

# **PARTICIPATORY DESIGN: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND INSIGHTS FOR FUTURE PRACTICE**

Peter Wacnik, Shanna Daly, Aditi Verma<sup>1</sup>  
University of Michigan

## **ABSTRACT**

Participatory Design - an iterative, flexible design process that uses the close involvement of stakeholders, most often end users - is growing in use across design disciplines. As an increasing number of practitioners turn to Participatory Design (PD), it has become less rigidly defined, with stakeholders engaged to varying degrees through the use of disjointed techniques. This ambiguous understanding can be counterproductive when discussing PD processes. Our findings synthesize key decisions and approaches from design peers that can support others in engaging in PD practice. We investigated how scholars report the use of Participatory Design in the field through a systematic literature review. We found that a majority of PD literature examined specific case studies of PD (53 of 88 articles), with the design of intangible systems representing the most common design context (61 of 88 articles). Stakeholders most often participated throughout multiple stages of a design process (65 of 88 articles), recruited in a variety of ways, and engaged in several of the 14 specific participatory techniques identified. This systematic review provides today's practitioners synthesized learnings from past Participatory Design processes to inform and improve future use of PD, attempting to remedy inequitable design by engaging directly with stakeholders and users.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Participatory Design (PD) is a design approach aimed at developing technologies with close involvement from stakeholders - especially those most affected by the end result, most often users. Participatory Design typically involves multiple rounds of requirements gathering, prototype development, implementation, and evaluation (Hardie, 1988). Originating in Scandinavian countries in the 1970s, PD was initially used to empower unions with action-oriented design methodologies (Bjögvinsson et al., 2012). One such instance involved the Norwegian Iron and Metal Workers Union (NJMF), where union representatives worked with government researchers to investigate new technologies for the workplace (Ehn, 1988). The NJMF research project resulted in multiple proposals for more efficient computer-based, shop-floor planning systems, changes in work organization on the shop floor, and a textbook compiled to educate union workers on planning, control, and data processing in their work.

However, over time, the use of PD has evolved, becoming less rigidly defined as a specific process. Instead, it has become an overarching term encompassing projects that engage stakeholders in multiple ways at various stages of design work. Approaches to stakeholder involvement in design have been described as user-centered, human-centered, co-design, customer co-creation, and crowdsourcing, among other monikers - all of which are considered participatory within this broader framework (Aitamurto et al., 2015). This broad application of Participatory Design has led to conflicting interpretations of its meaning. Rather than assert what PD is or is not, our work focused on bringing transparency to the ways designers are describing their use of PD so that others can analyze approaches and apply the learnings to their own work. We reviewed 88 design articles that discussed applications of Participatory Design from

---

<sup>1</sup> aditive@umich.edu

seven academic journals and five conference proceedings focused on design. Our review specifically focused on the type of Participatory Design research, the context in which Participatory Design was applied, stakeholder recruitment into PD, the timing of participation throughout a design process, and the participatory techniques used by practitioners.

Our findings provide a synthesis of key approaches from design peers that can support others in engaging in PD practice as well as analysis of PD processes. This synthesis is important for the design community, as there is growing recognition that inequities are born from improper design practices, and a twin desire across design disciplines - engineering design in particular - to remedy inequitable design by engaging directly with stakeholders and users. This paper shows what PD looks like in practice, compiling learnings from past PD processes to inform and improve its future use.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

Participatory Design has evolved significantly since its inception in the late 1970s in Scandinavia. Design thinking can be categorized as a modern interpretation of PD, with emphasis on the need for designers to address the social implications of innovation, collaborate with a diverse set of stakeholders throughout the process, and develop multiple prototypes to examine potential ideas for their effectiveness (Bjögvinsson et al., 2012). PD's core values, including democracy as means to enable proper user participation and acknowledging participants' tacit knowledge were pivotal in shifting designers' mindsets from designing objects to designing 'socio-material assemblies' involving stakeholders.

Scholars have since considered similar principles in the contexts of their design work. For example, Winschiers-Theophilus et al. investigated experiences in rural African communities, noting that it is widely accepted among designers that user involvement in a design process leads to better outcomes for the stakeholders but that user involvement has been variable across projects (Winschiers-Theophilus et al., 2012). They argued for a deeper exploration of the meaning of participation in design and its potential impact on design outcomes, particularly in cross-cultural contexts. They further claim that achieving meaningful participation requires mutual learning among designers and local community members, and that a variety of methods exist to facilitate that process. In addition to mutual learning as a tenet of successful Participatory Design processes, they emphasized that designers must gain in-depth local knowledge to guide the choice and adaptation of participatory methods.

In addition to individual analyses similar to Winschiers-Theophilus, Bidwell, and Blake, synthetic reviews of Participatory Design have been completed by other researchers. One such review finds that current definitions for Participatory Design are too narrow and lacking, leading to inconsistencies in PD processes that negatively affect the research and advancement of such design practices (Aitamurto et al., 2015). These researchers call for a more comprehensive understanding of such design processes - something that can start to be achieved for PD with a wide survey of literature and dissection of the themes in the design process in this paper.

## **3. METHODS**

We conducted a systematic literature review on how Participatory Design has been researched and practiced. We were guided by the following research questions:

- What are the different types of Participatory Design Research?

- In which design contexts has Participatory Design been used?
- How are stakeholders recruited to participate in Participatory Design?
- During design work, when and with what frequency were participants engaged?
- What Participatory Design techniques were leveraged in design processes?

### 3.1. Literature Search

The literature search was conducted from journals defined by Gemser et al. as top design journals as well as proceedings from popular design conferences (Gemser et al., 2012). The journals and proceedings included in the literature search are listed in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Sources Included in the Literature Search

<b>Academic Journals</b>	<b>Conference Proceedings</b>
<i>AI EDAM</i>	<i>American Society of Mechanical Engineering</i>
<i>Design Science Journal</i>	<i>Design Theory and Methodology Conference</i>
<i>Design Studies</i>	<i>Communications of the Association for Computing Machinery</i>
<i>Design Issues</i>	<i>Computer Supported Cooperative Work</i>
<i>Journal of Mechanical Design</i>	<i>International Conference on Engineering Design</i>
<i>Research in Engineering Design</i>	<i>The Design Conference</i>

We used the query “Participatory Design” within the title, abstract, or keywords to identify relevant articles. This search produced 151 articles that were filtered to remove duplicates and articles that were not full-length journal publications. This filtering process narrowed the literature to 95 items. We then excluded review papers of PD, resulting in 88 articles for analysis. This process is represented in Figure 1, and includes the number of articles from each of the journals or conference proceedings we reviewed - the publication cutoff for inclusion was May 2022.




Fig. 1. Filtering process to determine peer-reviewed articles to include in analysis.

### 3.2. Analysis

Two researchers began the literature analysis by dividing the articles and reviewing for key criteria listed in the research questions (Type of Participatory Design Research; Context of Design; Stakeholder Recruitment; Timing of Participation; and Participatory Techniques). The information identified in each article was input into a spreadsheet-formatted analysis matrix.

The researchers then converted the notes in the analysis matrix into a list of keywords and phrases for each research question (which we defined as codes) that summarized the information and also included excerpts from the articles as examples of each keyword or phrase. The codes and their descriptions were iterated upon through the process of categorizing articles and in discussions with the larger research team. This process led to categories being combined, eliminated, or added, to build a comprehensive yet concise framework for analysis - a description of the categories is contained in the supplementary materials.

Once the categories in the analysis matrix had been established, the two researchers reviewed entries of the matrix for each other, swapping six articles to cross-check the review process and matrix data. This

approach provided a way of checking reliability and ensured that all of the data collected across the items of literature was consistent and therefore suitable for analysis.

## 4. FINDINGS

### 4.1. Types of Participatory Design Research

We found five Types of Participatory Design Research, described in Table 2. Over half of the PD articles in our study were *Participatory Design Process Applications*, focused on a singular application of PD with commentary on the design process used in a specific context. *Participatory Design Technique Analysis* investigated a specific participatory technique and encompassed the second largest category. *Participatory Design Principles* examined one or more foundational ideas of PD processes, independent of the design context. *Guidelines for Participatory Design* discussed context-specific, prescriptive direction for a PD process. Finally, the smallest category comprised *Reflections on Participatory Design*, in which authors offered high-level reflections on past experiences with participation in design.

Table 2. Types of Participatory Design Research; Classifications and Definitions

<i>Type of Participatory Design Research</i> (Of 88 articles)	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Example</i>
Participatory Design Process Applications 53 articles; 60%	Articles that examined a full PD process to determine the effectiveness of a participatory approach.	A case study of the participation of disadvantaged women in Hong Kong, in a design process for the purposes of affecting government policy (Kwok, 2004).
Participatory Design Technique Analysis 13 articles; 15%	Articles that focused on a specific technique for fostering participation and involving stakeholders in the design process.	A study investigating the effectiveness of three-dimensional models to foster stakeholder input and participation in Botswana to discover resident preferences for street infrastructure and home design (Hardie, 1988).
Guidelines for Participatory Design 9 articles; 10%	Articles that encompassed directives for PD within a specific context, offering a prescriptive evaluation of how to effectively use PD.	An article that described infrastructuring techniques beyond the initial stages of PD through a case study introducing new fabrication technologies to a Danish school system, accompanied by tenets to guide others in implementing their expanded technique (Bødker et al., 2017).
Participatory Design Principles 9 articles; 10%	Articles focused on fundamental, overarching elements or characteristics of PD.	An investigation of the “mundane and strategic” work that permeates a Participatory Design process, such as coordinating workshop space, finding participants, or scheduling the timing of activities (Hyysalo & Hyysalo, 2018).
Reflections on Participatory Design	Articles that critiqued PD experiences from a practitioner’s perspective, including specific	An article describing pitfalls in the prototype testing experience in the development of an

4 articles; 5%	successes or failures.	Electronic Health Record prototype, prompted by attempts to rectify dissimilar stakeholder needs (Bossen, 2006).
----------------	------------------------	--

#### 4.2. Context of Design

A majority of the articles discussed projects, processes, or case studies in real-world contexts (81 articles; 92%) while a small number examined theoretical discussions or reflections of Participatory Design (7 articles; 8%). Beyond the general division of real-world versus theoretical studies, the specific contexts in which PD was applied are as follows:

- *The design of Artifacts* (6 articles; 7%) - PD used to support the design of products, whether intended for consumer sale or other uses. One subcategory within this group was the design of accessible technology. For example, one article described the creation of two different accessible devices: an intelligent mobility aid for the elderly to navigate crowded areas and alleviate stress from crowds, and an active wheelchair for athletic users (Wilkinson & De Angeli, 2014).
- *The design of Intangible Systems* (61 articles; 69%) - PD was used to support the design of software or other non-physical systems. This category included activity design, workflow management, and organizational processes. One example article in this category (subcategory electronic information management) described a PD project focused on the system for document preservation for brittle books in university libraries (Anderson & Crocca, 1993). Another example article, categorized as a public sector project, discussed a PD project to empower new-arrival women to Hong Kong, to have a voice in the government processes and policy surrounding housing and urban planning (Kwok, 2004). Finally, an example article in the subcategory of healthcare systems, discussed the use of PD techniques with Nigerian communities to implement computer and internet technology for medical records (Korpela et al., 1998).
- *The design of Physical Systems* (12 articles; 14%) - Articles described the use of PD to design physical systems that could be occupied or used by stakeholders, such as buildings, urban planning projects, and workspace design. An example of an urban planning project was an article that investigated an obsolete railway track that was a large infrastructural system in the city of Genk, Belgium (Huybrechts et al., 2018). Initially used to transport coal, a design team explored new purposes for the track by building community narratives through the extensive participation of residents in the early stages of the design process.
- *Design Process Critiques* (9 articles; 10%) - Some articles were contextualized in designers' experiences with PD processes or techniques, rather than the output of a project, and focused on reflections and evaluations of PD processes or techniques. For example, one article evaluated a role-playing game participatory approach, where peers interacted with each other and the game to share experiences with the New York welfare system (Campbell, 2004).

Figure 2 illustrates subcategories within these broader categories, including the number of articles within each subcategory.




Fig. 2. Design contexts in which PD was discussed.

### 4.3. Stakeholder Recruitment

The majority of papers that discussed stakeholder recruitment focused on the characteristics of the participant pools (62 articles; 70%) when commenting on recruitment methods. The six types of participant recruitment approaches discussed are described in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Methods of Stakeholder Recruitment for Participation

<i>Stakeholder Pool (Of 88 articles)</i>	<i>Recruitment Methods</i>
Target stakeholder demographic (17 articles; 19%)	Practitioners developed a target stakeholder and proactively recruited participants from that pool. Designers reached out over email, through workshops, through personal or professional networks, or with posters. Some projects randomly selected participants from a target stakeholder pool to contact for participation.
Expert users by application (4 articles; 5%)	Participants were members of social media groups or practitioners' networks and were offered the opportunity to apply to participate through those channels. In other cases, peers or organization administrators identified participants as experts to participate.
Open to the public (9 articles; 10%)	Practitioners invited communities to participate through participatory techniques held in public spaces (physical and online), posters, word-of-mouth, or fliers handed out by the research team.
Volunteers in interested organizations	Practitioners identified or were contacted by interested organizations

(10 articles; 11%)	and recruited people within those organizations.
Employees from a stakeholder company (14 articles; 16%)	The design work involved a specific company and employees from that company were recruited to participate. Employees either volunteered for the project or were directed by management to participate.
Students from a class (8 articles; 9%)	Seen in educational contexts, students were contacted to participate through emails, announcements to the class, or directed to participate by their teachers.

Most often, designers identified a target stakeholder demographic that they believed would bring the most useful insights to the design process, or be the most affected by the design outcome. Once this population was identified, designers reached out over email, through workshops, through their networks, or posters. In one example, practitioners designing a memory aid for people with amnesia recruited multiple amnestics along with a rehabilitation specialist and computer scientist through their professional networks, and approached each participant through that avenue to gauge their interest in joining the project (Wu et al., 2004). Some projects randomly selected participants from a target stakeholder pool to contact for participation - this method was mostly seen when designers used surveys as a participatory technique.

In cases where practitioners had little to no previous knowledge of the design context, they relied on stakeholders to bring a depth of understanding to the design process, sometimes co-designing the solution, which necessitated expert users as participants. Practitioners identified these experts through communications with their networks, their peers, or stakeholder organizations before offering them a chance to apply to join the design team and subsequently selecting expert participants for the project. For example, in the design of new product opportunities for the athletic wheelchair user market, practitioners recruited four paralympians to be expert users through their network - their status as experts sufficiently proven - to be lead users involved throughout the design process (Wilkinson & De Angeli, 2014).

The most open recruitment approaches involved design activities that were open to the public. For example, in an article describing the development of a community library, recruitment was very open and allowed all citizens the chance to participate (Dalsgaard, 2012). Practitioners accomplished this by leveraging participatory techniques in the library that invited people to record feedback and reactions to the project as they walked by. Another such example with open public recruitment saw researchers place posters in busy public areas, hand out fliers in the community, and rely on word-of-mouth to reach stakeholders (van Manen et al., 2015).

Engaging volunteers in an interested organization, employees at a company, and students from a class involved similar recruiting methods for designers. Commonly, these organizations or classes had specifically requested a project that utilized Participatory Design, and participants volunteered due to their awareness of the project or were directed by respective management to engage with designers. In cases where participants were not directed to engage, they learned of the design process through emails, posters, or announcements made by their organization. Two such examples of this type of recruitment saw hospital



staff engaged in the development of digitized X-ray examination technology (Kjær & Madsen, 1995) and students that redesigned educational activities (Guha et al., 2005) - participants were aware and involved due to their investment in the outcome, along with being directed by higher-level authority.

#### 4.4. Timing of Participation

The articles reviewed described involvement of stakeholders at various stages in or across a design process. We summarize the stages at which articles described stakeholder participation in Figure 3, with the quantity of articles noted for each specific stage. The timing of stakeholder engagement was not discussed in 7 of the 88 articles.




Fig. 3. Timing of stakeholder participation in the articles quantified.

Most articles (65 articles; 74%) described stakeholder participation throughout a design process at multiple stages of the work. For example, interaction design researchers developing interactive technologies for a municipal library involved stakeholders through reflections on the importance of the library, discussion of their visions for a future building, cogeneration and evaluation of design concepts for interactive technologies, and a plan to continue community involvement through the remainder of the project (the article was written before the new library had been constructed) (Dalsgaard, 2012). From the very beginning and throughout the project, the practitioners maintained stakeholder participation as a guiding principle for their work, explicitly empowering the people who would be using the library in the future by articulating in the project's core values that stakeholder participation would be the foundation on which design decisions were made.

Some articles (10 articles; 11%) specifically sought participation from stakeholders in the front end of a design process. For example, one article described a project repurposing an old coal track and the community participation - participatory workshops, interviews, prototyping, and context-specific activities - occurred during the early stages of the work that lasted 16 months (Huybrechts et al., 2018). At its conclusion, the project team had crafted multiple alternative uses for the track using input from the community.

A handful of articles (4 articles; 5%) described stakeholder participation in only the middle stages of a design process. In one example, at a project for a new university in southern Sweden to design workspaces, users were involved mainly during the prototype evaluation phase with VR technologies, testing and providing feedback on four prototypes the design team had developed (Davies, 2004).

The fewest number of articles (2 articles; 3%) involved stakeholders at only the back end of a design process. Tapped In, an online community aimed at supporting education professionals, used methods at the back end of the design process to sustain the infrastructure previously built for the community (Farooq et al., 2007). Users were asked to specifically contribute in developing the infrastructure by providing consistent feedback once the first iteration of the system had been implemented.

#### **4.5. Frequency of Participation**

Six papers (7%) described *single instances of engagement*, where the designer utilized one participatory interaction at one stage of a design process. In an article where designers investigated solutions to increase self-reliance during volcanic disasters in Costa Rica, the research team held two participatory workshops on consecutive days - one participatory interaction at one stage of the design process - that involved a questionnaire, individual and group brainstorming, and initial concept filtering and prioritization of needs (van Manen et al., 2015). The designers took insights from these one-off workshops to apply to the design process.

The other 79 articles (90%) described *engaging participants in multiple activities* within or across front-, middle-, and back-end activities of a design process. In this multiple engagement approach, designers often circled back to participants for additional information or evaluation. One example saw a research team explore speech-based operation of computers during dental surgeries (Cederman-Haysom & Brereton, 2006). The research had an iterative process that began with ethnographic studies with a large number of dentists and dental students, before identifying three specialists that participated in techniques such as low fidelity prototypes, design games, and role-playing throughout the design process. There were also three one-on-one design sessions with these specialists resulting in a prototype that was evaluated through discussion and a pilot trial during an operation. Three of the 88 articles (3%) did not discuss the frequency of stakeholder involvement.

#### **4.6. Participatory Techniques**

We identified 14 unique participatory techniques described in the articles, as methods to facilitate participation from stakeholders in the design work. Nearly all of the articles used multiple techniques for stakeholder participation. Of the 88 articles reviewed, 79 of them (90%) used at least two of the participatory techniques. The full list of techniques are described in Table 4, along with an example of how each technique was used in one of the papers in the systematic review.

Table 4. Specific Participatory Techniques Identified in Literature

<i>Technique</i>	
<i>Description</i>	<i>Example</i>
Participatory Workshops - (64 articles; 73%)	
Designers and participants met together in a mutual learning situation for input by stakeholders, learning about the design context, ideating solutions together, or evaluating the design path. Workshop activities included futures workshops, scenarios, ideation, design games, concept evaluation, problem or solution mapping, and stakeholder reflections.	Using co-ideation to develop more self-reliance in the face of volcanic disasters in Costa Rica, two, two-hour participatory ideation workshops were held in two central places near the volcano (van Manen et al., 2015). First, participants were given a questionnaire to gain initial insights. Then, they ideated on Post-its, subsequently collating Post-its into central themes and illustrating ideas. Each group selected one idea to develop further, presented their idea, and all groups voted to select their favorite.
Stakeholder Interviews - (61 articles; 69%)	
Interviews were conducted to gain a deep understanding of the stakeholder. Designers used semi-structured interviews, unstructured conversations, or user-led visits that enabled both an interview along with a demonstration of their user experience.	Investigating the implementation of computer support for the Editorial Board of a Film Board to streamline their workflow, interviews were conducted with multiple people from multiple stakeholder groups, with follow-up interviews as well (Simonsen & Kensing, 1997). During the dialogue, the authors viewed how participants completed tasks and heard their design suggestions. This built mutual learning situations between designers and stakeholders, which resulted in drawings of the current workflow and potential improvements to the system.
Prototyping with Stakeholders - (52 articles; 59%)	
Prototypes were presented to stakeholders or stakeholders were asked to build prototypes themselves. Stakeholders were able to visualize the solution and how it might be embedded into the relevant context. This included low-fidelity or high-fidelity prototype builds, stakeholders evaluating or reacting to prototypes, or a pilot installation of a prototype. In some instances, prototyping occurred during participatory workshops or prototype evaluation during interviews - in these cases, we counted the activity as a workshop or interview respectively, in addition to prototyping.	In the development of speech and gesture technology to be used during dental surgeries, researchers performed an ethnographic study with dentists and dental students, followed by multiple workshops with a demonstration of an existing low-fidelity prototype to elicit feedback (Cederman-Haysom & Brereton, 2006). A functional higher-fidelity prototype was developed and trialed with a dentist in-practice, gaining critical insights for designers.
Context-Specific Activities - (19 articles; 22%)	

<i>Technique</i>	
<i>Description</i>	<i>Example</i>
Context-specific activities were novel techniques developed by designers to engage stakeholders in a particular, unique context - with the activity likely not transferable to other projects. Most often, this involved notably modifying a participatory technique to better-suit the unique design situation. Some types of context-specific activities in the literature included a unique design game simulating a welfare system, guiding children through observation, or open-to-the-public displays to record stakeholder feedback, among others.	During the early stages of a project to motivate families to monitor power consumption and reduce electricity spending, the authors invented and facilitated an at-home card game for participating families to reflect on their power consumption practices (Albrechtslund & Ryberg, 2011). Doing so allowed families to ease into the PD process with a context-specific technique later leading to additional participation .
Update Meetings with Stakeholders - (13 articles; 15%)	
Update meetings were held with stakeholders to share progress reports and information. Designers presented this information to stakeholders and took questions or feedback.	To align with new reforms from the Danish Ministry of Education that emphasized 21st century skills in the classroom, a design team worked with three Danish municipalities to embed digital fabrication technology and design thinking into lower secondary schools with a hybrid learning space (Bødker et al., 2017). A steering committee was formed that met with the municipalities on a quarterly basis to discuss progress, share results, and receive feedback. These update meetings kept stakeholders up to date and informed of the progress.
Committee of User Representatives - (14 articles; 16%)	
User representatives acted as a type of committee to represent a larger stakeholder group. Rather than recruit participants for each event, practitioners leveraged this committee of the same user representatives - sometimes expert users - for most (if not all) of the participatory activities. As the user representatives participated in most other activities during the design process, we counted this technique in addition to other techniques used to engage the user representatives, such as workshops or focus groups.	During the design of a new, online entertainment system, designers utilized a Wiki forum to communicate with users (Hess & Pipek, 2012). In addition, they developed a larger user parliament of day-to-day users and a central committee that was composed of elected, expert users and staff members. With this two-group user representation, designers took input from a wide range of users in the parliament while meeting with the central committee weekly to make design decisions and implement functionalities.
Focus Groups - (10 articles; 11%)	
Focus groups created an environment that was conducive to more insights and consensus built from different perspectives within the stakeholder group. Designers included community members in	The early stages of a design project for the UK PM involved normally excluded citizens in focus group discussions to elicit feedback on the concept of an access token system for personal identification and admittance to public services

<i>Technique</i>	
<i>Description</i>	<i>Example</i>
focus groups most commonly, to discuss stakeholders' lifestyles and relevant thoughts about the design context. At times, stakeholders also evaluated prototypes in focus groups.	(Dearden et al., 2006). They began with an introduction and open discussion of participants' lifestyle issues with public services and utilities. They then discussed a more theoretical topic of smartcards or other media to assist the citizens with their lifestyle difficulties to help prompt insightful discussion.
Public Hearings - (9 articles; 10%)	
In public hearings, designers presented design paths and the process to be followed, explicitly organized to garner feedback from the public. It was also inherent that these hearings were open to the public for feedback from any stakeholder who feels they have insights to contribute. These were commonly seen in projects that dealt with large community infrastructure development.	In the development of a building to house a municipal library and the Citizens' Service Department in Aarhus, Denmark, the team was tasked with designing and integrating new, interactive technologies and services into the building (Dalsgaard, 2012). They leveraged public hearings where aspects of the building were presented and the floor opened to discussion with stakeholders once the information was conveyed.
Stakeholder Observations - (43 articles; 49%)	
Observations were leveraged by designers to get a firsthand view of the stakeholder's life, sometimes to the point of experiencing daily life with them. This appeared as observing natural tendencies at home or workflows of stakeholders in an organization, separated from the lifestyle, as well as embedding themselves in the design context, experiencing the environment that stakeholders do every day. Documentation methods of observations included written notes, pictures, or recordings.	Investigating the implementation of a new hardware/software system for digitized X-rays in a new hospital building for a radiology department, researchers utilized multiple sessions of observation (Kjær & Madsen, 1995). These were conducted at various locations in the hospital - secretary workplaces, during meetings within the department, in examination rooms - while taking pictures to document the workplace before implementing the new system. The authors emphasized recording the changes from the new system, and building on the department's regular work.
Stakeholder Surveys - (17 articles; 19%)	
Designers used surveys to obtain a large sample size of insights from stakeholder groups. With well-developed questions, designers gleaned quantitative data to survey the state of the design context and learn about stakeholders. They also collected qualitative data in open-ended questions on the survey, learning about stakeholders' lifestyles on a deeper level.	At the Institut Pasteur in Paris, a design team sought to create software tools to support scientific databases and network infrastructure (Letondal & Mackay, 2004). The authors conducted a campus-wide survey during the early stages of the design process that included 40 questions across various categories of software use and needs, garnering 600 responses. The findings mapped the different stakeholder groups at the institute, providing the researchers more contextual information.

<i>Technique</i>	
<i>Description</i>	<i>Example</i>
Competitive Benchmarking - (6 articles; 7%)	
In competitive benchmarking, designers created a survey of the current problem space while also identifying opportunities for new innovations. This technique took many forms, including a review of academic literature to gain an understanding of similar research contexts or applications, or benchmarking to evaluate current solutions from competitors and understand the gaps, guiding improvements for the future outcome.	During the design process for Sprock-it - a “hand-sized robotic character that encourages full-body interaction and engaging mental play” for children - the design team began by benchmarking competitor toys and devices (Burluson et al., 2007, p. 1). Stakeholders were indirectly involved in the benchmarking, as designers took four of the most popular, analogous products to benchmark - including the stakeholder’s voice based on the popularity, without consulting them directly. The designers analyzed the functionalities of each of these devices and how they accomplished the desired user experience.
Historical Document and Data Analysis - (13 articles; 15%)	
Historical document and data analysis involved reviewing internal documents and historical data to obtain an overview of the stakeholder organization, organizational workflow, or design context. Designers coordinated with stakeholders to obtain the most relevant documents and data, before separately analyzing it to build a foundational overview of the design context. This commonly occurred at the beginning of the participatory design process to get designers up to speed.	During an investigation of the construction and maintenance of a wireless community network (WCN) in Italy called Ninux.org, two authors began their process with a document review (Crabu & Magauida, 2018). They included local reports, articles, and other materials with a focus on methods of communication for users. This review led to a discussion of themes regarding the WCN, which informed the author’s initial understanding of the problem landscape and contextual data.
Infrastructuring for Continued Participation - (9 articles; 10%)	
Infrastructuring is a technique particularly unique to PD, aimed at building a system for stakeholder independence at the conclusion of the design process. Designers engaged stakeholders in a series of meetings, organizational changes, and a hand-off process to ensure seamless implementation of a solution and sustainable development by stakeholders into the future. This occurred with both virtual systems or physical systems.	About 200 members of a freelancer network that lived and worked throughout Germany used a program named SIGMA that provided them with technical equipment and software (Törpel et al., 2003). An infrastructuring method allowed for a continuous design process undertaken by the freelancers. The members, over time, built a strong foundation of system knowledge, using past experience to develop the system and bring new users into the continuous design process.
Stakeholder Personas or Scenarios - (7 articles; 8%)	
Designers used personas or scenarios as a form of indirect stakeholder participation during the design process. Practitioners developed personas or	Due to roadblocks in policy, the designers of OutBurst - a child-centric, online environment for children to react to and express their emotions about current events - were not able

<i>Technique</i>	
<i>Description</i>	<i>Example</i>
scenarios using previous stakeholder insights to represent an imaginary stakeholder or a common use-case situation respectively. After making these profiles, designers referenced and reflected on them consistently throughout the remainder of the design process.	to bring children to the studio during the design process (Antle, 2004). Instead, they developed a series of personas to indirectly bring children into the design process while they worked. The designers brainstormed multiple personas and eventually used one named Rachel and a second named Dodge. Designers consistently referred back to how Rachel and Dodge would think or feel about various design decisions to help guide the process and outcome.

#### 4.7. Strategy of Stakeholder Input

Looking across the techniques described in the articles, the strategy of stakeholder input used throughout the process was classified as either *predetermined* or *emergent* to investigate the level of flexibility and dynamics of stakeholder agency during the process. For *predetermined* Participatory Design processes, we defined the category as a PD process in which the techniques are pre-planned, followed specific guidelines for execution, and generally did not deviate from this initial plan; 39 articles (44%) used participatory techniques in this way. In one such example, researchers developed reading software for kids to make it more interactive and engaging (Kaplan et al., 2006). The research team first conducted a contextual inquiry about children’s reading habits before running a preliminary study where children used the developed reading software called Alph to read a book for four weeks. Researchers observed their use, took data, and held meetings to discuss the children's experiences. At the end of the experience, the users provided 3 things they liked, 3 they did not, and 3 suggestions for improvements in a final meeting.

*Emergent* Participatory Design processes had more nuance in the process execution. While the techniques were identified beforehand, the overarching goals and execution of the techniques actively evolved as the practitioners managed the design process; 47 articles (54%) used participatory techniques in this way. Especially emergent design processes included unplanned iterations on techniques - for example, circling back to a specific stakeholder group with additional interviews at a later stage in the design process to glean additional insights (Ginige et al., 2014). In another example, a researcher aiming to improve the wastewater management systems of low-income communities in Indonesia began with interviews to identify existing concerns amongst the public (Rosenqvist, 2018). This approach included a context-specific design game developed and played with participants to collaboratively evaluate, reflect, and iterate on the responsibility of stakeholders in wastewater management. The researcher was involved in this game and the workshops it took place in as well as a co-design workshop to move towards a new management model. Another design game was played with an expanded set of stakeholders to allow for further discussion with interviews conducted after the workshops to identify any shifts in matters of concern. Two articles did not discuss the dynamics of participatory techniques in the design process.

## 5. DISCUSSION

The literature pointed to specific Participatory Design case study discussions holding the largest share of articles (53 articles; 60%), with the literature also displaying a bias to intangible system design contexts (61 articles; 69%). A vast majority of the articles included stakeholder participation throughout the design

process (65 articles; 74%), through techniques that were both direct and indirect - displaying significant nuance in the Participatory Design technique playbook. These trends and the ways in which PD can begin to remedy inequitable design by engaging directly with stakeholders are discussed in the section below.

### **5.1. Types of Participatory Design Research Trends**

Of the five types of Participatory Design, a majority (53 articles; 60%) discussed specific case studies of PD within a design project. This type of research is critical for communicating design projects to the academic community and records the successes and challenges of a specific design process in a specific context for future practitioners to learn from. Each design process and context is different, with particularities and nuances that are not found in past work - a PD process to build a community library in Denmark (Dalsgaard, 2012) is significantly and justifiably different from the process to develop educational software to engage children in active reading (Kaplan et al., 2006). For this reason, commentary on the effectiveness of Participatory Design in a case study can be useful, but it forces researchers to interpolate how it applies to their work rather than drawing directly from strong, foundational guidelines and common principles. In this specific comparison, practitioners investigating the reading software would have needed to translate the specifics from the PD process for the library into general guidance, rather than being able to pull from a higher-level, foundational document outlining Participatory Design best practices, such as our literature review. The next largest share of the literature, 15% of articles evaluated a Participatory Design technique - a category that is similarly limited in scope to the case studies, as it does not evaluate the larger picture of PD. One such example delved into the nuances of 3D simulation models to allow residents of a Botswana settlement to model their own houses and discover the preferences of residents as to the street patterns of new areas in the settlement, with the research focusing on the effectiveness of the 3D models in discovering stakeholder needs (Hardie, 1988). This article and similar others are more specific than case studies, looking deeper at one particular technique or activity in a Participatory Design process - again, while extremely useful for practitioners to understand the nuances of a technique, this type of articles does not offer instruction in the way of taking the principles of Participatory Design and generalizing the for any and all design contexts.

The research of specific case studies and singular techniques in these two categories builds a diverse breadth of data to examine through a lens of equity in design. Our team was able to take an in-depth look and gain a ground-level understanding of equitable (and inequitable) design processes or techniques - in other words, we learned how equity shows up at a working level in PD. Understanding equity in PD on a case-specific basis enhances confidence in our analysis because our findings, and subsequently our discussion, is foundationally built from Participatory Design in action and applied ‘on-the-ground.’

The remaining 25% of articles reviewed fit best into categories discussing guidelines applicable to a certain PD context, foundational principles for any PD process, or an author’s reflections on the efficacy of PD in design. More often than not, these papers drew the guidelines or principles from a few design studies and missed aspects of PD from peer research. We believe this gap is notable in the Participatory Design research landscape, as articles that examine guidelines or principles might be directly applied to future projects. Such articles may also examine the deeper concerns of inequitable design - guidelines for a specific design context aimed at empowering a historically disadvantaged stakeholder group, or overarching principles that enable a design process foundationally imbued with equity, empowerment, and mutual learning. We did not find articles that specifically addressed the gaps of PD guidelines and



principles for equitable design, but similar works could have a positive impact and align with our analysis in this paper.

## **5.2. Design Context Trends**

A key metric showed the heavy majority of articles - 81 articles, or 92% - discussed real-world applications of PD. The findings of nearly all articles used in this paper were not conjecture of practitioners in a conference room. Rather, real projects with real stakeholders produced the learnings in this paper, adding credibility to our findings and indicating the likely success of these learnings if applied to future, real-world projects.

The more granular classification of Design Contexts in PD displays a bias towards intangible systems - 61 of 88 articles (69%). This aligns with the historical origins of PD in the 'Scandinavian Approach' from the 60s and 70s that developed from industries involving trade unions with the design and implementation of workplace systems and processes (Farrell et al., 2006). Although PD has also been historically used in the architecture discipline as well (Davies, 2004), the disparity of physical system contexts to intangible systems is an interesting dynamic. One explanation for this gap in design research could be the definition of the field - architectural projects were not commonly discussed in the journals analyzed, but those that were discussed are included in the physical systems classification. In other words, participatory architectural projects were not commonly published in the journals and conferences examined for this paper.

Even if the sourcing of articles for this paper affected the design contexts, we believe this gap to still exist in Participatory Design applications and research. Closing the identified gap across disciplines and contexts may help PD become more accessible and utilized across a wider breadth of design projects. In doing so, future practitioners would have a wider base of past knowledge to draw from, with examples that may be more relevant to their project. More diverse applications of PD will inevitably lead to more learnings about the pitfalls of PD, and the potential for inequitable design in a number of different contexts. The intangible-physical design context research gap is a topic that cannot be solved in this paper, nor did we find specific items in the articles to explain the anomaly. We would, however, advocate for the continued research of PD processes and techniques applied to more and more diverse design contexts. The more contexts Participatory Design is applied to, the more we know about how to succeed in delivering a solution, and how to avoid pitfalls that breed inequitable processes in all design contexts.

## **5.3. Consistent Stakeholder Participation**

The main theme that we see in the characteristics of stakeholder participation come from the timing of when stakeholders participated, and the methods with which stakeholders were recruited to participate. The combination of stakeholder participation throughout the design process in a significant majority of the literature, and the recruitment methods of each case study tailored to best represent the stakeholder group point to consistency being the key for stakeholder participation.

As indicated by the data, the vast majority of articles involved stakeholders participation throughout the design process (65 of 88 articles; 74%), emphasizing that consistent participation is common in PD. Taking this idea one step further, it also demonstrates that PD that consistently involves stakeholders leads to a democratic design process by allowing stakeholder input to guide the process early and often. When

stakeholders are involved consistently throughout a design process - in timing and approach - it becomes much easier for practitioners to ensure that the process is equitable. More opportunities for stakeholder input at more stages of the design process will inherently amplify stakeholder voices to ensure they are considered with ample weight when design decisions are made. Even with consistent stakeholder involvement though, the equitable PD processes begin with equitable recruitment.

Often it can be difficult to find participants - many projects rely on volunteers who give a large chunk of time to support the work. This may lead to an unrepresentative group of participants and inequitable solutions, which can be avoided with activities that thoroughly recruit diverse participants and establish the equity of all stakeholders. Recruitment activities such as advertising the project in the community, leveraging word of mouth (Francis, 1988), utilizing a sales pitch to encourage widespread participation (Dearden et al., 2006), and incentivizing participation encourage equitable recruitment for a design process. At its core, recruitment should be open, with attention paid to who is replying to invitations, who is participating in activities, and how participants are receptive to the design process. The methods used for recruiting participants often rely on the specifics of the project. This includes significant leg work to advertise the project for volunteers if the general public is the audience (Dalsgaard, 2012), or it could be a more targeted recruitment that only includes members of a particular organization that organized the project (Simonsen & Kensing, 1997). Regardless of the target audience for recruitment, the process must be equitable - participation must be equally accessible for all stakeholder groups that are affected by the design project; materials distributed to inform stakeholders of the opportunity to participate are clear, communicative, and inclusive; and participatory techniques used during the design process should be accessible for all participants. Ensuring equitable recruitment and participation empowers stakeholders in the design process - a key tenet of Participatory Design.

#### **5.4. Nuances of Participatory Techniques**

Participatory Techniques that were used in the literature are significantly more nuanced than a short definition. Our research team felt that defining these techniques at a high level was extremely valuable for a common understanding of the basic principles of each technique, but we realize that the ways in which the techniques are implemented can - and in the spirit of adaptability, should - stray from the explicit definitions in Table 4, while still maintaining the spirit of the participatory technique.

To offer another level of analysis that builds upon the definitions of participatory techniques, here we evaluate each technique as placed on a Spectrum of Directness, seen in Figure 4, with relation to the involvement of participants. For the purposes of this paper we will define a *direct technique* as one where participants are present and actively involved in the design activities that are a part of the technique. An *indirect technique* will be defined as one where there is not consistent, direct interaction between designers and participants.




Fig. 4. Participatory techniques categorized and placed along the Spectrum of Directness

This delineation between *direct* and *indirect* participatory techniques may at first seem to be a contradiction when discussing PD. It begs the question - how can a so-called ‘participatory’ technique only involve stakeholders *indirectly*? The key is that a variety of multiple techniques discussed in Table 4 and displayed in Figure 4 are used to build a comprehensive and effective Participatory Design process. Some specific techniques may not be directly participatory, but they are still critical for building a foundational knowledge base and practicing empathy in a participatory process. This is supported by trends across the techniques used in the literature, with only 19 articles (22%) leveraging exclusively more *direct* methods such as Participatory Workshops or Interviews, while 65 articles (74%) used or discussed at least one *indirect* method, including Benchmarking and Surveys. 4 articles did not discuss specific participatory techniques. It is clear if approximately 74% of the literature reviewed uses an indirect element in their Participatory Design process that these techniques are both commonly used and also necessary to the successful implementation of a PD process. An additional element of this delineation is the balance between direct and indirect techniques, to which the literature indicates a preference for direct methods with explicit participation. A quantification of this balance is not especially clear, as any method used during a PD process is subject to iteration or context-specific modifications and would require further research to examine a quantitative difference between direct and indirect techniques. In subsequent sections, the different categories seen in Figure 4 are discussed, explaining where the technique is placed on the Spectrum of Directness and why it is placed there.

*Varied Stakeholder Involvement* is intentionally vague - the participatory techniques that are classified here can be used in a variety of ways that are both direct and indirect stakeholder involvement as described below. With Context-Specific Activities, User Representatives, and Prototyping, this category consists on some level of both understanding stakeholders and providing stakeholders a platform to have

input on design outcomes, sometimes designing potential solutions themselves. Given this unique blend of participation, these techniques are classified as Varied Stakeholder Involvement.

*Understanding Stakeholders* has similar goals to those of ethnographic research during the design process - gain deep insights into the activities, needs, and thoughts of stakeholders. Techniques that achieve this include Observations, Interviews, Surveys, and Public Hearings. Each technique involves stakeholders contributing their insights to the designers in different ways, with the design team subsequently taking the insights to analyze and interpret them. In this way, designers learn about the stakeholders and use their input to make data-driven design decisions in alignment with stakeholder needs.

*Contextual Information Gathering* includes participatory techniques that help survey the landscape of three different areas: (1) competing or analogous design outcomes to inform successful or unsuccessful aspects of past work through Benchmarking, (2) Document and Data Analysis to analyze current work practices or trends and identify the gaps or potential needs, and (3) Personas or Scenarios to provide a contextual reference point to stakeholder needs throughout the design process. Overall, Contextual Information Gathering uses indirect methods to inform design decisions throughout the design process.

*Maintaining Stakeholder Involvement* occurs through the use of Infrastructuring or Update Meetings, when designers maintain consistent involvement with stakeholders. The level at which this is achieved differs between the two techniques, with Infrastructuring being used to drive future progress in user-led development and Update Meetings more common during the strict design process to keep users informed of progress and results. Both techniques help to keep stakeholders in the know during the design process, empowering them to contribute with the knowledge gained from these techniques.

*Direct Design Input* features two techniques - Participatory Workshops and Focus Groups - that directly involve stakeholders in insightful discussions and activities to elicit feedback and help guide the design process. These two techniques are categorized as Direct Design Input because they can go beyond information gathering at a base level, instead driving insightful, face-to-face participation during various stages of the design process to directly influence design decisions.

Even with the techniques defined in Section 4.5 and classified in this section, it is important to note that the ability to adapt is key to a successful Participatory Design process and that future applications may not fully align with the definitions or classifications in this paper. The basics of each PD technique can be taken and leveraged to best suit the specific needs of a design context, stakeholder group, timeline, or other variable - as long as it is done equitably and for the benefit of stakeholders. One simple way to begin to implement PD techniques equitably and effectively is to use a variety of techniques at a variety of stages throughout the Participatory Design process. As mentioned, 79 of 88 articles (90%) used multiple participatory techniques - clear support for the idea of varied techniques to spur stakeholder involvement. The more techniques that are used, the more different opportunities stakeholders have to participate. If these techniques happen at various times throughout the design process, more diverse voices can be heard at different points in time. Variety in technique and timing is not a singular answer to equitable Participatory Design, but it can be a first step to empowering a diverse group of stakeholders to have equitable opportunities to contribute to the design process.

### **5.5. Participatory, But Not Equitable**

We provide a synthesis of key approaches from design peers that can support others in engaging in PD practice as well as analysis of PD processes. This synthesis is important for the design community, but as we reviewed articles and compiled the findings, we realized that past design processes only strengthen the need to address inequities born from improper design practices and remedy inequitable design by engaging directly with stakeholders and users. While discussing the findings of the review, we emphasized equitable design, and tied through lines for practitioners to begin to take an active role in making design equitable for each aspect of the Participatory Design process.

To further emphasize the importance of designers actively engaged in implementing an equitable process, we chose one example that dealt with the development of informal settlements in Peru that reflected how PD can, at times, be successfully used for inclusion of typically disadvantaged stakeholders, and at other times used to expand the power of a leading demographic (Frediani, 2016). This power expansion can be done through the design of the process to a group's own benefit, the dilution of differing stakeholder needs into inaccurately homogenized findings, the potentially large scale design context that diminishes quieter voices, or predetermined, overly constrained solution requirements that diminish new learnings. All of the ways in which Participatory Design can be used to consolidate one group's influence over another are a cautionary tale that simply having stakeholders participate in design does not necessarily mean the process of solution is equitable. The power dynamics in projects such as these have raised questions of democracy in design and how PD can be effectively leveraged to empower stakeholders without taking advantage of power disparities. The focus on ensuring equitable empowerment is important as Participatory Design is recognized and utilized as an effective way to design with stakeholders. More support in the implementation of successful PD can have far-reaching benefits across design domains that require flexible processes and adaptable solutions to wicked problems (Rittel & Webber, 1973) - problems that affect large populations and may lead to solutions that harm minoritized communities when all stakeholders aren't provided a voice in the design process.

We are not the only advocates to acknowledge that just because a process involves stakeholders, does not mean it is automatically an equitable design process with just outcome. Other practitioners have also called for an emphasis on equitable Participatory Design - a particularly salient example points to the possibility of strengthened power imbalances between practitioners and stakeholders in design processes, advocating for a drastic rethinking of Participatory Design from a process to a meta-methodology of Radical Participatory Design (Udoewa, 2022). Discussions prompted by research such as this are crucial to push on previously held notions of equity in design, and drive the space beyond the idea that simply involving stakeholders deems a process equitable. Engaging directly with stakeholders and users is simply the first step towards a future of design that is participatory and equitable.

### **5.6. Future Work**

Further investigation of the nuanced aspects of equity, empowerment, and how these characteristics define successful results in Participatory Design projects is invaluable as the engineering design community works towards a future of truly equitable Participatory Design. Practitioners are already beginning to investigate design in this space, looking at increased intentionality to include compassion in Participatory Design processes through practitioner reflections to emphasize stakeholder's dignity, empowerment, and security (Seshadri et al., 2019) as well as redesigned design thinking processes to effectively include and

empower novices and nondesigners in a simplified design process (Efeoğlu & Møller, 2023). Articles such as these contribute to filling the gap in applied equitable Participatory Design research that should be understood further to best aid designers in their quest for equitable processes and outcomes.

Across the literature, it was common for authors to describe specific design process outcomes, but less common to see an evaluation of the effectiveness of PD as a methodology. Instead of commenting on how their design process proves or disproves the value of PD, authors offered comments on specific successes and challenges in their design process, within their specific design context. Since an understanding of the transferability of Participatory Design requires additional, extensive analysis, our team is developing a number of Participatory Design Principles that draw on this literature to craft foundational ideas of PD processes, independent of the design context as a follow-up to this work that will be expanded upon in a future paper.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

With this paper, we first examined what constitutes Participatory Design in the field by collating design literature from an array of sources and analyzing it with five overarching research questions: what variation exists in types of studies examining Participatory Design; in which design contexts has Participatory Design been used; how are stakeholders recruited to participate; what stages of design work were participatory, what did stakeholder involvement look like within these stages; and what Participatory Design techniques were leveraged in the design process. Through these research questions, we addressed a twin desire across design disciplines - engineering design in particular - to remedy inequitable design by engaging directly with stakeholders and users. This paper shows what PD looks like in practice, drawing from past PD processes to improve its future use for equitable processes and outcomes.

Our team determined multiple salient trends in the literature. A majority of the Participatory Design literature (53 of 88 articles; 60%) discussed specific case studies. The contexts in which Participatory Design were applied showed a majority (61 of 88 articles; 69%) of applications with intangible systems - with an overwhelming majority (81 of 88 articles; 92%) occurring in real-world projects. We saw that the most successful Participatory Design processes put in significant foundational work to recruit stakeholders, with methods tailored to recruit those who best represent the stakeholder group. Once recruited, stakeholders participated throughout the design process in a significant majority of the literature (65 of 88 articles; 74%), pointing to consistency being a key for stakeholder participation. This showed us that consistently involving stakeholders leads to a democratic design process, although said process must begin with equitable recruitment.

Once recruited, 14 distinct participatory techniques - described in Section 4.5 - were used to engage stakeholders in Participatory Design processes. A deeper analysis of these techniques manifested Figure 4 in Section 5.4 - the Spectrum of Directness. This spectrum allows for fluidity and flexibility in our definition of participatory techniques, demonstrating the oftentimes ambiguous nature of PD processes - and transitively the techniques practitioners use - that emphasizes the crucial nature of adaptability in PD.

In addition to the findings described above, we would like to emphasize again - any design process at its core must embody equity. As such, acknowledging the power dynamics in a Participatory Design process and making every attempt to mitigate undesirable dynamics are paramount. Designers must maintain their

focus on empowerment, especially when the line between empowerment and abuse of power in Participatory Design is a close one.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, W. G. (1988). Participatory programming for Digital Equipment Corporation, Inc. *DESIGN STUDIES*, 9(1).
- Aitamurto, T., Holland, D., & Hussain, S. (2015). The Open Paradigm in Design Research. *Design Issues*, 31(4), 17–29. [https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI\\_a\\_00348](https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI_a_00348)
- Albrechtslund, A., & Ryberg, T. (2011). Participatory Surveillance in the Intelligent Building. *Design Issues*, 27(3), 35–46. [https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI\\_a\\_00089](https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI_a_00089)
- Anderson, W. L., & Crocca, W. T. (1993). Engineering practice and codevelopment of codevelopment of product prototypes. *Communications of the ACM*, 36(6), 49–56. <https://doi.org/10.1145/153571.256015>
- Antle, A. (2004). Supporting children’s emotional expression and exploration in online environments. *Proceedings of the 2004 Conference on Interaction Design and Children: Building a Community*, 97–104. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1017833.1017846>
- Bertoni, A., Hallstedt, S. I., Dasari, S. K., & Andersson, P. (2020). Integration of value and sustainability assessment in design space exploration by machine learning: An aerospace application. *Design Science*, 6, e2. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dsj.2019.29>
- Beyer, H. R., & Holtzblatt, K. (1995). Apprenticing with the customer. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(5), 45–52. <https://doi.org/10.1145/203356.203365>
- Bjögvinsson, E., Ehn, P., & Hillgren, P.-A. (2012). Design Things and Design Thinking: Contemporary Participatory Design Challenges. *Design Issues*, 28(3), 101–116. [https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI\\_a\\_00165](https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI_a_00165)
- Bødker, S., Dindler, C., & Iversen, O. S. (2017). Tying Knots: Participatory Infrastructuring at Work. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 26(1–2), 245–273. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-017-9268-y>
- Bossen, C. (2006). Participation, power, critique: Constructing a standard for electronic patient records. *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Participatory Design Expanding Boundaries in Design - PDC '06*, 1, 95. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1147261.1147276>
- Bossen, C. (2011). Accounting and Co-Constructing: The Development of a Standard for Electronic Health Records. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 20(6), 473–495. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-011-9141-3>
- Boy, G. A. (2017). Human-centered design of complex systems: An experience-based approach. *Design Science*, 3, e8. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dsj.2017.8>
- Brandt, E. (2006). *Designing Exploratory Design Games: A Framework for Participation in Participatory Design?*
- Burleson, W., Jensen, C. N., Raaschou, T., & Frohold, S. (2007). Sprock-it: A physically interactive play system. *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Interaction Design and Children - IDC '07*, 125. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1297277.1297302>
- Büscher, M., Eriksen, M. A., Kristensen, J. F., & Mogensen, P. H. (2004). Ways of grounding imagination. *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Participatory Design Artful Integration: Interweaving Media, Materials and Practices - PDC 04*, 1, 193. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1011870.1011893>
- Campbell, N. (2004). Making sense of imbrication: Popular technology and “inside-out” methodologies. *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Participatory Design Artful Integration: Interweaving Media, Materials and Practices - PDC 04*, 1, 65. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1011870.1011878>
- Carmel, E., Whitaker, R. D., & George, J. F. (n.d.). *PD and joint application design: A transatlantic comparison*. 7.
- Carroll, J. M., & Rosson, M. B. (1996). Developing the Blacksburg electronic village. *Communications of the ACM*, 39(12), 69–74. <https://doi.org/10.1145/240483.240498>
- Cederman-Haysom, T., & Brereton, M. (2006). *A Participatory Design Agenda for Ubiquitous Computing and Multimodal Interaction: A Case Study of Dental Practice*. 10.

- Crabu, S., & Magaudda, P. (2018). Bottom-up Infrastructures: Aligning Politics and Technology in building a Wireless Community Network. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 27(2), 149–176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-017-9301-1>
- Dalsgaard, P. (2012). Participatory Design in Large-Scale Public Projects: Challenges and Opportunities. *Design Issues*, 28(3), 34–47. [https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI\\_a\\_00160](https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI_a_00160)
- Davies, R. C. (2004). Adapting Virtual Reality for the Participatory Design of Work Environments. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 13(1), 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:COSU.0000014985.12045.9c>
- Dearden, A., Lauener, A., Slack, F., Roast, C., & Cassidy, S. (2006). Make it so! Jean-Luc Picard, Bart Simpson and the design of e-public services. *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Participatory Design Expanding Boundaries in Design - PDC '06, 1*, 67. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1147261.1147272>
- DePaula, R. (2004). Lost in translation: A critical analysis of actors, artifacts, agendas, and arenas in participatory design. *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Participatory Design Artful Integration: Interweaving Media, Materials and Practices - PDC 04, 1*, 162. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1011870.1011890>
- DiSalvo, C., Louw, M., Holstius, D., Nourbakhsh, I., & Akin, A. (2012). Toward a Public Rhetoric Through Participatory Design: Critical Engagements and Creative Expression in the Neighborhood Networks Project. *Design Issues*, 28(3), 48–61. [https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI\\_a\\_00161](https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI_a_00161)
- Dong, A., Sarkar, S., Nichols, C., & Kvan, T. (2013). The capability approach as a framework for the assessment of policies toward civic engagement in design. *Design Studies*, 34(3), 326–344. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2012.10.002>
- Efeoğlu, A., & Møller, C. (2023). Redesigning design thinking for codesign with nondesigners: A method efficiency perspective. *Design Science*, 9, e14. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dsj.2023.11>
- Ehn, P. (n.d.). *Work-Oriented Design of Computer Artifacts*.
- Farooq, U., Schank, P., Harris, A., Fusco, J., & Schlager, M. (2007). Sustaining a Community Computing Infrastructure for Online Teacher Professional Development: A Case Study of Designing Tapped In. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 16(4–5), 397–429. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-007-9049-0>
- Farrell, V., Farrell, G., Mouzakis, K., Pilgrim, C., & Byrt, P. (2006). PICTIOL: A case study in participatory design. *Proceedings of the 20th Conference of the Computer-Human Interaction Special Interest Group (CHISIG) of Australia on Computer-Human Interaction: Design: Activities, Artefacts and Environments - OZCHI '06*, 191. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1228175.1228209>
- Francis, M. (1988). Negotiating between children and adult design values in open space projects. *Design Studies*, 9(2), 67–75. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X\(88\)90032-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X(88)90032-4)
- Frediani, A. A. (2016). Re-imagining Participatory Design: Reflecting on the ASF-UK Change by Design Methodology. *Design Issues*, 32(3), 98–111. [https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI\\_a\\_00403](https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI_a_00403)
- Gärtner, J. (1998). Participatory Design in Consulting. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 7(3–4), 273–289. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008635121175>
- Gemser, G., De Bont, C., Hekkert, P., & Friedman, K. (2012). Quality perceptions of design journals: The design scholars' perspective. *Design Studies*, 33(1), 4–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2011.09.001>
- Ginige, A., Paolino, L., Romano, M., Sebillo, M., Tortora, G., & Vitiello, G. (2014). Information Sharing Among Disaster Responders—An Interactive Spreadsheet-Based Collaboration Approach. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 23(4–6), 547–583. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-014-9207-0>
- Grønberg, K., & Mogensen, P. (1997). Informing General CSCW Product Development through Cooperative Design in Specific Work Domains. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 6(4), 275–304. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008626106968>
- Guha, M. L., Druin, A., Chipman, G., Fails, J. A., Simms, S., & Farber, A. (2005). Working with young children as technology design partners. *Communications of the ACM*, 48(1), 39–42. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1039539.1039567>
- Hardie, G. J. (1988). Community participation based on three-dimensional simulation models. *Design Studies*, 9(1), 56–61. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X\(88\)90026-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X(88)90026-9)



- Hess, J., & Pipek, V. (2012). Community-Driven Development: Approaching Participatory Design in the Online World. *Design Issues*, 28(3), 62–76. [https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI\\_a\\_00162](https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI_a_00162)
- Hornecker, E., Halloran, J., Fitzpatrick, G., Weal, M., Millard, D., Michaelides, D., Cruickshank, D., & De Roure, D. (2006). UbiComp in opportunity spaces: Challenges for participatory design. *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Participatory Design: Expanding Boundaries in Design - Volume 1*, 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1147261.1147269>
- Humphreys, T., Leung, L., & Weakley, A. (2008). Embedding expert users in the interaction design process: A case study. *Design Studies*, 29(6), 603–622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2008.07.006>
- Huybrechts, L., Dreesen, K., & Hagenars, B. (2018). Building Capabilities Through Democratic Dialogues. *Design Issues*, 34(4), 80–95. [https://doi.org/10.1162/desi\\_a\\_00513](https://doi.org/10.1162/desi_a_00513)
- Hyysalo, V., & Hyysalo, S. (2018). The Mundane and Strategic Work in Collaborative Design. *Design Issues*, 34(3), 42–58. [https://doi.org/10.1162/desi\\_a\\_00496](https://doi.org/10.1162/desi_a_00496)
- Irestig, M., Eriksson, H., & Timpka, T. (n.d.). *The Impact of Participation in Information System Design: A Comparison of Contextual Placements*.
- Johannessen, L. K., & Ellingsen, G. (2012). Lightweight Design Methods in Integrated Practices. *Design Issues*, 28(3), 22–33. [https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI\\_a\\_00159](https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI_a_00159)
- Kam, M., Ramachandran, D., Raghavan, A., Chiu, J., Sahni, U., & Canny, J. (n.d.). *Practical Considerations for Participatory Design with Rural School Children in Underdeveloped Regions: Early Reflections from the Field*.
- Kanstrup, A. M., & Bertelsen, P. (2006). Participatory IT-support. *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Participatory Design: Expanding Boundaries in Design - Volume 1*, 87–94. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1147261.1147275>
- Kaplan, N., Chisik, Y., Knudtson, K., Kulkarni, R., Moulthrop, S., Summers, K., & Weeks, H. (2004). Supporting sociable literacy in the international children's digital library. *Proceedings of the 2004 Conference on Interaction Design and Children: Building a Community*, 89–96. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1017833.1017845>
- Kaplan, N., Chisik, Y., & Levy, D. (2006). Reading in the wild: Sociable literacy in practice. *Proceeding of the 2006 Conference on Interaction Design and Children - IDC '06*, 97. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1139073.1139100>
- Karasti, H. (2001). Bridging Work Practice and System Design: Integrating Systemic Analysis, Appreciative Intervention and Practitioner Participation. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 10(2), 211–246. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011239126617>
- Karasti, H., & Syrjänen, A.-L. (2004). Artful infrastructuring in two cases of community PD. *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Participatory Design Artful Integration: Interweaving Media, Materials and Practices - PDC 04, 1*, 20. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1011870.1011874>
- Kensing, F., & Munk-Madsen, A. (1993). PD: Structure in the toolbox. *Communications of the ACM*, 36(6), 78–85. <https://doi.org/10.1145/153571.163278>
- Kensing, F., Simonsen, J., & Bødker, K. (1998). Participatory Design at a Radio Station. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 7(3–4), 243–271. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008683004336>
- Kjær, A., & Madsen, K. H. (1995). Participatory analysis of flexibility. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(5), 53–60. <https://doi.org/10.1145/203356.203367>
- Korpela, M., Soriyan, H. A., Olufokunbi, K. C., Onayade, A. A., Davies-Adetugbo, A., & Adesanmi, D. (1998). Community Participation in Health Informatics in Africa: An Experiment in Tripartite Partnership in Ile-Ife, Nigeria. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 7(3–4), 339–358. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008695307062>
- Kusunoki, D., Sarcevic, A., Zhang, Z., & Yala, M. (2015). Sketching Awareness: A Participatory Study to Elicit Designs for Supporting Ad Hoc Emergency Medical Teamwork. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 24(1), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-014-9210-5>
- Kwok, J. Y.-C. (2004). The weight of space: Participatory design research for configuring habitable space for new arrival women in Hong Kong. *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Participatory Design Artful*

- Integration: Interweaving Media, Materials and Practices - PDC 04, 1*, 183.  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/1011870.1011892>
- Labrune, J.-B., & Mackay, W. (2006). Telebeads: Social network mnemonics for teenagers. *Proceeding of the 2006 Conference on Interaction Design and Children - IDC '06*, 57. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1139073.1139092>
- Letondal, C., & Mackay, W. E. (n.d.). *Participatory Programming and the Scope of Mutual Responsibility: Balancing Scientific, Design and Software Commitment*. 11.
- Li, J., Wilson, L., Stapleton, S., & Cregan, P. (2006). Design of an advanced telemedicine system for emergency care. *Proceedings of the 20th Conference of the Computer-Human Interaction Special Interest Group (CHISIG) of Australia on Computer-Human Interaction: Design: Activities, Artefacts and Environments - OZCHI '06*, 413. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1228175.1228261>
- Luke, R., Clement, A., Terada, R., Bortolussi, D., Booth, C., Brooks, D., & Christ, D. (2004). The promise and perils of a participatory approach to developing an open source community learning network. *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Participatory Design Artful Integration: Interweaving Media, Materials and Practices - PDC 04, 1*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1011870.1011873>
- Mambrey, P., Mark, G., & Pankoke-Babatz, U. (1998). User Advocacy in Participatory Design: Designers' Experiences with a New Communication Channel. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 7(3-4), 291-313. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008687122083>
- McPhail, B., Costantino, T., Bruckmann, D., Barclay, R., & Clement, A. (1998). CAVEAT Exemplar: Participatory Design in a Non-Profit Volunteer Organisation. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 7(3-4), 223-241. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008631020266>
- Menendez-Blanco, M., De Angeli, A., & Teli, M. (2017). Biography of a Design Project through the Lens of a Facebook Page. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 26(1-2), 71-96. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-017-9270-4>
- Merkel, C. B., Xiao, L., Farooq, U., Ganoë, C. H., Lee, R., Carroll, J. M., & Rosson, M. B. (n.d.). *Participatory Design in Community Computing Contexts: Tales from the Field*. 10.
- Mørch, A. I., Engen, B. K., & Åsand, H.-R. H. (n.d.). *The Workplace as a Learning Laboratory: The Winding Road to E-learning in a Norwegian Service Company*.
- Nilsson, B., Peterson, B., Holden, G., & Eckert, C. (2011). Design Med Omtanke: Participation and sustainability in the design of public sector buildings. *Design Studies*, 32(3), 235-254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2010.11.002>
- Oberdorfer, J. (1988). Community participation in the design of the Boulder Creek branch library. *Design Studies*, 9(1), 4-13. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X\(88\)90022-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X(88)90022-1)
- O'Day, V. L., Bobrow, D. G., & Shirley, M. (1998). Network Community Design: A Social-Technical Design Circle. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 7(3-4), 315-337. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008691222992>
- Oostveen, A.-M., & van den Besselaar, P. (2004). From Small Scale to Large Scale User Participation: A Case Study of Participatory Design in E-Government Systems. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1432508>
- Painter, B. (n.d.). *The Electronic Claim File: A Case Study of Impacts of Information Technology in Knowledge Work*.
- Pekkola, S., Kaarilahti, N., & Pohjola, P. (2006). *Towards Formalised End-User Participation in Information Systems Development Process: Bridging the Gap between Participatory Design and ISD Methodologies*.
- Pilemalm, S., Lindell, P.-O., Hallberg, N., & Eriksson, H. (2007). Integrating the Rational Unified Process and participatory design for development of socio-technical systems: A user participative approach. *Design Studies*, 28(3), 263-288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2007.02.009>
- Robertson, T. (1998). Shoppers and Tailors: Participative Practices in Small Australian Design Companies. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 7(3-4), 205-221. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008626803428>
- Robertson, T., Mansfield, T., & Loke, L. (2006). Designing an immersive environment for public use. *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Participatory Design: Expanding Boundaries in Design - Volume 1*, 31-40. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1147261.1147267>

- Rönkkö, K., Hellman, M., Kilander, B., & Dittrich, Y. (2004). Personas is not applicable: Local remedies interpreted in a wider context. *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Participatory Design Artful Integration: Interweaving Media, Materials and Practices - PDC 04, 1*, 112. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1011870.1011884>
- Rosenqvist, T. (2018). Redirecting a Scattered Public Toward Alternative Matters of Concern: Shifting Perceptions of Urban Wastewater Governance in Indonesia. *Design Issues*, 34(4), 51–65. [https://doi.org/10.1162/desi\\_a\\_00511](https://doi.org/10.1162/desi_a_00511)
- Roussou, M., Kavalieratou, E., & Doulgeridis, M. (2007). *Children Designers in the Museum: Applying Participatory Design for the Development of an Art Education Program*. 4.
- Sanoff, H. (1988). Community arts facilities. *Design Studies*, 9(1), 25–39. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X\(88\)90024-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X(88)90024-5)
- Seshadri, P., Joslyn, C. H., Hynes, M. M., & Reid, T. (2019). Compassionate design: Considerations that impact the users' dignity, empowerment and sense of security. *Design Science*, 5, e21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dsj.2019.18>
- Simonsen, J. (2007). Involving top management in IT projects. *Communications of the ACM*, 50(8), 52–58. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1278201.1278206>
- Simonsen, J., & Hertzum, M. (2012). Sustained Participatory Design: Extending the Iterative Approach. *Design Issues*, 28(3), 10–21. [https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI\\_a\\_00158](https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI_a_00158)
- Simonsen, J., Karasti, H., & Hertzum, M. (2020). Infrastructuring and Participatory Design: Exploring Infrastructural Inversion as Analytic, Empirical and Generative. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 29(1–2), 115–151. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-019-09365-w>
- Simonsen, J., & Kensing, F. (n.d.). *Using ethnography in contextual design*.
- Srinivasan, R., & Shilton, K. (2006). The South Asian web: An emerging community information system in the South Asian diaspora. *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Participatory Design: Expanding Boundaries in Design - Volume 1*, 125–133. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1147261.1147280>
- Sun, L., Zhang, Y., Li, Z., Zhou, Z., & Zhou, Z. (2022). inML Kit: Empowering the prototyping of ML-enhanced products by involving designers in the ML lifecycle. *Artificial Intelligence for Engineering Design, Analysis and Manufacturing*, 36, e8. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0890060421000391>
- Taxén, G. (2004). Introducing participatory design in museums. *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Participatory Design Artful Integration: Interweaving Media, Materials and Practices - PDC 04, 1*, 204. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1011870.1011894>
- Törpel, B. (2006). *The Design Game in Participatory Design and Design Education—Chances, Risks and Side Effects*.
- Törpel, B., Pipek, V., & Rittenbruch, M. (2003). Creating Heterogeneity – Evolving Use of Groupware in a Network of Freelancers. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 12(4), 381–409. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026192900770>
- Udoewa, V. (2022). An introduction to radical participatory design: Decolonising participatory design processes. *Design Science*, 8, e31. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dsj.2022.24>
- van Manen, S., Avarð, G., & Martínez-Cruz, M. (2015). Co-ideation of disaster preparedness strategies through a participatory design approach: Challenges and opportunities experienced at Turrialba volcano, Costa Rica. *Design Studies*, 40, 218–245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2015.06.002>
- Vlachokyriakos, V., Crivellaro, C., Kouki, H., Giovanopoulos, C., & Olivier, P. (2021). Research with a Solidarity Clinic: Design Implications for CSCW Healthcare Service Design. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 30(5–6), 757–783. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-021-09404-5>
- Wagner, I. (2012). Building Urban Narratives: Collaborative Site-Seeing and Envisioning in the MR Tent. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 21(1), 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-011-9152-0>
- Wilkinson, C. R., & De Angeli, A. (2014). Applying user centred and participatory design approaches to commercial product development. *Design Studies*, 35(6), 614–631. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2014.06.001>
- Williams, A. (2002). Assessing prototypes' role in design. *Proceedings of the 20th Annual International Conference on Computer Documentation*, 248–257. <https://doi.org/10.1145/584955.584991>

Winschiers-Theophilus, H., Bidwell, N. J., & Blake, E. (2012). Community Consensus: Design Beyond Participation. *Design Issues*, 28(3), 89–100. [https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI\\_a\\_00164](https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI_a_00164)

Wu, M., Richards, B., & Baecker, R. (2004). Participatory design with individuals who have amnesia. *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Participatory Design Artful Integration: Interweaving Media, Materials and Practices - PDC 04, 1*, 214. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1011870.1011895>

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

### A. Analysis Matrix Categories

The categories contained in the analysis matrix were as follows. Note that there were additional categories that are not covered in this paper.

<i>Article Analysis Category</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Type of Participatory Design Research	<i>Description from the text</i> - An initial description using quotes and specific information from the text describing the type and scope of PD covered in the article.
	<i>Scope of PD keyword classification</i> - General classification to sort the articles, described further in Section 4.1.
Context of Design	<i>Description from the text</i> - Using quotes and specific information from the text, this includes a detailed description of what was being designed and the intended outcome of the design process.
	<i>Designed item keyword classification</i> - Initially classified into four high-level categories to describe the context in which PD was discussed or applied. The categories are discussed in Section 4.2.
	<i>Context environment classification</i> - Binarily distinguishes the environment described by the literature, specifically if the work examines a real world project or a theoretical experiment/reflection
Stakeholder Recruitment	<i>Description from the text</i> - Specific information and techniques that the author used to recruit participants for PD activities. Included in this are methods of outreach, location of activities, participation incentives, and recruitment efficacy, if discussed.
Timing of Participation	<i>Description from text</i> - Specific information and quotes that indicate the stage or phase of the design process during which stakeholders were involved.
	<i>Stage of the process keyword classification</i> - Categorizes the timing of stakeholder participation into one of four general stages of the design process described in Section 4.4.
	<i>Frequency of participation</i> - Distinguishes one-time stakeholder participation from iterative stakeholder participation during the PD process.
Participatory Techniques	<i>Description from text</i> - Identifies the specific techniques and methods

	that were used in the PD process discussed in each item of literature. Quotes and specific information provide in-depth data.
	<i>Strategy of stakeholder input</i> - Identifies the techniques used by the authors as predetermined (a set plan to involve stakeholders that was adhered to) or emergent/changing (a flexible process that adapted with the needs of stakeholders and changes in design).