Participatory Design Tutorial

Jesper Simonsen
Professor of Participatory Design
Director at Designing Human Technologies
Roskilde University

designinghumantechnologies.dk
Participation and mutual learning

- My traditional conceptualization (bachelor-level)
- My contemporary conceptualization (graduate-level)
Participatory Design
- a preliminary definition

“Participatory Design can be defined as a process of investigating, understanding, reflecting upon, establishing, developing, and supporting mutual learning between multiple participants in collective ‘reflection-in-action’ (Schön 1983). The participants typically undertake the two principle roles of users and designers where the designers strive to learn the realities of the users’ situation while the users strive to articulate their desired aims and learn appropriate technological means to obtain them.”

Mutual learning
- two principal roles

Domain expert (user)

Dialogue and mutual learning
Concrete exemplary knowledge
Sharing knowledge
Supported by tools and techniques
Open contact and authentic meeting

Techn. expert (designer)
6 knowledge areas

Drawing
Process model
Affinity diagram

Abstract knowledge
Users’ present work practices
Relevant descriptions of users’ present work practices
Abstract knowledge

Concrete experience
Concrete experience with the users’ present work practices
Concrete experience with the new IT usage

Diagnostic map

New IT usage
Visions and design proposals

Design workshop
Design game
Scenario

(Virtual map)

Technology options
Overview of technological options

1st hand knowledge
Ideal
Plan
Procedure

2nd & 3rd hand knowledge
Manifest
Situated action
Process

1st hand knowledge
Visits, usability lab
Own exp. with e.g. KM-systems

Thinking aloud

Prototyping
Pilot implementation

Observation

Interview

In-situ interview

Litterature review
Vendor demo

Orig. ref.: Kensing and Munk-Madsen, CACM., 36/4, 1993
Elaborated in a book on PD: Bødker et al., 2004
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Participation (PD-Handbook p. 5)

“Any user needs to participate willingly as a way of working both

▶ as themselves (respecting their individual and group’s/community’s genuine interests) and

▶ with themselves (being concentrated present in order to sense how they feel about an issue, being open towards reflections on their own opinions) as well as

▶ for the task and the project (contributing to the achievement of the shared and agreed-upon goals of the design task and design project at hand) (Storm Jensen 2002).”
Experiences and challenges

- Design as ‘emerging’ change
- Sustained PD: Extending the iterative approach (2 ways)
  Realization/implementation + ambition (think BIG)
- Formative real-use evaluation (design-in-use)
- The role of the users in sustained PD
Design as ‘emerging’ change

Design idea/vision → Iterative design → Design in use

Evaluation

Design Research, Routledge (2010), Figure 14.3, p. 207

(Orlikowski and Hofman, 1997)
Design as ‘emerging’ change

Traditional PD focus

Iterative design

Design idea/vision

Evaluation

Design in use

Typical technology evaluation (STS) focus

Sustained PD must embrace: +
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Evaluation method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated -realized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better overview of patients</td>
<td>Mental workload/TLX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better coordination</td>
<td>Counting # missing pieces of inf. &amp; messages to pass on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated -curtailed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved NIP recordings</td>
<td>Record audit (paper and EPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impr. med.-treatment/nursing plans</td>
<td>Rating scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From oral reporting to collective reading of EPR</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective investigation of the EPR</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunalty -based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing nursing observations during the team conference</td>
<td>Observation and focus-group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task list supporting coordination</td>
<td>Observation and focus-group interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Evaluation method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated-realized</td>
<td>Mental workload/TLX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better overview of patients</td>
<td>Counting # missing pieces of inf. &amp; messages to pass on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better coordination</td>
<td>Record audit (paper and EPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved med.-treatment/nursing plans</td>
<td>Rating scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative assessment &amp; documentation (PD weakness)</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated-curtailed</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved NIP recordings</td>
<td>Observation and focus-group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imper. med.-treatment/nursing plans</td>
<td>Observation and focus-group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From oral reporting to collective reading of EPR</td>
<td>Observation and focus-group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective investigations of the EPR</td>
<td>Observation and focus-group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative identification &amp; evaluation (PD strength)</td>
<td>Observation and focus-group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity-based</td>
<td>Observation and focus-group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of observations during the team conference</td>
<td>Observation and focus-group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task list supporting coordination</td>
<td>Observation and focus-group interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustained PD

- Sustained PD must embrace: +
- Local competences are pivotal to sustained PD (initiated by AR projects, Simonsen, 2009)
- PD must think BIG
  - Large scale technologies are highly configurable
    (Industrialized ISD - Bansler and Havn 1994; 1996)
  - Rapid development in global business logic standards (e.g. HL7, SNOMED-CT)
- PD must seek sustained influence (beyond research projects)
  - Short iterations, effective outcomes, quantitative measurements
  - Scaling and disseminating PD to public and private companies
Schön: The reflective Practitioner

Reflection-in-action
- or “situated learning” (Lave and Wenger 1991):

“The practitioner allows himself to experience surprise, puzzlement, or confusion in a situation which he finds uncertain or unique. He reflects on the phenomenon before him, and on the prior understandings which have been implicit in his behaviour. He carries out an experiment which serves to generate both a new understanding of the phenomenon and a change in the situation” (Schön, 1983, p. 68).

Petra’s and Clara’s drawings (Schön 1992)
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