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Introduction

Everyone wants to participate

Oswald Devisch, Liesbeth Huybrechts, Roel De Ridder and Sarah Martens

Ever since the turn of the millennium, countries all over Europe are increasingly witnessing situations in which citizens are demanding a more direct form of democracy, ranging from a cry for more information, to being involved in actual decision-making procedures, or simply taking the autonomy to self-organize. At the same time, governments of these countries are gradually putting citizen participation at the centre of their policy objectives, striving for more transparency, the co-production of public projects, or the empowerment of communities to self-organize and take up part of the decision power. In short, there is a loud and clear call for participation, voiced by both citizens and policymakers.

In practice, however, these voices hardly ever seem to reinforce one another, as they typically back up diverging agendas. For instance, for some citizens, participation implies giving a voice to marginalized groups, whereas for others it is a NIMBY (Not In My Backyard) tool to safeguard their particular privileges. For some policymakers participation is synonymous with a more direct form of democracy, whereas others only invest in it to create public support for policy that was outlined beforehand, or they promote self-organization as an excuse to outsource public services to the civil society. This variety of interpretations of the concept of participation nurtures a vivid, but also a little focused debate. Therefore, this book aims to critically unpack the concept of participation, both in theory and in practice. A good starting point to do this is to go back to one of the most cited texts in Participatory Design, being Sherry Arnstein’s *A ladder of citizen participation* in which she defines participation as ‘the redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future’.

In this article, Arnstein analyses the relation between decision making and citizen participation in the United States in the sixties. She introduces the figure of a ladder to illustrate how those in power continuously find
ways to regain the power that they redistribute via participatory processes, resulting in an endless moving up and down the ladder of citizen participation. Today, this ladder figure is more relevant than ever. The loud and clear call for (more) participation increases the amount of traffic up and down the ladder, with more groups, a bigger diversity of groups, jumping higher on the ladder, and experiencing bigger falls.

The aim of this book is to make this traffic visible or ‘to make public’ this continuous redistribution of power (Arnstein, 1967). The book explicitly focuses on the political nature of participation, based on the conviction that participation implies that marginalized aspirations and needs are made visible and audible and lead to a renewed reflection over the public interest (De Bie et al., 2012). We link this political meaning of participation to what Latour (2005a, 31) calls ‘to make things public’, and follow his argument that this requires a multitude of architectures, technologies of speech, sets of procedures, definitions of freedom and domination, ways of bringing together those who are concerned – and even more important those who are not concerned – and what concerns them, and ways to obtain closure and come to a decision.

This book specifically discusses the role that technology and social media (can) play in the (participatory) design of this multitude. With technology we refer to analogue artefacts such as scale models, maps, prototypes and artistic interventions, as well as to digital objects such as games, soundscapes and geo-apps. With social media we refer to digital applications supporting posting, sharing, commenting and rating. The question that returns in all the book chapters is how technology and social media can support (marginalized or dis-empowered) citizens to co-design this ‘multitude’ of objects (such as technology and social media) to bring people together, in order to initiate participatory processes. How it can help them to sustain participatory processes, to diversify them, and to open them up.

This introduction first presents a critical engagement with the discourse on participation in order to avoid framing it as a mere tool or romanticizing it as the ultimate goal. It then turns to Actor Network Theory, of which Latour is one of the central protagonists, in order to discuss the role of objects (such as technology and social media) in making public the dynamic of participatory processes. This introduction then situates Participatory Design as a discipline that focuses on the design of and the experimentation with these objects. The introduction ends with a summary of the 16 articles of this book in order to illustrate the diversity of design strategies that the authors present as to how the participatory design of (and with) technology and social media can help to keep focus on the political nature of participatory processes.
Crafting civic engagement

Arnstein’s ladder figure makes clear how the diverging agendas of citizens and policymakers result in ‘significant gradations of citizen participation’ (1967, 217). In all, she defines eight levels of participation, with manipulation at the bottom and citizen control at the top of the ladder. After which she stresses that this ladder is obviously a simplification conceived ‘to understand the increasingly strident demands for participation from the have-nots as well as the gamut of confusing responses from the powerholders’. Arnstein also points at a second limitation of the ladder, namely that the have-nots and powerholders are not homogeneous blocs, but instead ‘encompass a host of divergent points of view, significant cleavages, competing vested interests, and splintered subgroups’ (1967, 217). In other words, also among citizens there is a continuous need for the redistribution of power. This makes Arnstein conceptualize citizen participation as a dynamic process, during which groups continuously change composition and position, at one moment moving down, and the next one moving up the ladder.

The central argument of this book is therefore that the ultimate ambition of a participatory process should not be to help groups reach the highest rung of the ladder (citizen control), but to instead let as many (sub)groups take part in the ladder traffic; to focus on keeping things moving (up and down the rungs). Defined as such, participation is not about a local authority organizing a one-off event asking citizens for advice on a policy proposal, or about a collective of (self-organized) citizens running a community garden, but instead about a never-ending process of making public new marginalized aspirations and needs (De Bie et al., 2012).

Hurenkamp et al. (2012, 143) argue how

It is not only at the polling station, but also in the workplace, in schools, at the market, and at the dinner table that they make up their mind about who is in and who is out. And it is not a permanent idea that they develop, but a meandering concept of what it takes to let other citizens be part of their communities.

They write how people feel ineffective and helpless in truly discussing these matters, hindered by differences in terms of money, power and culture, but also by large organizations and bureaucracies ‘that tell them when to work and when to take holidays, how to be happy and how to complain’. This makes them conclude that

Skills are required to make public-spirited dialog out of musings at the kitchen table or among a homogenous sports team. These skills are best summarized in terms of craftsmanship. One thinks, for instance, of patience, flexibility, and dealing with resistance in a flexible manner, but also tolerance, respect, and good judgment.

(Hurenkamp et al., 2012, 143)
They conclude that the development of these skills, and the performance of this craft, requires blood, sweat and tears; from both citizens and policymakers.

‘Making things public’

In Politics of Nature (Latour, 2004), Acting in an Uncertain World (Callon et al., 2009) and especially Making Things Public (Latour and Weibel, 2005), Latour, Callon and others hint towards the possible role of non-humans within participatory processes. Latour (2005a), for instance, writes ‘Who could dream of a better example of hybrid forums than the scale models used by architects all over the world to assemble those able to build them at scale 1?’ In this sentence Latour takes into account the agency of the designer/model builder to speed up the protocol for dealing with the prevailing issue. Michel Callon (2005), on the other hand, seems to have less faith in objects as such to tackle the issues people are confronted with. In his contribution to Making Things Public he talks about lay people who ‘have no particular competence for treating [issues] but by becoming concerned, transform their incompetence into strength’ (ibid., 31). According to Callon (ibid.), it is because ‘nobody is able to provide [concerned groups] with such equipment’ – that is, socio-cognitive prostheses that would be instrumental to name the issues and to conceive of solutions – ‘this situation of weakness could be transformed into a position of strength by becoming the best experts on the problems they and other groups face’. For Callon, it is actually the lack of appropriate tools that sparks a new research collective into being. He doesn’t state that objects do not have a role once the research collective has started. However, he underlines the role of laymen in exploring these objects. For Callon, within a hybrid forum, laymen become the best experts, since they fiddle with technology and media, just like the scientists in Latour’s early work.

Actor Network Theory (ANT) thus appears to us as a frame that takes objects seriously, within political/deliberative processes. For ANT what a thing ‘does’ is more important than what a thing ‘is’. What a thing ‘does’ – its performance – is the manifestation of a network of humans and non-humans and between humans and non-humans there is no a-priori divide (Latour, 1993). Actor Network Theory reached adulthood in the 1980s as a way to describe how science works, and, gradually, how every other ‘making of’ or ‘ordering of the world’ (Law, 1994) functions. What ANT is capable of – probably better than other ‘theories’ or ‘ontologies’ (Latour, 1999) – is to describe movement. ANT-theorists try to grasp buildings, for example, as moving things (Latour and Yaneva, 2008). A building is, because of its use that changes over time, the impact of the weather, the involvement of more or fewer people etc., never really finished. Therefore, ANT defines a building precisely in that way, as a thing that constantly evades a fixed definition. The same line of reasoning can be helpful to define
participatory processes, as living things, continuously moving up and down a ladder.

What is thus especially important is that ANT has taught scholars and designers not to freeze-frame on singular objects, but to keep in mind that everything – every representation – is nothing more than a link in a network (Latour, 2005b). In that way, ANT always recognizes the full worth of the plural, be it regarding people, objects or representations. In that line of thought, citizen participation needs to be approached as a moving thing, through continuously demanding for the politicizing of the issues at hand, and through pluralizing and diversifying the (amount of) actors and their points of view. Matters of concern, because they happen to be more of ‘gatherings’ than objects (Latour, 2005c, 114), only exist when they are visible.

‘Democratic design experiments’

Participatory Design (PD) was introduced in the 1970s to allow users and designers to create better products, systems, spaces through a process of collaboration. PD searches ways to enhance and share power in decision making in the design process with those who are affected by the design, thus opening the design process for their input (Ehn, 2008). Many scholars in PD have built on ANT to frame and politicize the design process. In this light, we can read Callon’s and Latour’s texts as an invitation to PD to conceive of new devices, new media and new technologies tailored to specific hybrid forums; to design processes of collectively fiddling with technology and media in order for individual citizens and organizations to sharpen their skills and gain expertise in the issue at hand. This coincides with how Binder et al. (2015) have recently theorized ‘the drawing together of parliament and laboratory’. PD processes, they claim, simultaneously deal with the process of making things public (the parliament) and the search for new tools to support this process (the laboratory). Binder et al. (2015) see this process as democratic design experiments in which designers rehearse with diverse citizens, organizations and policymakers on how to organize themselves around issues with which they are concerned, in other words, as exercises in the craft of participation. It is ‘an active and delicate matter of proposing alternative possibilities just clearly enough to intrigue and prompt curiosity, and, on the other hand, to leave enough ambiguity and open-endedness to prompt the participants’ desire to influence the particular articulation of the issue’ (ibid., 11).

These democratic design experiments allow for the continuous and changing process of forming ‘publics’ around certain matters of concern or controversies (DiSalvo et al., 2012). The reference to the plural of publics (based on Dewey, 1927) underlines the flexibility in the specific configurations in which people use these information infrastructures to address things they are concerned with. They can share common concerns for a while, but can just as easily dissolve when they no longer agree. As stated by DiSalvo et al. this implies that (2012, 205):
Design activities will often have to be brought to the varied sites and locals [e.g. Figure 0.1], whether physical or online, where community members are in the habit of finding each other and conducting the activities that are central to the maintenance of community ties. Furthermore, roles such as designer and user are less predefined, hence subject to negotiation and likely to shift over time and across different spaces.

Figure 0.1 Architecture students and residents prototype a community station along an abandoned train track in Genk, Belgium

Source: www.future-is-today.be/category/wegenwerken.
In search of design strategies

Summing up, participation refers to those moments when citizens, organizations and institutions assemble to renegotiate the common interest. Technology and social media can play a role in initiating, guiding and sustaining these moments, on the condition that they are open enough to allow for collective experimentation. This book collects 16 articles that all discuss such democratic design experiments. The focus lies on the design strategies that framed the use and/or development of technologies and (social) media used within these experiments to make sure that a fall down the ladder of participation was always followed by a climb back up.

Each article addresses another (spatial) issue, involves other actors, and is developed within another context (ranging from a formal planning procedure to a self-initiated research project), resulting in 16 tailor-made design strategies. The book clusters these in four meta strategies: to diversify, to co-produce, to interrupt and to document. In the same way that Arnstein’s eight levels are a simplification, this clustering is evidently artificial. In reality the tailor-made strategies may belong to two or more clusters, or can be assigned to another cluster depending on the perspective that one adopts. What they do have in common is that they are all designed to make things public. The following paragraphs introduce the four meta strategies and briefly situate the 16 articles.

- The first meta strategy, to diversify, is to make marginalized needs and groups visible and audible (De Bie et al., 2012) in the participatory process, literally by involving these groups in the participatory process, and/or virtually by tracing the actor-networks (the relations between groups, between groups and places, or between groups places and practices).
- The second meta strategy, to co-produce, is to open up the participatory decision-making process by giving space to the concerns of all actors involved, by collectively developing alternative futures, by co-designing the co-production process and/or by investing in skill building required to do all this.
- The third meta strategy, to interrupt, is to introduce (knowledge) controversies in the participatory process that are able to produce new publics and/or shared knowledge (Whatmore, 2009), by slowing things down and/or co-designing temporary fictions.
- The fourth meta strategy, to document participatory processes, is to support the building of knowledge commons, by providing documentation tools, by improving the skills to use these tools (and develop similar ones) and/or by organizing collective reflections over the documented practices.

Five articles are assigned to the first strategy, to diversify. The first article, by Tim Devos, Seppe De Blust and Maarten Desmet, asks how to increase
the plurality of voices within urban renewal processes. It explores the strategy of storytelling and discusses a case in which the visualization of local narratives helped to start a productive discussion between (different generations of) residents and the local authorities. The second article, by Caroline Claus, deals also with urban renewal. It proposes to approach renewal sites as acoustic territories and invites people to collectively map their soundscapes in order to become aware of the (hidden) meanings of these sites for subcultures. The third article, by Bruno Meeus and Burak Pak, puts focus on the issue of superdiversity and introduces counter-mapping as a strategy to give voice to those who are absent in policy documents. They use open-source geographic web platforms to map the linguistic landscape of two arrival neighbourhoods. The fourth article, by Saba Golchehr and Naomi Bueno de Mesquita, starts from the claim that in order to design public spaces that are open to appropriation, designers need to tap into ongoing (public) debates. It discusses how the datamining of geo-social media platforms can help designers to achieve this. The fifth article, by Maurizio Teli and Maria Menendez-Blanco, continues the discussion on the appropriation of public space and proposes to draw up relational maps that reconstruct the relation between actors, interests and the specific socio-political economy.

Four articles are assigned to the second strategy, to co-produce. The aim of the first article, by Jose Carrasco et al., is to co-produce knowledge on domestic routines in order to then try and increase their collective character. Within an educational context, they explore the strategy of self-evaluating and self-monitoring, relying on a variety of technologies and media such as scale models, digital mapping tools, design charts, and creative devices. The aim of the second article, by Magdalena Baborska-Narozny, Eve Stirling and Fionn Stevenson, is to co-produce knowledge on the management of residential communities in order to increase their self-efficacy. They visualize the online and offline activity of two communities and discuss the interaction between Facebook groups and face-to-face groups. The aim of the third article, by Torange Khonsari, is to co-produce knowledge on the self-management of community initiatives. She adopts the design strategy of prototyping: to collectively build physical constructions and develop management skills along the way. The aim of the fourth article, by Rémy Vigneron, Denis Caraire and David Miet, is to co-produce knowledge on soft densification: on the densification of urban sprawl by and for private stakeholders. Their strategy is collective envisioning: together with stakeholders they visualize possible futures based on a deep understanding of current dwelling situations and aspirations.

Another four articles are assigned to the third strategy, to interrupt. The first article, by Salvatore Di Dio, Gianfranco Rizzo and Ignazio Vinci, questions how to change mobility behaviour towards more sustainable mobility. It adopts the strategy of gamification and challenges participants to minimize their CO₂ emissions, as such initiating a temporary, self
organizing community. The second article, by Katharina Gugerell, Philipp Funovits and Cristina Ampatzidou, explores how to make participants reconsider their opinions on renewable energy. The authors adopt the strategy of playful scenario building and evaluate a number of experiments with a digital serious game. The third article, by Teodora Iulia Constantinescu, Loredana Gaiță and Alexandra-Maria Rigler, questions how to help people reappropriate public space (within a post-communist context). They explore the strategy of artistic interventions and design and build three event spaces. The fourth article, by Chiara Del Gaudio, poses the question of how to support social innovation. It argues that this requires the design of dissipative structures and illustrates how scenarios and prototypes can be dissipative.

The final three articles are assigned to the fourth strategy, to document. The first article, by Zsófia Ruttkay and Judit Bényei, takes place within the context of museums and explores how to sustain a debate among the museum and its – actual or future – visitors, and among visitors that are not necessarily present at the same time. They illustrate how digital installations can help to implement this strategy. The second article, by Andrea Botero and Joanna Saad-Sulonen, looks at community initiatives and at how to sustain engagement in order to build up a knowledge commons. It reconstructs two documentation practices by mapping the underlying artefact ecologies. The third article, by Jessica Schoffelen, Liesbeth Huybrechts and Oswald Devisch, focuses on open design and on how to keep on designing in use-time. It proposes to incorporate documenting in the design process and develops documentation games to support this incorporating.

And what about the future?

The articles do not only provide strategies to support democratic design experiments, but also hint at directions for future research into making things public:

1. Participatory processes beyond the ladder
   The design processes discussed in this book make clear that participatory processes are part of a continuous movement on a ladder, but also that – in their attempt to make things public – they cannot be studied in isolation within the participatory logic. For instance, the articles show that citizen’s own ways of participating in issues they are concerned with quickly become an intrinsic part of the relational network of the designers, their visitors, the events they organized; and this in relation to governments and private actors the designers work with, etc.

2. Participatory processes beyond the citizen
   It is clear that if participatory processes take their role in making things public seriously, we need to go beyond discussing the role of the citizen,
but make more transparent what our own role and responsibility as designers is. In many of the cases described in the book, designers developed a very close relationship with the citizens they work with, which required the designers to continuously reflect on their own role and position in the design process; especially in relation to the other actors involved. This self-reflection puts some positive pressure on the designers to design processes and artefacts that recognize the participants’ agency and desires. It also produces some challenges; because of their close involvement they can also become blind to the possible threats, such as the fear of designing, because no design proposal will completely satisfy all community members.

3. Participatory processes beyond the event

Participation is easily described as an event, something that is ‘organized’, but processes of making things public are a lengthy process of tinkering. The participatory initiatives discussed in this book show that these processes move not only up and down the ladder, but also move on a temporary scale from what is permanent to something temporary. Some of the very temporary participatory events became quite permanent infrastructures. At the same time, what were intended as permanent participatory environments were built in such a way that they could be easily deconstructed, and thus are characterized by their temporary and flexible character.

On a more abstract level, one could thus argue that the mission of participatory design processes in making things public is part of an evolving multidirectional movement of political, human and material infrastructures, in which designers, people from the studied community, policymakers, private companies and material aspects of the city’s space are all part of giving form to the future of our surroundings. What the authors illustrate is that participatory design of/with technology and social media can help to keep these infrastructures public, open and democratic in order to prevent the traffic on the ladder of citizen participation from getting congested.
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Notes

1 An artist and residency in a deprived neighbourhood in Amsterdam that aims to put the neighbourhood and its community practices on the map as a cultural hotspot (www.cbkzuidoost.nl/kunst/residency-bijlmair/).

2 DMI is a collaboration initiated in 2007 between the New Media TEMLab, University of Amsterdam and the Govcom.org Foundation Amsterdam and aims at reworking methods for Internet research. The DMI Summer School takes place every year and is hosted by the University of Amsterdam. It is an intensive two-week programme where PhD researchers test and develop digital methods for societal research. During the DMI Summer School participants actively engage in empirical research projects, employing Web-specific software tools such as scrapers and crawlers.

3 #Zwerfie was introduced in February 2014 by a Dutch entrepreneur, which led to a national campaign that encourages people to pick up one piece of litter a day, make a ‘Zwerfie’ and post the photo on Twitter with #zwerfie.


5 CASA’s Twitter Tongues map. Available from: www.twitter.mappinglondon.co.uk (24 April 2015).

6 The Centre for Advanced Spatial Analysis (CASA) is an interdisciplinary research institute at University College London (UCL) that explores the science of cities.
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Table 5.2 provides a summary of these lenses along with some of the questions that can guide designers working in public spaces in looking through each of the lenses. This table is not meant to contain an exhaustive or complete set of questions; instead it illustrates in a synthetic way how these lenses can be used in practical terms and therefore serve as an instrumental – and open to changes – reference for designers.

To summarize our discussion on the described cases, and to answer our research question, “what does designing in public spaces mean?”, we can claim that, on the basis of what has been described so far, designing in public spaces means to engage with relational practices that continuously redefine participation in a historically and geographically contingent way. Continuously redefining participation leverages on the novelty brought by design practices, allows for the emergence of controversies and the questioning of boundaries, to transform social relations toward a more communal way of living.

Notes
1 More information on the cited projects can be found using the following links: https://enspiral.com/; https://stocksy.com/; http://pieproject.eu/; https://commonfare.net/
2 As previously mentioned, we analysed the interviews abductively, inspired by a grounded theory approach (Dey, 1993, 2004). To do that, we listened to the audio track and transcribed the passages that, for us, represented the core points of the conversations we had with the researchers. After that, we leveraged on the qualitative analysis software Atlas.ti to code the texts and to assemble the codes into higher level concepts. A total of 145 codes and 13 concepts resulted from the analysis.
3 For readers accustomed to qualitative analysis inspired by grounded theory, when we use the term “most relevant” we refer to the “most populous” of codes and/or concepts. When we use “theme”, we refer to concepts, and when we use “word”, we mean code. This imprecise use of language is meant to make the text fluid and understandable for the part of the audience not acquainted with the technical jargon of qualitative analysis in the social sciences.
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strengthen opinions and levels of communication, for example via exchanges between students of architecture and students of geography, sociology or anthropology. Additionally, we should dedicate part of our energy to creating a new setting for urban forums in which citizens could gain access to learning design processes, even in hypothetical situations, and could formulate their own interpretations.

This framework called Common Extra House Lab helped the students involved in it gain confidence. It was in the midst of uncertainty that students wrote:

> Working as facilitators, we entered in the private sphere of homemakers and we understood their schedule, their concerns, their hopes . . . we learnt that everyday life is supported by the homemaker, which disables her personal development . . . at the end we were able to evaluate how flexible a dwelling could be, in order to accommodate productive uses. (students Amorós y Doménech, 2014)

Nonetheless, the architect and educator Jeremy Till emphasises that these new ranges of participatory processes involve levels of risk, uncertainty and chaos. Two main problems remain to be solved: first, the distance between expert knowledge (the architect) and tacit knowledge (the user); and second, the obstacles deriving from codes, tradition and hierarchy. In a way, he concludes that the process should take place in the physical context and, beyond considering it a case of problem-solving theory, think about architecture as a ground for the negotiation of hopes (Till, Blundell, Petrescu, 2005).
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life actions is the crucial factor that ultimately builds trust among Group members. This makes their engagement worthwhile – showing tangible results from digital discussions. A clear overlap between social media narratives and the physical experiences of daily life is evident for residents in both case developments, which bodes well for the development of Facebook activism within housing communities. Facebook also allows its users to preserve a clear distinction between their Facebook identity and daily privacy. This means a weak-ties community remains as such but is still enabled to efficiently solve together collective issues. This seems to be the key of why Facebook proved to work well for both developments as a digital tool for collective empowerment and civic action.
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Note

1 Group with a capital G denotes the Facebook Group.
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the mobile honesty stall that promotes the garden by selling its produce at local events and festivals, the hired local community rooms where annual general meetings are held, the local community kitchens in community centres hired to make food for public consumption and the roaming shed that hosts children activities and workshops. In order to construct a liminal fragment of the city where common grounds are formed, the architect/designer needs to consider its governance, its power structures, the intent of its core common space and its network of supporting spaces. The architect/designer will position him/herself in the liminal space between a consultant and a citizen.
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and amenities, and stop urban sprawl. Shifting governance balance, by reinstating homeowners in their full capacity to develop projects on their plots, is an appealing way to trigger the release of land resources meeting the needs of many kind of households, not least elderly people and families.

Modeling technology as used in the BIMBY process shows relevant potential to unlock possibilities and set households in motion. Based on multifaceted skills, empathy, collaborative pedagogy, the bKO role and the modeling protocol offer a robust solution building on the owners of single-family dwellings to contribute to the end of urban sprawl. The capacity for BIMBY processes to foster civic engagement depends, above all on the way both professional and homeowners put this technology into use when interacting together with the model. The incrementation of the process, required to address urban sprawl and evolve existing neighbourhoods, calls for a rise in new professions building on technology as a means to reinstate homeowners in their full capacities, at both individual and community level.

Notes
1 Funded by the French Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR) within the “Sustainable Cities” programme.
2 BIMBY (Build In My Backyard) is a collective mark registered (INPI n°3983105) as an open-source collaborative systemic project. The BIMBY concept encompasses any action aiming at housing production, under the following conditions:
   a) without urban sprawl, on plots already built, without complete demolition of existing dwellings;
   b) initiated by the inhabitant, in an architectural and landscape approach respectful of the neighbourhood and of the local community common project;
   c) orchestrated by local governments, in a process of territorial development federating and integrating the projects of the inhabitants;
   d) without land speculation, with a full transparency about the inhabitant’s real estate assets’ value and enhancement potential.
3 www.lab-invivo.eu
4 This second stage will not be explored in this chapter.
5 This approach continues to underpin, for example, BIM development.

References


Eurostat, 2009. Consumers in Europe: An extensive range of statistics on consumers: Price levels, shopping, housing and much more (No. STAT/09/95), Newrelease.


Further research will involve wider university student samples and other testing cities, trying to understand the constraints of the model and to check the results already gathered.
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adopt pro-environmental behaviour (Misra & Kumar Panda 2017; Sheth et al. 2011). Hence, serious games can also be considered as entrance points to engage individuals and groups with low intrinsic motivation and ‘green’ attitude. We argue that efforts in building up intrinsic motivation are crucial, due to the uncertainty of extrinsic motivation and incentives and related crowding out effects (Rode et al. 2015).

Second, the identified gender gap illustrates the importance of considering the category ‘gender’ more closely in the design of games with more pronounced environmental narratives and their evaluation. Hence, our work aligns with Ito (Ito 2007), advocating the importance of the social and cultural context in which (serious) games are played and used. Since women immerse themselves more strongly in narratives (Tondello et al. 2017), and ‘environmental’ and ‘green’ narratives are more commonly associated as ‘female’, male players might turn into hard to reach groups. This calls for particular attention in the design of serious games with environmental, sustainability – or more in general – ‘green’ narratives (in a middle European context). Therefore, for serious games with the explicit goal to support participatory actions, exploring gender-sensitive game interfaces and narratives, as well as the relations between intrinsic motivation and player types on significantly larger samples and crossing different game narratives (environmental/non-environmental) are interesting follow-up questions for future research.

Third, testing player typologies and player motivations in serious games already during the game design might deliver useful results and support the design process. However, yielding sample sizes big enough to run statistical tests might pose a challenge for regular design processes. Nevertheless, we advocate rigorous studies testing player typologies, enjoyment, learning and motivations on a larger scale at least in the ex post phase to yield sufficient evidence for the value and potential of serious games in planning and governance.
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trajectories initiated in the last two decades. Factors such as socio-economic development and the future participatory agenda will be the subject of important challenges and driving forces for imminent changes.
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social networks, reporting sexist behaviour. *Frida Feminista*² spread those messages through and on city walls (Figure 13.2).

Furthermore, there are the several “*Shoot the shit*”³ projects that, through urban initiatives, encourage reflections about crucial topics within the urban context.

One must also not forget the Piseagrama editors’ *lambe-lambe* initiatives.⁴ These are examples of initiatives by groups of people without the aim of suggesting solutions or gathering people together for designing. They are aimed at provoking discussions among different points of view on critical issues first of all.

Finally, upon fostering understanding about the designer’s action, it stands out that if the design process is a process involving the possibility of expression and decision making and therefore the expression of the power of shaping the future, it is the same design process that becomes the place of confrontation between ideas capable of leading to new, future possibilities. In other words, it is the place where fluctuations that lead away from the system happen, as well as where the new self-organization can be promoted. This can be done through techniques and tools typical of design, that is, the use of scenarios and prototypes that allow the expression and discussion of divergent ideas (Manzini and Jégou 2006; Hillgren, Seravalli and Emilson 2011), as well as prospecting for a new organization through interaction between the elements. Thus, scenarios and prototypes can have the double role of allowing the emergence of controversy, and of stimulating the new self-organization. In this framework, cooperation exists both at the moment of opposition, confrontation and conflict as well as of discussion and common work towards defining the new self-organization, thus spanning the full spectrum of cooperation possibilities outlined by Sennett (2012).

Notes

1 In this chapter, the main references used in discussing and exemplifying design for social innovation are from the DESIS Network (Design for Social Innovation and Sustainability Network), which is one of the main research and practice networks on social innovation within the design field. Definitions are from the discourse of its main voices (i.e. the international coordinator), while cases are randomly chosen.

2 www.instagram.com/fridafeminista/?hl=pt

3 www.shoottheshit.cc/projetos/

4 http://piseagrama.org/campanha/
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decided – which is very problematic independent of the topic, the setting and the – in time changing – visitors and society. A couple of absolute measurements such as time spent in the exhibition, especially with the “naked eye” observation of exhibits, the recall of information and the future plans for revisit can be good indication of success. The analysis of failures can be just as insightful as that of success stories.

On a higher level and in a longer time span, the societal impact is of interest. Does the museum succeed in fulfilling its societal roles, and to what extent is this to be attributed to the digital arsenal that it exploits? How do visitors see the museum? What are the implied changes within institutions (e.g. new attitudes, a new organizational structure, new roles – and new forms of education and training to prepare for the new jobs), in the creative design industry (e.g. are there instruments to help start-ups and young creatives to enter the new market)? One may also consider the impact of the museum as a stakeholder in (life-long) education. Related to the immense complexity of the design and assessment tasks, we should establish further academic forums to share and acknowledge interdisciplinary work in Digital Museology, on the intersection of design, technology and humanities.
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Notes

1 A handful of large and world-famous museums, profiting from mass tourism, get record numbers of visitors, often also because of their new kinds of exhibitions. However, the smaller and less well-known local museums have to fight to obtain visitors, and on a longer term to ensure their survival.
2 http://icom.museum/the-vision/museum-definition/.
3 See the case of the Rijksmuseum http://rijksmuseum.nl/Rijksstudio, or the Cleveland Museum of Art http://clevelandart.org.
4 NODEM, MuseumNext, Museum and the Web conferences.
5 We have asked students of our Digital Museum course since 2010 every year.
6 See creators and more at http://techlab.mome.hu/woeres100.
7 See creators and more at http://techlab.mome.hu/bikurholim.
8 See creators and more at http://techlab.mome.hu/preparingforsaturday.
9 See creators, photos and video at http://techlab.mome.hu/colourmirror.
10 See creators and more information at: http://create.mome.hu/rooftops_at_dawn/.
11 Information on creators and access to the virtual tour at: http://zsidotemeto.mome.hu/index_en.html.
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constant going back and forth between online and face-to-face interactions that complement one another. Participatory design approaches attuned to their contribution to nurture commons might offer ways for civic initiatives to explore hybrid interaction possibilities around knowledge sharing. The collaborative development of documentation practices for this would be a key aspect around which the intrinsic participatory design practices of the community can be developed and the social dilemmas made visible.

Documentation within a participatory design angle should strive thus to nurture a knowledge commons, and not just sharing documentation. This means supporting communities to reach a commitment to jointly create and manage a “common pool resource” (Ostrom 1990) with recognition for the invisible care work that this entails. However, when approaching this type of work, participatory designers might find that their role is better articulated through membership by being a commoner. Interventions that are done under a membership model will have different rhythms than bounded PD projects. We have only been testing the ground in our dual roles as PD designers and community members in the KUG and we recognise the need to develop new models for such practice.

PD approaches may also help bridge a gap in the technical and media literacy found in initiatives. Here the setting differs from, e.g. the open source communities, where technical know-how is more homogeneous. These also brings us close to PD’s recent interests in seriously considering futures beyond neoliberal structures, and articulating this space as a valid one for participatory design to explore (e.g. Hakken et al. 2015). This entails possible collaborative work on and around documentation, and PD efforts towards what Korsgaard et al. (2016) refer to as development of computational alternatives. Products and services provided by global corporations are now used en masse, even for supporting commons-sensitive initiatives. What would be relevant computational alternatives to support ways of doing and documenting together that are in themselves alternatives to market-driven approaches? Emerging explorations that aim to give users control and ownership of the artefact ecologies they use, such as platform cooperativism (Scholz & Schneider 2017), although currently focusing more on issues around paid labour, rather than volunteering, might be one way for PD to contribute.
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Notes

1 www.opensourcewarehouse.org
2 Open Source Ecology is developing open source blueprints for the Global Village Construction Set, being the 50 most important machines that it takes for modern life to exist. OSE aims to develop a modular, scalable platform for documenting and developing open source hardware, including blueprints for physical artefacts and for related open enterprises. http://opensourceecology.org
3 http://tr-aders.eu
4 E.g. collecting a dynamic range of perspectives or aiming for engaging new participants.
5 Allowing participants to share what they documented and what documentation strategy they explored during the day.
6 The workshop was organised for the PD project Bespoke Design that explores the development of open self-management tools for diabetes type 1 and building a community concerning this purpose (see Schoffelen, Huybrechts & Dreessen 2013; Schoffelen, Dreessen & Huybrechts 2015). In this particular workshop three participants were involved, i.e. a user experience (UX) researcher, a design researcher and a master student in product design that responded to our open call for participation.
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