

Cyber Safe Generation: Digital education by design

Participatory Design Model: Conceptual Description







IO2 Participatory Design Model: Conceptual Description

CyGen's participatory design model is based on the methodology of participatory design. Put simply, this means that those who are the users of information technologies – in this case the CyGen digital education package – should have a central place in their development (Simonsen & Robertson, 2013). Participatory design literature incorporates a set of theories, practices and studies which engage end users fully in the design of technologies (Yarosh & Schueller, 2017).



CyGen was designed around a series of Design Cycles: a series of development activities completed in each partner country. The first design cycle was completed in the United Kingdom, the second in Denmark, the third in Belgium, and finally the fourth in Greece. This design enabled us to fully embrace the principles of participatory design, developing our digital education package alongside data collection and digital education package development in each partner country.

The principles of participatory design align to the values regularly used by the international CyGen team in their work (Lomax, 2012; Pyer & Tucker, 2017) across all our partner countries. The planning that underpinned the project developed from a single key focus; that children's voices should be central to the research and its outputs. Within the project, we worked with



children to position them as co-designers. We also worked with parents and teachers. They – along with children - were our key stakeholders; their voices and opinions underpin both our findings and the outputs of the collaboration.

Child-centred methods were combined with flexibility of delivery within the project's Design Cycle. Involving them in this way was key to ensuring that the educational outputs reflected their needs. The process of involvement in and of itself was also





designed to support their development (Biggeri et al., 2019). Children in Denmark supported the initial design and testing of the Design Cycle and the associated toolkit. This process of engagement and feedback was continued throughout each of the four design cycles with key messages about 'what works' fed-forward to the other partners. In these ways, the project sought to "investigate, understand, reflect upon, establish, develop, and support mutual learning between multiple participants..." (Simonsen & Robertson, 2013 p. 2).

References

- Biggeri, M., Arciprete, C. & Karkara, R. (2019) Children and Youth Participation in Decision-Making and Research Processes [Online]. In: *The Capability Approach, Empowerment and Participation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 193–221. Available from: http://link.springer.com/10.1057/978-1-137-35230-9_8 [Accessed 11 October 2019].
- Lomax, H. (2012) Contested Voices? Methodological Tensions in Creative Visual Research with Children. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* [Online], 15 (2), pp. 105–117. Available from: http://oro.open.ac.uk/31040/1/Lomax_(part_edted)_14.1.12.docx.
- Pyer, M. & Tucker, F. (2017) 'With Us, We, Like, Physically Can't': Transport, Mobility and the Leisure Experiences of Teenage Wheelchair Users. *Mobilities*, 12 (1).
- Simonsen, J. & Robertson, T. (2013) Participatory Design. In: *Routledge international handbook of participatory design*. Routledge, pp. 1–17.
- Yarosh, S. & Schueller, S. M. (2017) Happiness Inventors: Informing Positive Computing Technologies Through Participatory Design With Children. *Journal of medical Internet research* [Online], 19 (1), p. 14. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28096066> [Accessed 11 October 2019].





The Partnership











The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.