**

	rare (up to 10% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	sometimes (11-30% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	moderately commonly (31-60% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	often (61-99% of cases)	0 (0) 0
q1.2.3	What is the reason you do not pick up food (more often) in returnable containers?	
	there is no such possibility	100 (219) 93.99
	such possibility is offered very rarely	0 (0) 0
	returnable containers from different manufacturers are not standardized, which makes their use difficult	0 (0) 0
	it is easier to use non-returnable container even though returnable is offered	0 (0) 0
	it is easier to pay for non-returnable container than to carry returnable one with me	0 (0) 0
q1.3.1	If this service allowed it, would you use your own and/or returnable container?	
	yes	36.07 (79) 33.91
	yes, but only in exceptional situations	16.44 (36) 15.45
	I don't know, I haven't thought about it	38.81 (85) 36.48
	no, I would continue to use non-returnable containers	8.68 (19) 8.15
q1.3.2	If you had to use your own or returnable container, how would that affect your decision to use this service?	
	it would not, I would continue to use this service	81.74 (179) 76.82
	I would avoid using this service	15.98 (35) 15.02
	I would not use this service	2.28 (5) 2.15
q2	How many times a week, at least once a day, do you get water from a machine installed in a public space?	
	0	7.72 (18) 7.73
	1	0.86 (2) 0.86
	2	4.72 (11) 4.72
	3	28.75 (67) 28.76
	4	39.48 (92) 39.48
	5	6.0 (14) 6.00
	6	1.29 (3) 1.29
	7	11.16 (26) 11.16
q2.1	Do you use your own container to take water?	
	always	13.02 (28) 12.02
	never	77.67 (167) 71.67
	rarely (up to 10% of cases)	6.51 (14) 6.00
	sometimes (11-30% of cases)	2.79 (6) 2.57
	moderately commonly (31-60% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	often (61-99% of cases)	0 (0) 0
q2.2	What is the reason you do not use (more often) your own container for taking water?	

**Proceedings of the 2022 IX International Scientific Conference Determinants
of Regional Development, No 3, Pila 27 - 28 October 2022**

	the machine does not provide such a possibility	1.07 (2) 0.86
	it is simpler than carrying my own container	98.93 (185) 79.40
q2.2.1	Does the choice of ecological materials for making cups that the machine offers influence the decision whether you use it?	
	yes	2.14 (4) 1.72
	no	97.86 (183) 78.54
q2.2.2	Do you take water from machines that use reusable cups?	
	always	0 (0) 0
	never	100 (187) 80.26
	rarely (up to 10% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	sometimes (11-30% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	moderately commonly (31-60% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	often (61-99% of cases)	0 (0) 0
q2.2.3	What is the reason you do not take water (more often) from machines that use reusable cups?	
	there is no such a possibility	100 (187) 80.26
	such a possibility is offered very rarely	0 (0) 0
	not hygienic	0 (0) 0
	it is easier to use non-reusable cups	0 (0) 0
q2.3.1	If a service allowed it, would you use returnable containers?	
	yes	51.34 (96) 41.20
	yes, but only in exceptional situations	6.95 (13) 5.58
	I don't know, I haven't thought about it	27.81 (52) 22.32
	no, I would continue to use non-returnable containers	13.90 (26) 11.16
q2.3.2	If you had to use your own or returnable container, how would that affect your decision to use a service?	
	It would not, I would continue to use this service	79.14 (148) 63.52
	I would avoid using this service	14.44 (27) 11.59
	I would not use this service	6.42 (12) 5.15
q3	How many times a week, at least once a day, do you get hot drinks / coffee, tea, hot chocolate, etc. / from a machine installed in a public space?	
	0	0 (0) 0
	1	1.29 (3) 1.29
	2	5.15 (12) 5.15
	3	16.31 (38) 16.31
	4	71.67 (167) 71.68
	5	4.72 (11) 4.72
	6	0.86 (2) 0.86
	7	0 (0) 0
q3.1	Do you use your own container for hot drinks?	

**Proceedings of the 2022 IX International Scientific Conference Determinants
of Regional Development, No 3, Pila 27 - 28 October 2022**

	always	0 (0) 0
	never	100 (233) 100
	rarely (up to 10% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	sometimes (11-30% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	moderately commonly (31-60% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	often (61-99% of cases)	0 (0) 0
q3.2	What is the reason you do not use (more often) your own container to take hot drinks to go?	
	the machine does not provide such a possibility	100 (233) 100
	it is simpler than carrying my own container	0 (0) 0
q3.2.1	Does the choice of ecological materials for making cups that the machine offers influence the decision whether to use it?	
	yes	10.3 (24) 10.30
	no	89.7 (209) 89.70
q3.2.2	Do you get hot drinks from machines that use reusable cups?	
	always	0 (0) 0
	never	100 (233) 100
	rarely (up to 10% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	sometimes (11-30% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	moderately commonly (31-60% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	often (61-99% of cases)	0 (0) 0
q3.2.3	What is the reason you do not take hot drinks (more often) from machines that use reusable cups?	
	there is no such possibility	93.13 (217) 93.13
	such a possibility is offered very rarely	0 (0) 0
	not hygienic	6.87 (16) 6.87
	it is easier to use non-reusable cups	0 (0) 0
q3.3.1	If a service allowed it, would you use returnable containers?	
	yes	52.79 (123) 52.79
	yes, but only in exceptional situations	3.00 (7) 3.00
	I don't know, I haven't thought about it	30.90 (72) 30.90
	no, I would continue to use non-returnable containers	13.30 (31) 13.30
q3.3.2	If you had to use your own or returnable container, how would that affect your decision to use a service?	
	it would not, I would continue to use this service	82.40 (192) 82.40
	I would avoid using this service	8.15 (19) 8.15
	I would not use this service	9.44 (22) 9.44
q4	How many times a week, at least once a day, do you use cutlery to consume takeaway food (purchased at fast food restaurants or express restaurants or those you bring from home)?	
	0	19.74 (46) 19.74

**Proceedings of the 2022 IX International Scientific Conference Determinants
of Regional Development, No 3, Pila 27 - 28 October 2022**

	1	7.72 (18) 7.72
	2	2.57 (6) 2.58
	3	28.75 (67) 28.76
	4	39.48 (92) 39.48
	5	1.72 (4) 1.72
	6	0 (0) 0
	7	0 (0) 0
q4.1	Do you use reusable cutlery to consume takeaway food?	
	always	28.34 (53) 22.75
	never	65.24 (122) 52.36
	rarely (up to 10% of cases)	6.42 (12) 5.15
	sometimes (11-30% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	moderately commonly (31-60% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	often (61-99% of cases)	0 (0) 0
q4.2.1	Does the choice of ecological materials for making cutlery that you get with the food you buy influence the decision whether you will buy that food?	
	yes	4.48 (6) 2.58
	no	95.52 (128) 54.94
q5	How many times a week, at least once a day, do you drink a juice from a machine that is installed in a public space or in fast food restaurants?	
	0	16.31 (38) 16.31
	1	3.0 (7) 3.00
	2	12.02 (28) 12.02
	3	48.07 (112) 48.07
	4	11.16 (26) 11.16
	5	5.58 (13) 5.58
	6	0 (0) 0
	7	3.86 (9) 3.86
q5.1	Do you use your own container to get tap juice?	
	always	10.77 (21) 9.01
	never	85.64 (167) 71.67
	rarely (up to 10% of cases)	1.54 (3) 1.29
	sometimes (11-30% of cases)	2.05 (4) 1.72
	moderately commonly (31-60% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	often (61-99% of cases)	0 (0) 0
q5.2	What is the reason you do not use your own container (more often) to drink tap juice?	
	there is no such possibility	4.02 (7) 3.00
	it is simpler than carrying my own container	95.98 (167) 71.68
q5.2.1	Does the choice of ecological materials for making cups that the machine offers influence the decision whether to take a juice?	
	yes	13.70 (24) 10.30

**Proceedings of the 2022 IX International Scientific Conference Determinants
of Regional Development, No 3, Pila 27 - 28 October 2022**

	no	86.21 (150) 64.38
q5.2.2	Do you get juice from machines that use reusable cups?	
	always	0 (0) 0
	never	100 (174) 74.68
	rarely (up to 10% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	sometimes (11-30% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	moderately commonly (31-60% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	often (61-99% of cases)	0 (0) 0
q5.2.3	What is the reason you do not take juice (more often) from machines that use reusable cups?	
	there is no such possibility	90.8 (158) 67.81
	such a possibility is offered very rarely	0 (0) 0
	not hygienic	9.2 (16) 6.87
	it is easier to use non-reusable cups	0 (0) 0
q5.3.1	If a service allowed it, would you use reusable containers?	
	yes	18.46 (36) 15.45
	yes, but only in exceptional situations	12.30 (24) 10.30
	I don't know, I haven't thought about it	61.03 (119) 51.07
	no, I would continue to use non-returnable containers	8.20 (16) 6.87
q5.3.2	If you had to use your own or reusable container, how would that affect your decision to use this service?	
	it would not, I would continue to use this service	81.03 (158) 67.81
	I would avoid using this service	10.77 (21) 9.01
	I would not use this service	8.20 (16) 6.87
q6	How many times a week, at least once a day, in one of the cafes do you take hot drinks to go /coffee, tea, hot chocolate/?	
	0	0 (0) 0
	1	29.18 (68) 29.18
	2	7.72 (18) 7.72
	3	31.76 (74) 31.76
	4	22.32 (52) 22.32
	5	5.58 (13) 5.58
	6	0.43 (1) 0.43
	7	3.0 (7) 3.00
q6.1	Do you use your own container for hot drinks to go?	
	always	0 (0) 0
	never	87.98 (205) 87.98
	rarely (up to 10% of cases)	12.02 (28) 12.02
	sometimes (11-30% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	moderately commonly (31-60% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	often (61-99% of cases)	0 (0) 0

**Proceedings of the 2022 IX International Scientific Conference Determinants
of Regional Development, No 3, Pila 27 - 28 October 2022**

q6.2	What is the reason you do not use (more often) your own container to take hot drinks to go?	
	there is no such possibility	76.82 (179) 76.82
	it is simpler than carrying my own container	23.18 (54) 23.18
q6.2.1	Does the choice of ecological materials for making cups that cafe offers influence the decision whether to use their service?	
	yes	15.88 (37) 15.88
	no	84.12 (196) 84.12
q6.2.2	Do you get hot drinks in returnable containers?	
	always	0 (0) 0
	never	100 (233) 100
	rarely (up to 10% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	sometimes (11-30% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	moderately commonly (31-60% of cases)	0 (0) 0
	often (61-99% of cases)	0 (0) 0
q6.2.3	What is the reason you do not take hot drinks (more often) in returnable containers?	
	there is no such possibility	100 (233) 100
	such a possibility is offered very rarely	0 (0) 0
	the returnable containers of different cafes are not standardized, which makes their use difficult	0 (0) 0
	it is easier to use non-returnable container even though returnable is offered	0 (0) 0
	it is easier to pay for non-returnable container than to carry a returnable one with me	0 (0) 0
q6.3.1	If a service allowed it, would you use (more often) your own or returnable containers?	
	yes	34.76 (81) 34.76
	yes, but only in exceptional situations	15.88 (37) 15.88
	I don't know, I haven't thought about it	20.60 (48) 20.60
	no, I would continue to use non-returnable containers	28.75 (67) 28.75
q6.3.2	If you had to use your own or returnable container, how would that affect your decision to use a service?	
	it would not, I would continue to use this service	67.81 (158) 67.81
	I would avoid using this service	26.60 (62) 26.60
	I would not use this service	5.58 (13) 5.58

Source: own study.

The analysis of the obtained answers indicates that the majority of respondents use food and beverage services at least once a week. Only 6% of respondents answered that they do not use these services, while 7.72% of respondents do not use water from machines, and 16.31% of respondents do not purchase tap juice, which indicates the relative

prevalence of this form of behavior. This observation is supported by a noticeable percentage of those who use services of this type on a daily basis ($q_1 = 10.3$, $q_2 = 11.16$, $q_5 = 3.86$, $q_6 = 3.0$), and a pronounced percentage of those who moderately regularly (2-3 times), or regularly (4-6 times) use such services ($q_1 = 34.33 / 36.48$, $q_2 = 33.47 / 46.77$, $q_3 = 21.46 / 77.25$, $q_5 = 60.09 / 16.74$, $q_6 = 39.48 / 28.33$). The results obtained in this way indicate that the selection of respondents is proper, in other words, that it is a representative group on the basis of whose answers it is possible to better understand the choices that accompany the observed forms of behavior.

The choice to use their own container for taking food and drinks to go ($q_{1/2/3/5/6 .1}$) is made by a significantly small share. The answer "always" was given by a relatively small number of respondents, and only in the categories of getting water and juice from machines ($q_{2.1} = 13.02$ and $q_{5.1} = 10.77$). Close values manifest the connection of the type of choice, where those who always use their container for getting water from machines most often use their container for getting tap juice. On the other hand, the number of people choosing to never use their own container is very pronounced, where this value is 100% when getting hot drinks from machines. The value of $q_{3.1}$ is directly related to the value of $q_{3.2}$, and in relation to the answers $q_{2.1}$ and $q_{5.1}$, suggests that those who use their container to get water and juices from machines would use their container to take hot drinks too, but do not do so because of the very design of the machines, which does not allow it. This is supported by the result that 12.02% of respondents use their container for hot drinks in cafes (the decision to *rarely use this option* is explained by the structure of the answer $q_{6.2}$, i.e. by the rare possibility of making this choice). However, based on this answer, we conclude that a number of respondents have a developed tendency to use their own container even to get hot drinks. It is important to note that those who choose to use their own container for drinks to go, do not make such a choice when taking takeaway food ($q_{1.1}$), which suggests that they do not make such a choice due to the inability to use their container in such situations (relation $q_{1.2}$ and $q_{4.1}$).

The results of the choice to use reusable containers shows that none of the respondents make this choice ($q_{X2.2} = 100$). The analysis of the answers ($q_{X2.3}$ in relation to $q_{2.1}$ and $q_{5.1}$) suggests that such a choice would probably be made by some respondents if such a possibility were enabled.

The use of environmental materials has relatively little influence on the decision to use the offered services (qX.2.1), with an average value of 8.36%. The relation between q2.1 and q5.1 to q2.2.1 and q5.2.1 in some ways mitigates the registered low percentage of those whose choice is influenced by the use of materials for making cups, since those who always use their containers when getting water and tap juice from a machine avoid the use of non-organic packaging offered by the machine. In the analysis of this type of question, a significant deviation in the choice depending on the type of service is noticeable. The use of non-ecological packaging has the least negative impact on the decision to use the service in cases of taking food to go (q1.2.1 = 3.65 and q4.2.1 = 4.48), as well as in the case of getting water from a machine (q2.2.1 = 2.14), while the influence of this factor is much more pronounced in the choice of using machines for hot drinks (q3.2.1 = 10.3), tap juice (q5.2.1 = 13.70) and hot drinks to go offered in cafes (q6.2.1 = 15.88). A comparison of the relation between q3.2.1 and q6.2.1 with q3.1 and q6.1 in relation to q2.1 and q5.1 indicates that those who would use their own container in a specific situation, but are not able to do so, adjust their choice by the possibility to use ecological materials. Interestingly, this influence is most pronounced in the use of tap juice (relations q5.2.1 and q5.1), which is explained by the influence of additional factors on the choice of juice consumption.

A comparison of the values of qX.1-b with qX.2-a and qX.2-b, as well as qX.2.2-b with qX.2.3-a indicates that in addition to a large number of respondents who in their choice were primarily guided by comfort in execution of the service (qX.2-b), there is a significant number of those who explain their decision by the lack of possibilities (qX.2-a). Although it cannot be assumed that the introduction of such a possibility would automatically mean its influence on decision-making, it is reasonable to assume that it would influence the reconsideration of choice. Furthermore, a comparison of the values qX.2-a and qX.2.3-a with qX.3.1-a and qX.3.2-a (where X=1,2,3,5,6), with the exception of q2.2-a, q5.2-a and q5.3.1-a, indicates that design that does not offer the possibility of choice that supports environmentally sustainable behavior can be recognized as a factor that psychologically justifies or strengthens irresponsible choices. This is further supported by the comparison of the values qX.2-a and qX.2.3-a with qX.3.1-a and qX.3.1-c (where X=1,2,3,5,6), with the exception of q2.2-a and q5.2-a, which indicates that alternative choices were not taken into account due to already existing technical limitations.

Finally, results of the values $q_{X.3.1-a}$ (where $X=1,2,3,5,6$) indicate that a change in the design of certain machines and processes would have a positive effect on increasing the percentage of environmentally responsible choices, while results of the values $q_{X.3.2-c}$ (where $X=1,2,3,5,6$) shows that such a change in the design of certain machines and processes would not significantly influence the abandonment of these services.

Summary, recommendations

The growth of services that offer food and drink to go go in Serbia has negatively affected the ecological stability by increasing the packaging waste. The text presents the results of a preliminary survey, conducted to examine the relationship between the options offered to the users of these services and the choices made by them in relation to their current opinion on increasing packaging waste. The research did not include the measurement of attitudes regarding the preservation of environmental stability, but the focus was on the analysis of choices in the forms of behavior related to the problem. The assumption I started from is that these choices are conditioned by multiple factors, of which the offered possibilities, related to these processes, play an important role. Analysis was focused on a connection between design solutions and forms of behavior. In this sense, the educational function of design is emphasized. Namely, design that does not offer the possibility of choice that supports environmentally sustainable behavior is recognized as a factor that psychologically justifies or strengthens irresponsible choices. The results of the research showed that the environmental commitment is sufficiently strongly developed in a smaller number of respondents, influencing their choices to a limited scope. In most cases, alternative choices were not taken into account, which was explained by technical limitations. This leads us to an assumption that different choices would be considered in the changed circumstances. A group of questions examining potential choices in changed circumstances indicates that a change in the design of certain machines and processes would have a positive effect on increasing the percentage of environmentally responsible choices, and that such a change would not significantly influence the abandonment of these services.

Although design should not be understood as the only factor influencing the type of choice, changes in this domain would provide a prerequisite for the development of environmentally responsible choices without significant potential withdrawal from the

use of services offered. One of the conditions for understanding a design as responsible is to offer responsible choices. In this case, it means the development of those solutions that will encourage the use of their own containers in the use of food and drinks to go. Such a design approach would be in line with the growing campaigns to increase environmental awareness, which in turn would potentially contribute positively to its acceptance.

References

- HESKETT, J. (2005). *Design: A very short introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press
- ROBEYNS, I. (2005). The Capability Approach: a theoretical survey, *Journal of Human Development*, No 6:1, 93-117.
- SEN, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- THACKARA, J. (2005). *In the bubble: Designing in a complex world*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.