

# D4.1 State of the art overview of existing ways of involving a variety of stakeholders in the creation of and reflection on content creation within an urban context

Prepared by Paul Biedermann and Andrew Vande Moere

Research[x]Design - KU Leuven

Partners: KU Leuven, StudioDott, Bits of Love, NXP, VRT and BUUR

Date: 31/05/2019

# **General Introduction & Content Overview**

The current document represents the complete content overview of Deliverable (D) 4.1. The document is continuously updated with new chapters, containing the latest findings of task (T) 4.1: Knowledge Synthesis of work package (WP) 4: Interaction Design of the CityStory project. The central challenge of this WP is to understand how physical interaction components (e.g. installations in the city, mobile units) can be intertwined with digital interfaces (e.g. smartphones, public displays). The purpose of this particular deliverable is to create an overview of existing, state of the art ways of involving a variety of stakeholders in the creation of and reflection on content creation within an urban context. The results documented in this report will further serve as input to inform the ongoing research activities of WP2 and WP3 and will be evaluated within WP5.

# Until this moment, the document contains the following chapters:

### Chapter I

Contains the findings of all research activities, carried out in between August 2019 (M01) and January 2020 (M05). In particular it describes the process of an initial literature review to identify a set of state-of-the-art design interventions for the public creation of and reflection on content. The identified works have been categorized by the type of engagement they attempt to trigger, resulting in a preliminary framework, containing the four engagement types: Community communication, community inquiry, co-design interventions and reflection triggers. Based on this framework we identified a series of core challenges of citizen participation and created a list of design recommendations to counteract these challenges.

### Contents

| 1 | Intr | Introduction3   |      |  |  |
|---|------|---|------|--|--|
| 2 | Met  | hodology  | 3    |  |  |
| 3 | Sto  | rycatcher Framework                                       | 4    |  |  |
|   | 3.1  | Active and Passive Storycatchers:                         | 4    |  |  |
|   | 3.2  | Engagement Types  | 9    |  |  |
| 4 | Cha  | llenges in Citizen Participation                          | 19   |  |  |
|   | 4.1  | Display blindness   | . 19 |  |  |
|   | 4.2  | Complexity of multiple citizens engaging at the same time | . 19 |  |  |
|   | 4.3  | Fear of not being able to contribute                      | . 19 |  |  |
|   | 4.4  | Evaluation apprehension                                   | . 19 |  |  |
| 5 | Des  | ign Considerations  | 20   |  |  |
|   | 5.1  | Tacitcs of curiosity:                                     | . 20 |  |  |
|   | 5.2  | Playful engagement  | . 20 |  |  |
|   | 5.3  | Collaboration   | . 20 |  |  |
|   | 5.4  | Ownership / Giving a voice to the people                  | . 20 |  |  |
|   | 5.5  | Feedback  | . 20 |  |  |
|   | 5.6  | Simplicity  | . 20 |  |  |
|   | 5.7  | Relevance:  | . 21 |  |  |
|   | 5.8  | Anonymity   | . 22 |  |  |
|   | 5.9  | Honeypot Effect   | . 22 |  |  |
|   | 5.10 | Ambiguity   | . 23 |  |  |
|   | 5.11 | Trust   | . 23 |  |  |
| 6 | Dis  | cussion   | 24   |  |  |
|   | 6.1  | Ownership vs. Simplicity                                  | . 24 |  |  |
|   | 6.2  | Playful vs. meaningful interaction                        | . 24 |  |  |
| 7 | Cor  | nclusion  | 24   |  |  |
| 8 | Lim  | itations  | 24   |  |  |
| 9 | Ref  | erences   | 24   |  |  |

# **Chapter II**

Contains the findings of all research activities, carried out in between January 2020 (M05) and May 2020 (M09). The present chapter builds on the data set of chapter I and presents an updated version of the previously acquired public engagement framework. Furthermore, it proposes an encompassing placemaking interface stakeholder relationship model, that describes how the investigated interfaces encouraged or resisted true bidirectional dialogues amongst all involved stakeholders. Finally, it discusses their power relationships and provides a list of critical considerations of how to design more democratic interfaces, that facilitate placemaking in transparent and accountable ways between all the stakeholders.

### Contents

| 1 | Intr | oduction   | 3  |
|---|------|--|----|
| 2 |      |  |    |
| 3 | Plac | 5  |    |
|   | 3.1  | Analysis   |    |
|   | 3.2  | The Model  |    |
|   | 3.3  | Stakeholders   | 7  |
|   | 3.4  | Interface Components                                     | 8  |
| 4 | •    |  |    |
|   | 4.1  | Reflection Interfaces                                    | 9  |
|   | 4.2  | Communication Interfaces                                 | 10 |
|   | 4.3  | Inquiry Interfaces                                       | 11 |
|   | 4.4  | Differences in Participant Agency                        | 12 |
| 5 | Disc | cussion  | 13 |
|   | 5.1  | How Placemaking Interfaces are Controlled by Gatekeepers | 13 |
|   | 5.2  | How Placemaking Interfaces are Technologically Motivated | 14 |
|   | 5.3  | How Placemaking Interfaces Express Participant Feedback  | 14 |
|   | 5.4  | How Placemaking Interfaces can Matter                    | 15 |
| 6 | Lim  | itations   | 16 |
| 7 | Cor  | nclusion   | 16 |