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Abstract

Today’s emerging Co-design processes between citizens and civil servants in helixes groups, produces multiple challenges for the interaction designer. How can these challenges produce new merging roles and communication strategies for interaction designers for use in Co-design processes?

This thesis focuses on the design research process outcomes from Co-design processes between civil servants and citizens in urban development processes. The tangible outcomes will be elicited through the merging of practice-based know-how as seen through the eyes of an interaction designer with a bifocal lens on Social psychology and Behaviour economics.

This research process produces tangible outcomes in the form of educational material, communication methods and strategies for interaction designers, civil servants in Co-design processes.

Additional outcomes are digital communication strategies for city operations based on the need for increased citizen involvement in the urban development process.
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1 Introduction

According to the Malmö commission (Malmökommissionens slutrapport, 2014), Malmö city should apply three aspects of sustainable development: Economical sustainability, ecological sustainability and social sustainability. This thesis focuses on the social sustainability aspect of city development, and especially the Co-design process between citizens and the civil servants of Stadsbyggnadskontoret, (City Planning Office), in the urban development process of Amiralstaden in Malmö.

In the fall of 2017 I attended the Co-design course, “Co-design – Design, participation and democracy” at Malmö University. In that course, me and my team of fellow students, performed research together with stakeholders within the Amiralstaden process. The Amiralstaden process and Stadsbyggnadskontoret, is a process where one of the aims is to find out the citizens needs as a basis for city planning development. Stadsbyggnadskontoret also aims to develop new processes i.e. a communication strategy, and new learnings in order to evolve into a more “citizen collaborative” department. One of the key insights from the Co-design course project research, was that the citizens needs to be included in the early stages of the project formulation of city development planning, and not somewhere in the middle, where there is little chance to influence the process. In order to include the citizens in the early stages of development projects, the citizens need to find a way to influence Stadsbyggnadskontoret. And Stadsbyggnadskontoret needs to know how to communicate their message, needs to know how to include the citizens and how to acquire an understanding on how to build sustainable relations with the citizens.

The main focus of interaction design research processes is to understand the needs and behaviours of the users of a product or service. This in order to produce a sustainable design that is based on the end user needs and behaviours. One of the most frequently used methods to extract user data is the participatory design method. This method is described numerous times by interaction design researchers. It is a user-driven design method where the user is seen as the expert of their domain and it will be further described in the
theory section. By making use of participatory design methods, the interaction designer role, can be extended to include the role as a designer of societal processes. Design methods that might end up in digital tangible outcomes and as digital strategies, but also help the interaction design community to teach civil servants, to understand the qualities of design thinking and also to apply its methods. And extend that understanding to include how design research methods can both be applied on large societal scale interactions, such as urban development processes, as well as understanding the needs and behaviours of both the citizens, the civil servants and the organisations in urban development processes. An interaction designer could also extend his or her role, not only to map out the needs and the behaviours of the end user, but also to understand how these needs and behaviours arises in the first place. These aggregated factors of macro societal interactions and interpersonal interactions can be understood to a higher degree by the use of social psychology and behavioural science, and be applied into the interaction design methods, and strategies, to enable a design process for societal and social change. A design process that truly rests on a deeper level of user-driven processes should produce a higher degree of sustainable design outcomes. This thinking is by no means new to the interaction design community. But if this design process can elicit, propose and/or carve out new roles for the interaction designer, or at least create an understanding of what qualities an interaction designer might make use of when engaging in Co-design processes with citizens, civil servants and organisations, then this design process thesis can be of great practical use to the rest of the interaction design community.

2 Framing of the project

Going into this research process I had both a set of clearly defined questions but also a set of undefined questions that I sought to define through the research process. Those undefined questions had a more intuitive origin, and I had a wish to fill in the missing gaps that could tie my role as an interaction designer student and tie the key findings in previous Co-design experiences to this research process. It is quite clear that as an interaction designer in Co-design processes with Quadruple Helixes one will need an understanding of interpersonal processes and how these interpersonal processes can be mapped out into Co-design strategies as well as digital strategies. The ambition in this project is to take the learnings from previous Co-design processes and the key findings from this Co-design process, and somehow create a deeper understanding about the Co-design process between interaction designers, citizens and civil servants.

The clearly defined question that yielded this project was to create a communication process/strategy between civil servants and citizens. With
the Amiralstaden process as case, this project has performed a collaborative process with a municipal operation and sought to bring in the citizen’s right from the start of the formulation stages of the process. An overarching goal has been to see to that citizens can be given an influential spot in future municipal operations processes. As I have wanted to explore this collaborative context in order to find Co-design approaches and strategies in between municipal organisations and citizens the research question is formulated as;

*How can Co-design processes between civil servants and citizens elicit a proposal for a Co-design package with communication strategies for interaction designers, civil servants and organisations, in order to see to that citizens can be given an influential spot in future municipal operations processes?*

Results will be formulated as a set of guidelines for communication strategies that can be applied by civil servants. As a designer I am also designing Co-design methods to be used by the target group of civil servants and interaction designers in Co-design processes. As these processes most often are a mixture between interpersonal skills and concrete design efforts, such as communication platforms, the guidelines will also yield some practical advice for the design of the Malmö city’s website. Another result is my involvement in the development of the quadruple helix, ‘Kunskapsalliansen’, which should be understood as a prototype.

Another target group for the project are interaction designers working with Co-design processes and civic engagement in the sense that my process illustrates valuable ways of interacting with civil servants and citizens. Some of these contributions refer to how the interaction design community can learn from theories from Co-design, Social psychology and Behaviour economics. These ways are also proposals on how to create sustainable relations in Co-design processes. It has in the recent years, through the disciplines of Participatory design and Co-design, been recognized that interaction designers not only design digital artefacts but also must develop a capacity for facilitating communication processes. I have sought to apply the perspective of Social psychology, attitude and behaviour influence, and theory from the field of Behaviour economics into the interaction designer’s mind-set. This in order to produce a deeper understanding of the interpersonal processes in Co-design with citizens, civil servants and city operations. If I could make use of and extract interpersonal skills in the meetings with citizens and civil servants, these can function as a basis for a digital strategy for municipal communication platforms i.e. the city website as well as incorporate interpersonal strategies into the Co-design process.

Applying a stance of action research, where I have been involved in the Amiralstaden process, the research question has grown successively through my active participation in the municipal project and the report aims to describe my role in the project in order to elicit knowledge contributions in relation to the research question.
I like to view these Co-design processes and applied theories as one merged process with a common outcome and conclusion.

2.1 Thesis structure
The thesis structure following the background story of previous experiences and learnings of working in Co-design projects, and how those experiences and learnings influenced this thesis, is followed by a general to specific theory section where the focus lies on Co-design, Interaction design, Social psychology and Behaviour economics. The theory section is followed by a description of a relevant digital example relating to theory where I look at the Paris city website. After that comes a methods section where I present the Co-design methods that were performed during the process. This is followed by the design process section where I give an outlined description of how the research process was performed. Successively followed by a design outcome section, where the key findings and tangible outcomes from the design process and theory is presented. Lastly, I draw a conclusion, a short reflection and a future outlook for the outcome of this process.

3 Background

3.1 The youth centre
In 2009-2013 I was employed by the city of Malmö as a project assistant/activity leader at a youth centre for youths in the age of 16 to 24. I was there primarily to work in the music studio and to start up a film editing studio. The meeting place was a joint project of Malmö city and the European Union and was initiated by Bertil Nilsson, (who also helped to initiate the transformation of the urban area Augustenborg in Malmö, into the eco-friendly neighbourhood it is today, Augustenborg is also an urban development forerunner and amongst others an influence to Bo01 – Västra Hamnen). After several unrests in the urban area of Hermodsdal, unrests created by youth’s primarily centred around the Hermodsdals school and Professorsgatan, a dialog with the youths was initiated. Together with youths from the area and Malmö city, Bertil Nilsson formed a “Parliament” where dialogues about the immediate future were held. This “Parliaments” tangible outcome was the open meeting place “Lilla Växthuset” (Little greenhouse). It was called “Lilla Växthuset” because the original “Växthuset” was meant to be much bigger, but lack of funds made “Lilla Växthuset” move into a basement in a residential house right at the heart of Professorsgatan. It was the young people who, through the dialogues in the parliament, developed the activity contents in the meeting place. It was the young people who helped renovate the basement, it was the young people who were hired as project co-workers and it was the young people that helped to develop the operation. The most important thing in the operation was to gain young people's trust and confidence, both in us as staff and of Malmö city as an operation. The music studio and the film editing were my main tasks, but as
it was an open meeting place on the most criminally exposed street in Sweden, with many socio-economic difficulties, the music studio became a way of building relationships with the visiting youths. That was a big challenge and if it was hard to see the long term benefits at the time, the “Lilla växthuset” certainly has been a link in a chain of events that has created a more socially sustainable city area. I would like to think that on an interpersonal level it was a success, building relations that made a real difference in many lives and acting like a door opener into the society for many of the visiting youths. Of course, having an open meeting place on, at the time, one of the most criminally charged streets in Sweden, has an impact on the operation on a daily basis. Criminality and socioeconomic vulnerability is not a healthy norm setter. And together with other factors like, Swedish employment laws forcing the dismissal of the youths that were employed on a project basis, thus damaging the foundation layer of gained trust between the municipal, the civil servants and the youths. But the final nail in the coffin that put an end to the operation was health hazardous mould spores found in the basement. These spores finally closed the Lilla Växthuset. In hindsight, not realizing it at the time, I had placed myself in the midst of a Co-design process, containing Co-design process ingredients like, a ‘Design Thing’, technology and human mediators, stakeholder infrastructure, living lab as an experimental zone and so on. And from this Co-design process came a practice based learning and a practice based” Know-how”. What we did learn was the interpersonal skills that was sometimes crafted out of necessity in dire situations. Situations between us as civil servants and youths in distress. Stressful and threatening situations made us review our role as civil servants and that we lacked interpersonal tools to create sustainable relations with troubled youths. Other learnings were that of youths that already had a commitment and motivation to make music and a role in the community as musicians, they had better tools to sustain a long-term level of commitment without us civil servants as motivators. It was much harder to find committed youths in the other 90 percent of visitors. But that might be because we had not identified each individuals driving force or motivation (extrinsic and extrinsic motivations), and they themselves had not identified or acknowledged their driving force or motivation. Working to a large degree with youths that had started to identify themselves as criminals, and acting out their criminality, took focus from the majority group of youths that were not involved in criminal activity. So, after the closing of Lilla Växthuset, the rest of the civil servants in the project, started to put more focus on the silent majority. Working with positive role models form the silent majority that could act as norm setters, and the majority as both a descriptive (perceptions of how people actually behave in given situations), and injunctive (perceptions of what is approved or disapproved by the majority), norm in order to encourage the community to act as the majority, and to act as the salient role models.

What I learned and brought into this research:

- Finding and identifying the inner motivation in each individual (Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation).
• Finding and strengthen positive role models in the ‘silent’ majority that can act as “Agents of change” and mediators, thus creating a community with positive descriptive and injunctive norms.
• Interpersonal skills to create sustainable long-term relations

3.2 The Co-design course at Malmö University

During the course “Co-Design-Design, participation, democracy”, My student design team, made some valuable experiences of importance for this project. One of the observations was on the use of official language in communication with the citizens. This lead me/us to try out different ways of communication. Officialese (bureaucratese) is a language that is used to communicate between experts, municipal and developers in projects. This work lingua produces an understanding between these stakeholders that is necessary, but at the same time the language is excluding a large part of the citizens from understanding the process. Language can be shaped to protect one’s own interests, to exclude citizens and sustain social inequalities. This is of course not the case in this context, but hegemonic structures might be hard to identify and also hard to acknowledge its existence when there is no identified source of origin. Now, that might not be the originators deliberate purpose but if they are not aware of this excluding effect and that they themselves can be a part of this excluding factor then they have, to a degree, a lack of disease insight. Citizens has to be quite academically prepared in order to understand this lingua, and to digest all the documents and reports would take a lot of effort. Therefore, the city operations have to address this matter with seriousness. “Officialese” is a language that does not travel well outside its own barrier. It is a language that excludes the citizens. (The citizens are the ones that are on the receiving end of the design outcome, the end product has a substantial impact on their lives). The workshop, as described later on, made the participants reflect on these different types of communication. My student team wanted to explore alternative ways of communicating with citizens that are not so confident with the officialese language. Therefore, we organised a workshop around this subject.

One group of citizens that are excluded in the democratic process is children. They have little to none influence in urban development processes, yet they are the end-users of many design products and are, to a high degree, affected by design and urban development processes. Children are automatically excluded from the very beginning of urban development project formulation that is initiated by the city and other stakeholders. Together with the help from Kristian Almquist at ‘Drömmarnas hus’, an operation that organises theatre-school and art-school for children in Malmö, we gave a group of teenagers the chance to give their interpretation of the Amiralstaden process. We gave them some of the texts from the project documentation (in slightly edited form) and from that text they produced a subjective interpretation and produced six pieces of poetry. We wanted to give their voices a place and a chance to influence the Amiralstaden process, so at the final ‘Design Thing’, (see section about Design thing) we incorporated this poetry and the language of the heart.
3.2.1 The Workshop: Language of the heart

The ‘Design Thing’ had representations from the city, from Malmö university, from stakeholders involved in urban development’s. These stakeholders often produce the “Officialese” documents and we wanted to see how the poetry travelled within individuals and in groups. And in what way it was understood by these stakeholders. And also if they could metabolize the difference between the two languages. We did this by playing the voices from the kids, and then instructed the participants to listen and interpret the poetry into drawings. Then we played the voices that were taken from the official documents from the Amiralstaden project and the participants were told to yet again listen and interpret the poetry into drawings. In the second half of the workshop the participants formed groups and went through the same procedure. But this time, they were told to interpret and communicate amongst their group what they had listened to and then agree on what to present to the other groups in the workshops. This procedure produced an empirical, almost corporal understanding of the differences on how language can be interpreted and understood. The participants had to:

• Understand the message/Internalize the message
• Interpret the message
• Communicate the message/Externalize the message

This difference produced an emotional understanding about these children’s dreams and their personal lives. A personal story that affects us emotionally is easier to integrate and to empathize with. And it is easier to interpret and communicate when the message comes from the heart and also aims for the heart. After the course ended I had the pleasure to perform our workshop at the Institute for sustainable urban development in Malmö. The workshop was part of an all-day seminar that discussed the theme; ‘How do we Co-create the socially sustainable city’. This was also part of an exit strategy to give feedback to the youths who produced the poetry. So that there was evidence that they had an influence on the urban development process.
3.2.2 Key findings from the Co-design course was:

- To include citizen involvement in the first stage of urban development project formulation
- Officialese as a barrier between civil servants and citizens
- The use of intelligible, interpersonal language to communicate and establish empathy between civil servants and citizens.

Attitude change and experimental zones

Another key finding from this Co-design process was that of establishing or supporting of “Grey zones”, in the urban development process. These zones have low housing rents and a high level of creative operations, and is often a place where eccentricity is the norm. These places might also have a problem with criminality and socioeconomic exclusion. Tolerant urban areas are constantly threatened by a mixture of big corporate finance and hegemonic normative urban development, but should be protected as important sites for experimental urban development. Grängesbergsgatan in Malmö is such an experimental zone that can be a humus for social innovation. This should be understood by the city and the civil servants and lay as a basis for attitude change amongst civil servants and city operations. An attitude change that is important for building sustainable, long-term relations with citizens.

In summary we realized the need of attitude changes about citizen empowerment and citizen involvement in urban development processes,
amongst civil servants and city operations, and that interaction designers can take on this challenge. A challenge that lead me into this project.

We produced a video that was a part of the exit strategy, and a narrative around our design process that could travel as learning material.

https://vimeo.com/241292649

As a payback to the youths from ‘House of Dreams’ that provided our student design team with material for our workshop. I helped out by moderating an “How to perform ideation, iteration and concept packaging” workshop. The theme of the workshop was, ‘Communication process between Malmö city and youths’. This workshop laid as a basis for the construction of this thesis final workshop and the following research process with Amiralståden. I also had short inspiration meetings with the youths about design thinking processes.

Figure 2 Dream workshop “House of dreams’, Drömmarnas hus Malmö. #innocarneval
4 The research process

4.1 An introduction to the stakeholders involved

*Malmö city*

Malmö city is an organisation consisting of many specialist organisations. It employs over 24,000 people within the organisation and has a huge economic effect traction power on Malmö city’s private entrepreneurs. An organisation like this has to be highly structuralized and organized in a strict manner, but it can also be portrayed as Charles Landry writes, "We can portray (the city operation) in a stereotypical way as follows: The main symbol of this urban type is the large factory and mass production; the mental model is the city as a machine; the management and organisational style is hierarchical and top down; structures are siloed, vertical with strong departments, and there is little if any partnership; the method of acquiring knowledge is by rote learning and repetition; there is a low tolerance of failure; functions, such as working, living and leisure, are separated; there is little understanding of aesthetics.\(^1\)" (Landry. C. 2016, p. 246). This top-down structure is not beneficial for the creation of long-term sustainable relationships with citizens and also with committed civil servants that wants to contribute with ideas and innovation. How this top-down structure can be made into a bottom-up structure might be a question of a change of attitudes of civil servants i.e city operations. And if this attitude change can elicit long-term benign Co-design process between citizens and municipalities, it could in turn elicit a horizontal Co-design process that is equal in its form thus socially sustainable. Some of the factors to consider when working with a large organisation as Malmö city could be:

- Hierarchy based structure – How could it be transformed into a horizontal structure? At least in the Co-design process.
- Title based structure – How could the city loose the hierarchy based titles in meetings with the citizens?
- No partnership between citizens and civil servants – How could the Co-design process elicit a sense of colleague relation between civil servants and citizens?

*Stadshyggnadskontoret – SBK*

The Stadshyggnadskontoret develops detailed plans/blueprints for city development. And by doing so they have a commitment by Swedish law to inform concerned citizens about development changes. SBK communication department sends out information mailings to residents in the neighborhood affected by the detailed plan. The information is usually in authority/officialese language and sometimes in plain language or easy Swedish. Occasionally information is provided in Arabic and very rarely in English. The planning officer is the one civil servant at the SBK operation that participate in a two-way communication with residents. When the information that residents can submit comments to SBK has reached the
residents, the planning officer invites to an information meeting or consultation with the residents in the concerned area. These consultations and information meetings are statutory. At this meeting, it is limited what can be communicated from SKB and limited in how much the residents can influence and change the detailed plan. The detailed plan is usually largely determined before communicating it to residents, and there is usually little room for a Co-design process. The residents can make suggestions if they experience something that is good or bad but usually cannot make changes in the detailed plan. In some cases, an appeal from the residents is brought against the detailed plan. The residents can also physically submit comments by going to the City Hall. This communication process usually takes 12-18 months before construction can speed up. SBK has three development parallel, process plans for Malmö city:

- OVERVIEW PLAN
  A long-term urban development plan of 20-30 years.

- AREA PLAN
  How a larger area in the city will develop in a shorter period

- DETAILED PLAN
  The detailed plan is suggestions for how services, preschools, rental housing, villas and so on should be included in the detailed plan. It is usually this detailed plan that is informed and communicated to concerned citizens/residents.

Accordingly, the residents have very little influence how a detailed plan will look. Most often, the process is too long gone for it to be an idea for the citizens/residents to try to influence the detailed plan. This might lead to a suggestion that citizens and SBK should engage in a ongoing long-term dialogue and collaboration. This to ensure that there is an ever flowing dialogue between SBK and citizens. So that the citizens can be engaged in the early stages of the development of the detailed plan. It can also be concluded that SBK communication department has no communication strategy in Co-design matters with citizens. Thus it is this design research process and Co-design process that will help to formulate such a communication process.

The Amiralstaden process

Amiralstaden is the collective name for the urban development processes based on the coming Station Rosengård. The station Rosengård will be completed in December 2018. Amiralstaden process is part of the Malmö Innovation Arena and is partly financed by the European Regional Development fund. The aim is to build bridges, both physical and mental bridges, between citizens of the Amiralstaden and to densify the area with new buildings around Amiralsgatan. The process involves property owners, traders, businesses, associations, companies as well as citizens. And in the Amiralstaden office on Kopparbergsrgatan, meetings, workshops and several other activities are organized in which various actors participate. The goal is to gather Malmö city and society's efforts in the area to create more jobs and housing. In addition, the supply of culture will increase and the conditions
for good health will be improved. In other words, the Amiralstaden will help the stationary neighbourhoods to offer good living environments for children and adults. One way to increase the social sustainability is the involvement of citizens. And one way is by following the Malmö commission suggestion of setting up the ‘Kunskapsalliansen’ as a group of stakeholders, including citizens, Stadsbyggnadskontoret, Malmö university and others. One of the aims of this Kunskapsalliansen is to create a communication strategy for The Stadsbyggnadskontoret.

Kunskapsalliansen

In 2011 The Malmö commission started a local commission to work for reduced differences in health in Malmö city. The Malmö commission organised themselves in a transdisciplinary group that integrates various types of knowledge, scientific and experience-based knowledge. This ‘Helix group’ of transdisciplinary experts was called the ‘Kunskapsalliansen’, the ‘Knowledge alliance’. In the end report the commission suggested that Malmö City should make social investments in order to reduce inequalities in health amongst citizens in Malmö. One of the social investments they suggested, was the formation of helix groups that could help create a more social sustainable Malmö and reduce health inequalities between citizens. In other words, create spaces for Co-design processes between stakeholders from different backgrounds. This “Kunskapsalliansen” lay as a foundation for the Amiralstaden process own version of ‘Kunskapsalliansen’, and its ‘Living lab’, the Amiralstaden meeting place at Kopparbergsgatan 4. The Amiralstaden meeting place/office functions as a real-life experimental zone for a quadruple helix, containing government, universities, firms and citizens, to perform experimental innovation research in an urban context. In this case, the Amiralstaden Living-lab, ‘Kunskapsalliansen’ was perhaps created with a clear inspiration from the Malmö commission report, or rather an intuitive intention of informal, experimental research through citizen involvement and with the stakeholders that occupies it.

My design team

I was both asked by Amiralstaden, and also initiated the effort to form and join a research team to perform a Co-design research process in the Amiralstaden context. I did this, together with a Service designer that worked as pro bono volunteer), and an interior architect from Syria (that also functioned as an interpreter/translator) that was a Malmö city project employee. Although our aim was to perform a Co-design process our experiences and knowledge of Co-design varied. This had to be communicated within the group. I took this as a main focus in the initial phases of the process.

Citizen representation in the Quadruple helix group "Kunskapsalliansen"

In order to create a sustainable society one should of course involve citizens from all socio economic and socio cultural backgrounds in the Co-design process. From citizens with little to none influence in the economic and
democratic process to stakeholders with great influence in the democratic, economic or societal processes. It is these meetings that help create, not only sustainable outcomes, but also to a large degree forms an understanding based on interpersonal relations between the various stakeholders. These understandings lay as a basis for a common formation of new governance and the formation of new municipal communities with citizens and civil servants. It is this democratic, interpersonal process, that in itself, is the sought after outcome. Creating bonds and a social context between citizens and other stakeholders in the city.

*This set of stakeholders is quite a complex compost. What role could be played by an interaction designer as a facilitator of communication?*

The merging of an interdisciplinary, multi-talented interaction designer that can view and participate, in this case, the Co-design process, from more than one field of science perspective. In this perspective the fields of Behavioural economics and Social psychology, all help to create a holistic view on the design research phase and its various outcomes. Whether the outcomes are digital artefacts or contextual know-how-practices, the design rests on a bed of principles that are empirically deduced from fields that are highly relevant for an interaction designer when working in Co-design processes. This view of the interaction designer as, not only a designer of user-research based digital- or non-digital interfaces or artefacts, but an interaction designer that can travel in and out of many user-contexts. And be able to have a birds-eye perspective on the design process and an introspective perspective on what shapes people’s behaviours. That introspective perspective, on the users and the user-context, could be based on Social Science, Behavioural science, Social psychology, cognitive neuroscience and other nearby fields. This is by no means new to the interaction design discipline but when engaging in Co-design processes this introspective perspective is to a high degree important as it can function as a basis for Co-design facilitation communication and methods, but also for more traditional interaction design outcomes like digital outcomes. An interaction designer is for the most part working with human-computer interaction but can can also travel into nearby fields of design that share a common view on user-centred design. Like Service-design and Co-design. To be able to create sustainable user-centred design, it might not be enough to only make use of user-centred methods such as participatory design methods, and not make use of the knowledge of why users are behaving in certain ways or how the behaviours are formed in the first place. The action-reaction-feedback based interaction design, aimed at digital user interfaces, is traditionally the starting point and the end product of an interaction design research process. But when an interaction designer is working in complex Co-design processes within quadruple helixes, there is much more to understand than the mere Action-Reaction based feedback. And the interaction designer must take on many roles in order to facilitate, communicate and to produce a sustainable design.
5 Theory

5.1 Co-design

In the beginning of the course, Co-design – Design, participation and Democracy at Malmö University, Pelle Ehn had a presentation about Co-design and he answered my question about the difference between Co-design and Participatory design with, I can’t remember the exact quote but he said something like; “I do not want to try to define what the differences are but rather to shed light on the similarities between all co-creational processes”. And by that he might have meant, that when one performs a co-creative process, the process fluctuates, intertwines, develops and creates an interdisciplinary design process. So, one can not only speak about one defined process but of many processes that merges into one another. The Co-design process as it is described by Sanders et al, - “When we acknowledge that different levels of creativity exist, it becomes evident that we need to learn how to offer relevant experiences to facilitate people’s expressions of creativity at all levels. This means leading, guiding, and providing scaffolds, as well as clean slates to encourage people at all levels of creativity”, (Sanders & Stappers, 2008, p. 24). Sanders and Stappers continuous with, “We refer Co-design to the creativity of designers and people not trained in design working together in the design development process”. Le Dantec writes, “We take for granted that human computer interaction focuses on the interfaces and experiences that people have with computing”. He continuous, “The interfaces we create might be between human and computer, but they are most often mediating and enabling human to- human experiences of one kind”. “Human-computer interaction has always had an interest in relations, just as it has long been concerned with the ways in which computing can improve the lives of people— first in the workplace, then in the home, and now in all of the many spaces in between”, (Dantec, A.C, 2017, p. 1, 25, 30) “. In these “spaces between” it is a change from a user-centred design process to that of participatory experiences. It is a shift in attitude from designing for users to one of designing with users. It is a new design movement (that we call Post design) that will require new ways of thinking, feeling and working. Participatory experience is not simply a method or set of methodologies, it is a mind-set and an attitude about people. It is the belief that all people have something to offer to the design process and that they can be both articulate and creative when given appropriate tools with which to express themselves.” (Sanders E. 2002, p.1). This participatory design mind set has grown into the realm of public operations. As a way to create social sustainable societies, citizens need to get closer to public operations and to bridge the gap between civil servants and citizens. And it is this attraction between citizens and public operations that needs to be scrutinized and researched in order to be able to design strategies for long-term sustainable citizen-public operations, -Co-design processes. Co-design lies its focus on,” not so much the product itself that matters, but rather the development of shared design practices and ways of framing issues and articulating relations to those issues that position social
design as a tool for building sustainable infrastructures of civic and community engagement” (Le Dantec. A.C 2017, p. 29). All tough the Co-design process itself could have many tangible outcomes, it is the process itself that is the building brick of a sustainable society. When the citizens create future possibilities together with the civil servants it also creates an empowerment of the citizens. The Co-design process involves participants in all levels of participation, (Sanders & Stappers, 2012), from citizens, with no influence in the economic and democratic process, to stakeholders with great influence in the democratic, economic or societal processes. They all have different incitements to participate and they all have different levels of education, economic status and cultural background. The Co-design process is an enhanced participatory design process where the stakeholders all take part in the creative process from the initial project formulation to the end project. Other stances say that Co-design participants can enter anywhere in this process (Sanders & Stappers, 2012). That puts a lot of effort to wrap up what has been done and to communicate this to new stakeholders that enter an ongoing Co-design process.

5.1.1 Participatory design, Social design and Social innovation

In 1971, the forerunner of sustainable design, designer and architect Papanek, wrote in “Design for the real world”, that,” Design must become an innovative, highly creative, cross-disciplinary tool responsive to the true needs of men. It must be more research oriented, and we must stop defiling the earth itself with poorly-designed objects and structures.” (Papanek. 1971, p. 2). This is a preface to today’s still ongoing discourse in the interaction design community, about design and designer ethics in interaction design processes and outcomes. It is not defined as a dogma in the interaction design community but something that one can choose to relate to if one thinks it is relevant. But, of course it is always relevant when one works as an interaction designer with people as the end-users of the produced design. And especially when interaction designers engage themselves in Co-design processes with citizens and civil servants. In this context it is of value to establish one’s own perspective regarding sustainable design for the common good. “Emphasizes the value of the process of designing within community settings as a kind of capacity building and empowerment.” (Le Dantec. A.C, 2017, p. 3). “Social design focuses on the kinds of problems whose solutions require human relation and collective action. Social design, Co-design is, “Top-down vs. bottom-up. This polarity relates to where the change starts and, therefore, who its original drivers are. If they are experts, decision makers, or political activists, the innovation is largely top-down. If they are (mainly) the people and communities directly involved, then the innovation is (mainly) bottom-up”, (Manzini. E., 2017, p. 1). This ‘Bottom-up’ innovation creates sustainable design outcomes via Co-design processes. This perspective creates empathy throughout an organisation or community and it is a benign perspective to adopt as an interaction designer in Co-design processes because this perspective resonates really well with the user-centred interaction design process. But it is not always one can have the “Bottom-up” as a starting point for Co-design processes and social innovation. It could also be an initiative from the civic operations, in this
case the Stadsbyggnadskontoret and Kunskapsalliansen. “Social innovation, both in its starting move and in its long-term existence, often depends on more complex interactions between very diverse initiatives, where the ones undertaken directly by the people concerned (bottom-up) are often supported by different kinds of intervention by institutions, civic organizations, or companies (top-down). We refer to these interactions as hybrid processes, (Manzini. E. 2017, p. 63).

“All the participants can be considered as ‘design researchers’, engaged in ‘mutual learning’ (Robertson et al. 2014, p. 25-28) and exploring the best way to achieve their ends together. There is no gatekeeper to relationships, either during or after the design process.” In this perspective all participants should be treated as equal contributors in the process. The citizen is an expert of their domain and are equal to other stakeholders from universities, public operations and firms. If this is not communicated at all time in the process, there will be an unbalance in the input that is distributed into the process and the citizens will lose faith in the process. In fact, the citizens should be treated as top of the heap contributors, turning the hierarchy pyramid upside down. This approach or attitude should be well communicated to others in the Co-design process. An equal design process for all ‘design researchers’ is a vertical process where the “Bottom-up” perspective is turned upside down so that the citizens are the ones that drives the initiatives and creates the basis for end-products or services. When this perspective has been made into a solid co-creative process it resembles that of a horizontal design process. Where no titles or positions in the organisation hierarchy has an influence on the creative process and outcome.

5.1.2 The Amiralstaden Office as a Living Lab

A living Lab has many definitions and can be described as an “interventionist action research-oriented approach, the labs constitute a milieu where an open-ended infrastructure for innovation allows a continuous match-making process and prompts quick contextual experiments, exploring whether innovation in practice can be about opening up spaces for questions and possibilities”, (Björgvinsson et al. 2010, p 1 & 44). Another definition of the living lab could be that of a setting where the stakeholders share resources and opportunities and aims to define problems to solve and assisting each other to reach a common goal. In these environments people (experts and non-experts) interact and work in productive ways, designing and implementing cooperative and joint experimental activities that result in collective learning and shared understanding”. The living lab as a collective, practice-based learning milieu, where, “citizens become co-producers of innovation together with all the different actors/stakeholders”, (Grazia Concilio, 2016, p. 26). The Living lab, Amiralstaden meeting place, is an experimental zone, where the Co-design process can find informal and formal ways to communicate the collaborative process and to produce practice based “Know-how” and tools. It is a place where stakeholders can create suggestions for future design concepts and future collaborative organisational models. It is also a space where a narrative unfolds through the Co-design process and where there once were no common language and history there is a creation of common
stories, a creation and use of a common language. A community that creates and defines itself through language and a common experience, thus shaping a cohesive cultural additive to a new urban-context. A context where new design suggestions come alive out of the derivatives accumulated from the Co-design process. The Living lab is a Triple helix (Etzkowitz, H. 1998), of various stakeholders from universities, governments and firms. “The universities provide science-based and technical expertise, the government provides formulation of policy’s and firms provide development and marketing of products” (Grazia Concilio, 2016, p. 22). The Living lab in the Amiralstaden process is the Amiralstaden meeting place, this is where the “Kunskapsalliansen” resides. ‘Kunskapsalliansen’ is a Triple helix group consisting of university experts from Malmö University (Co-design experts), government (Stadsbyggnadskontoret) and various expert stakeholders going in and out in the process as participants. The aim of ‘Stadsbyggnadskontoret’ is to find out the needs and dreams of the citizens in the Amiralstaden area, this in order to be able to perform user-based city planning. This includes the involvement of citizens in the Co-design process and including citizens as domain experts in the helix group. When the citizens enter the Triple Helix group it becomes a Quadruple Helix group of co-designers (Arnkil et al., 2010). At present the ‘Kunskapsalliansen’ organizes itself as a Quadruple Helix group.

5.1.3 Agonistic design space and counter-hegemonic practice

Amiralstaden living lab is also a place where agonistic meetings can take place. The political philosopher Chantal Mouffe, (as cited in Hillgren et al. 2016), argues that we need to set up agonistic cross-sector collaboration stages, “in order to create a sustainable democratic society, that opposes an elite hegemonic consensus, and include alternative voices in the democratic discourse.” This agonistic discourse is a compost for innovation and the Co-design process in the experimental living lab. Malmö city is a hegemonic, structure based organisation, and an agonistic design space can inspire counter-hegemonic practices (Hillgren, et al. 2016). The agonistic discourse can eventually lead to a “bottom-up” innovation process and help to create horizontal design processes. So, to stimulate this “bottom-up” and horizontal design process evolution, it is an important factor to facilitate and support the living lab as an experimental, agonistic, counter-hegemonic space. This strategy should be applied to the quadruple helix, ‘Kunskapsalliansen’. Or, for that matter, any helix groups involved in cross-sector collaborations with citizens.

5.1.4 The Design thing and the exit strategy

The Co-design process enables the building of a stage where Co-designers from all walks of life, especially the less experienced co-creators, can feel empowered by the learnings and the outcomes from the the design process. This stage resembles that of a Nordic Thing; “In pre Christian Nordic and Germanic societies these things were the governing assemblies and places, where disputes were solved and political decisions made” (Ehn, P. 2008, p. 1). In this Design thing there is; "A process that involves both setting the
preconditions for a process of change and opening up opportunities for new design things…”, (Emilsson, Hillgren, 2014, p. 69). In other words, to be able to create a “Design thing” that lives on after the designer leaves the stage. So, that the people, the stakeholders, in the Design Thing, become living carriers of practice based know-how, that is passed on to new Co-designing stakeholders. Creating an Exit-Strategy that can link the old with the new. The Amiralstaden as a physical space, a Design Thing, to meet and perform the Co-design process and a Design Thing to present future suggestions to the civil and public society.

5.2 Social psychology

Social psychology is the study of how people affect, and are affected by, others. There are many situations where participants affect each other in Co-design processes with many stakeholders. What are the basic influences of these affects and can they be mapped out and designed for? “In the traditional design process, the researcher served as a translator between the “users” and the designer. In Co-designing, the researcher (who may be a designer) takes on the role of a facilitator.” An interaction designer might not only work with human and computer interaction but also with the communication of and facilitating of Co-design processes. This acquires a part of psychology knowledge about human/human interaction, communication skills, and the ability to empathize with other people. The designer can also define these spaces where new professional roles are needed in the process. For instance, a social psychologist can bring in theories and “know-how” of interpersonal relations, disclosing patterns and factors which can lay as a basis for the design”, (Pastma & Stappers, 2006). And in my experience of Co-design processes with citizens and city operations it is this lack of social interaction knowledge and theories that can hinder the evolution of a sustainable, long term collaboration between citizens and the city. Therefore, I suggest, that when working with these Co-design processes, involving a high degree of social interaction that can have a high influence on the future society, then it is of a great assistance to the interaction designer, to gain knowledge about social psychology theories in order to see patterns and factors that can help to facilitate the Co-design process. This also bring about insights that can influence the design outcome.

5.2.1 Attitude and behavioural influence

People’s attitudes towards objects is based on their beliefs about the object or subject. For instance, people’s attitudes toward car use can be influenced by their beliefs about climate change (Haddock & Maio, 2009). In this case citizen’s attitudes toward Malmö city can be influenced by their beliefs about how democracy works or, if one is a new Swedish citizen, how governance has been carried out in their home countries. Or that they happened to meet with one instance of Malmö city and that meeting was a bad experience, thus adopting an attitude that says all of Malmö city is bad. Civil servant’s attitude toward citizen involvement could be based by their
beliefs about how governance should be performed and always has been performed in the past. This belief produces an attitude of “it has always been this way” and there is no need for change. Peoples beliefs can be based on strong incitements or weak incitements and their attitudes are often biased by their beliefs. If one wants to construct a persuasive message to change people’s attitudes and behaviour it is a good idea to start to map out what people’s beliefs about an object is. The persuasive message can then be delivered via different routes to persuasion. Three of the persuasive models are the “Yale model of persuasion” (Hovland et al. 1953), the “Elaboration likelihood model”, (Petty & Cacioppo., 1986), and the “Heuristic/Systematic model”, (Chaiken et al., 1989). These are models to understand how people are receiving and processing persuasive messages and how much depth of cognitive processing is needed to receive and accept a persuasive message. People often adapt an attitude that can give them social favours and also adapt attitudes that coincides with their self-image. If an attitude and a behaviour contradicts one another then a cognitive dissonance, (Festinger., 1957, 1964) can arise. For instance, a smoker often knows that it is bad for the health to smoke cigarettes and that creates a cognitive dissonance between attitude and behaviour. To adjust this dissonance people often adjust their attitudes to fit their behaviour. These theories can be used to produce messages about citizen involvement and to change both citizens and civil servant’s attitudes towards each other. By crafting persuasive messages, images, text, narratives that knows how to reach the different target groups, one can change the attitudes and behaviours of both parties to adapt a positive attitude toward citizen involvement amongst those who has a negative attitude in the first place. Whether this is a good or bad thing to do, or what effects it can have, when a certain amount of manipulation is involved, is both debatable and in need for further research.

5.2.2 Self-disclosure in interpersonal relations

Self-disclosure is private personal information that is communicated to a conversation partner. Studies show that a “high disclosure by the target is likely to result in high reciprocated disclosure by the subject (the disclosure-reciprocity effect) (Collins. L. N. et al., 1994, p 469.). This means that when a person opens up and speaks about private matters the conversation partner also makes use of self-disclosure. This behaviour increases the liking of each other. All tough if one applies to much Self-disclosure from the first meeting it can be viewed as inappropriate. (Altman et al., 1973) suggested, for example, that disclosing personal information at the earliest stages of a relationship may be experienced as being too pushy. As a result, the disclosing person may be looked upon as unfit or neurotic. So, But the overall conclusion is that Self-disclosure can help to create strong bonds between conversational partners. This disclosure can be adapted in interview sessions between citizens, interaction designers and civil servants and it can also be adapted as communication strategy between organisations and citizens. Self-disclosure can be seen as a transparency into the structure of the municipal operations. This self-disclosure helps the citizen to form a positive attitude towards the municipal operation and opens up doors to
encourage citizens to get involved in co-design processes or to create a more personal dialogue between the conversational partners.

5.2.3 Active listening

Active listening, (Rogers, 1951), is also called empathic listening, speaker-listener technique, reflected listening or dialogic listening and is the act of hearing a speaker in order to produce a positive interaction outcome, (Weger et al. 2014). Active listening is widely used by many fields of science and practises like, therapy, education, negotiations, public administration, leadership and management. It can be used to build relations, empathize, build self-esteem, gather information, during crisis negotiation, change perspectives and attitudes, (Hoppe, 2006), (Weger et al. 2014, p. 13-31). When performing active listening one can apply three stages of active listening:

1. Value-free, positive acceptance of the other person. Avoiding premature judgment.
2. Active empathetic listening, reflecting understanding, clarifying information through paraphrasing a version of the speaker’s Message.
3. Asking questions, summarizing, and sharing back to the speaker.
4. Self-expression in communication with the speaker.

5.3 Behaviour economics

5.3.1 Choice Architecture and Nudging

The 2017 Nobel Prize in Economics was awarded to Richard Thaler for his work with behaviour economy. In his work he often refers to what in psychology is called the Dual process theory. The Dual process theory describes how a thought can arise from two different routes; The implicit, automatic system and the explicit, reflective system. These are cognitive systems of processing information. The automatic system also named System 1, is the cognitive processing of information with our “gut feeling”. With this gut feeling we take decisions based on thumb rules. Those decisions are a rapid, intuitive process that happens instantly without reflective thought processing. System 2 is the slow, reflective system people uses when they learn new things, like learning to ride a bike or learning a new language. When people have a lot of choices, or if they want to take life changing decisions, like a decision on how to place one’s retirement funds capital, one would expect that they would choose wisely based on research of the subject. But people seldom have time or the knowledge to cut through all the choices in order to make the right decisions. Thaler suggests a paternalistic liberalism that helps people take life changing decisions. Without taking away choices he suggests to guide and put people in a direction to make the best choice for themselves. He also points out that the default option should be the safest and best option. One example is from Thaler and Sunsteins book, Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health,
Wealth, and Happiness, (2008) and describes a scenario of a cafe in a staffroom. In the cafe, there is a buffet of assorted food. If I was a Choice architect that would Nudge people into choosing vegetarian food, I would design a flow that will make more people choose the vegetarian options. I would put salad and beans and water first on the buffet. The healthiest dishes, like broccoli and smoothies I would place at eye level. The fish would be placed a little more unavailable and badly lit and finally I would put the meat at a hard to reach level, badly lit and late in the choice flow. By doing this I would not take away peoples options and I would offer all options and nudge people in the right direction in order to help them to make the right decision. In my design construction, I do not force anyone to make decisions they do not want to take. I emphasize small changes and details and involves all aspects of the decision-making environment.

5.3.2 Soft libertarianism/Libertarian paternalism

Libertarian paternalism is the collective term for ‘Nudging’, and are “actions of government that attempt to improve people’s welfare by influencing their choices without imposing material costs on those choices... We can understand soft paternalism, thus defined, as including nudges, (Sunstein. C, 2014, p. 58). In today’s society and especially in the Swedish society the privatization of state institutions has grown from strict regulated governmental services, such as schools, health care, pharmacies, private retirement plans and such into a private “freedom of choice market”. According to Thaler and Sunstein, the free market choices are too many and too difficult to comprehend and researched by the average citizen. One can say that the freedom of choice market is designed for the sellers and not for the buyers (users). And it is implicating a serious risk to choose wrongly when life altering decisions are to be made, like insurances or retirement plans. Nudging is a way for the state and municipals to, in a paternalistic but libertarian way, help people make the right choices and decisions.

5.3.3 Extrinsic and intrinsic values in the Co-design context

The extrinsic and intrinsic motivation of volunteers. “Aspects, like fun, pleasure and enjoyment of each other’s company while performing Co-design processes are high motivational factor to stay in the community and to continue to be committed and engaged” (Light-Akama, 2017, p. 7). So the emphasis to adapt an understanding of participants intrinsic and extrinsic motivations about volunteering is imperative. That understanding can be used as a basis to design a Co-design context that is an environment that contains both intrinsic values (fun, personal development, enjoyment in informal meetings and more), and extrinsic values (“looks good on my CV”, networking, learning new skills, free meals).

This understanding could also enable an opportunity to present extrinsic and intrinsic values to stakeholders that traditionally focuses on the extrinsic values, statistics of health, market investments and capital growth, health benefits, labour market benefits, of a project success. And how these intrinsic values, on a long-term basis, can turn into extrinsic values. The
intrinsic values of having fun, of personal development, of learning new skills etc. could be transferred to extrinsic values or outcomes such as better mental health in citizens, better equipped to take new steps in education or employment and so on.

5.3.4 Descriptive, injunctive and prescriptive norms

In an advertising campaign made, in the 1970’s, to influence people to reduce littering, (Cialdini, 2003), pointed out that there were differences in descriptive norms (perceptions of people's actual behavior, whether it is approved or disapproved by others), injunctive norms (perceptions of what is approved/disapproved by others), and prescriptive norms (standards approved or unauthorized by others). Cialdini pointed out that the campaign authors had not paid attention to this when crafting the campaign - and the commercials first depicted a scene with an American native Indian who paddled the canoe in a river in a beautiful landscape, when suddenly a car turns up and throws out rubbish on the river bed and then drives away. The native American Indian is upset but paddles on and more and more cars appear, throwing out garbage. The authors wants to show that there are many who are littering and that's what we're going to change. But by showing that it's the norm to throw garbage in the nature, the authors, in an unconscious way, shows that it is the norm, the standard way of behavior. It becomes the descriptive norm that affects our attitude. The descriptive norm overthrew the prescriptive norm and the littering actually increased after the campaign. What they might have done was to show that there was one individual who was littering and that this individual behaved in a particularly bad way. And the authors could, in a injunctive way, shown that it is actually the majority that does not litter. The people who saw the commercial were influenced by those who created the norm and who were littering. They identified themselves more with those who littered than with the upset paddling native American.

Summary

It is not desirable that Malmö city repeats such a mistake of letting prescriptive norms override the descriptive norms. When crafting messages and translating them into digital communication strategies, Malmö city should be able to adapt the communication strategies to fit with these aspects of social psychology, attitude and behavior formation and normative messages. And in order to stimulate a “bottom-up”, horizontal design process evolution, it is an important factor to facilitate and support the living lab as an experimental, agonistic space for the quadruple helix, ‘Kunskapsalliansen’.

Note: Read about design processes and governance, Transformative design (Red paper) and Meta-design (Fisher, G. 2007, 2013), (Fisher, G and Scharf, E. 2000,) if you want to get a perspective on designing for new ways of governance and a perspective on Meta-design, designing for designers.
6 A relevant digital example

6.1 Paris city website

An example of how the previously mentioned theories can be expressed in digital artefacts is the Paris website.

![Paris website 'Participate button'. Google translate from French to Swedish](image)

The City of Paris official website seems to have a strategy for citizen involvement. This via a ‘Participate button’ on the upper right corner. This would give the impression that Paris city encourages citizen participation and that they have an organisational structure to receive such commitment. Another impression of the website is that it is focusing on the stories within the city. Creating strong image driven narratives of descriptive norms that can engage citizens and help shape a positive attitude towards involvement. The visitor can also create an account.
At the ‘Participate’ page there is various options if one wants to engage and get involved in processes. The user can share innovations and also submit suggestions and debate. This gives the impression that Paris is guiding citizens into participation either within the City operation or into volunteer organisations and NGO’s. When the visitor presses the Citizen Agenda link a page with various workshops with various topics is presented:

Figure 4 Paris website ‘Participate’ page

At all pages there is a link to a twitter account where Paris city council answers all kinds of questions. This gives the impression that (from my perspective) the Paris City council is performing ‘Active listening’ and ‘Self-disclosure’ i.e displays a transparent operation.

Figure 5 Citizen workshops
6.2 Insights from relevant example and theory

The emerging of new communication tools of interpersonal character both for the interaction designer in participatory design processes but also for civil servants and public organisations in Co-design processes, should be considered by the interaction design community and the city operations. Both as strategies for the facilitation of Co-design processes, and as Social psychology, and Economic behaviour based strategies for communicating with and about citizen’s involvement in Co-design processes. This communication strategy can also be applied as a digital strategy to display and design such values and theories on to digital platforms. The theory’s behind extrinsic and intrinsic values or motivations, might give the merging of a new role for the Co-designer as a ‘Motivational architect’. It is important to perform intrinsic and extrinsic mapping in order to both craft motivational strategies in the Co-design communication process as well as in motivational design strategies for digital communication via for instance a website. Factors that can be included in the digital and interpersonal communication strategies can be as follows:

- Co-design methods – Methods of facilitating the communication
- Active listening and Self-disclosure
- Social psychology - Attitude and behaviour influence
- Behaviour economics – Choice architecture, nudging and normative messages
- Intrinsic values and extrinsic motivations and values can be mapped out to enable the designing of ‘Motivational strategies’
- Extrinsic and intrinsic values when accounting for private market stakeholders, governance stakeholders and politics.

7 Co-design methods

7.1.1 Action research

The definition of Action Research is to immerse oneself and to understand an existing context. This without a specific end goal in mind and no specific tangible end goal. The understanding elicits key findings where the designers can test and evaluate prototypes that are derived from the research process, and then present design opportunities. I had previously performed an Action research process in the co-design course at Malmö University in the Amiralstaden process context. That process produced an understanding of the Amiralstaden context and the Co-design process. Some of these findings lay as a foundation to the Action Research and co-design process in this process and can be seen as pre-conceived knowledge of the context or as a continuation of the first project. I choose to see these processes as part of one process. A design method project process and an Action research process can sometimes produce a blurred line between methods of design
and tangible outcomes, this, since the design method and the process itself becomes a tangible outcome.

7.1.2 Infrastructure strategies

The concept of ‘Infrastructure’ as a method to map stakeholders and to bind them together was helpful in the early stage of the process. “We cultivate long term relationships with diverse actors and slowly build a designing network”, (Emilsson, Hillgren, Seravalli, 2014, p. 70). We managed to connect stakeholders and even to find a spot of our own in the project infrastructure, (our involvement in the Amiralstaden project and with stakeholders in the Amiralstaden project stretches beyond the end of this course and into future collaborations.). This infrastructure, and connecting the stakeholders in the infrastructure, is not a direct reflection of the interaction design process but elevates the view of the interaction designer and help to shed a birds-eye view over more complex flows of interaction on a macro scale, in a societal, democratic context.

7.1.3 Interviews & conversation pieces

Getting to know each other as persons and not as citizens and civil servants is a key factor to understand the underlying incitements and motifs of a person. Informal meetings and informal conversations also centre design problems by talking about a design artefact. Artefacts that help create interest around the subject and get participants involved and open up for discussions. This artefact becomes a cooperating tool for the co-design congregation. In our case we wanted to try to direct the conversation to be about the city planning subject. And wanted to know what the persons thought about their neighbourhood architecture. So we gave them a home assignment to photograph their neighbourhood and specifically pick out spots that they disliked or liked, so called ‘Sensitising assignements’, (Sanders & Stappers. 2012, p. 76), that help to trigger and frame the conversation. Sensitizing assignements that help produce an idea of how the user behaves in the user context. This sensitizing assignment, gave the participant a week to frame an opinion about the issue. At the same time, we also took some photos as a backup if the participants failed to produce any photos. We also brought some coffee bread as a courtesy gift. The interviews were performed in the participant’s homes.
7.1.4 Surveys

Quick quantitative surveys on the internet can be used to elicit user data that can lay as a basis for construction of personas. The questions could be open ended or closed. Qualitative web based surveys that one can use to get additional user data. This useful data can be combined with face-to-face interviews to produce personas. I used this survey to elicit more data about volunteering experiences. Who were the volunteers and why did they volunteer?

7.1.5 Personas

Interviews with citizens who work as volunteers to map out their needs and behaviours as well as the intrinsic and extrinsic values that motivates them to work as volunteers. The intrinsic motivations are strong factors of why
citizens engage themselves as volunteers. I did qualitative target group analysis via an internet-survey asking about volunteering. That helped to elicit user facts and together with the many deep interviews it produced personas that can be used as a basis for user-centred design. Personas is a fictional individual, expressing properties of a target group and are often built up from field research. Personas are often story based and are used to map out and understand the target groups needs and behaviours. This can be used to communicate whom and what to design for to others in the design group (Sanders & Stappers. 2014). In this case there are many different target groups that can take place in Co-design processes with the city. Some of them might be of more broad character like immigrants, elderly and teenagers and some of them might be of a more personal nature like for an example, “Middle-aged vegan, designer with children in urban area with interests in music, meditation and arts, is seeking to participate in volunteer work regarding veganism in public schools,”. (Below is an example of a persona of a volunteer:

- My specific contribution to personas is that I clearly describe and display the user intrinsic and extrinsic data. And also produce useful data about how this particular user could influence others as a descriptive norms setter. The specific data is described to the left and to the bottom left.
7.1.6 Letters/mailings/language

The language in all official documents that are aimed for citizens should be a language that promotes equality and dismantles power hierarchy. A language that is an intelligible, “Easy-to-understand Swedish” in order to not exclude citizens from understanding, or just excluding by using linguæ (Officialese) that is difficult to understand for laymen in mailings to the public. This can be the case when internal project documents in the project is written in a language that is supposed to travel well in the municipal organisations or through expert stakeholder realms. The language should be of a personal character and not of a “strict municipal authorities” character that maintains a power structure barrier. A communication through a language of a personal character, because the entire process of communication, from the initial contact to the last, should be of a personal character. This in order to at all time explicitly effect the citizens’ attitude towards the municipality so that there is an aspect of active listening and affirmation of the citizen as an equal partner and not just a number in a document.
7.2 Workshop

The workshop participants were the citizens and the civil servants from SBK and other stakeholders from the Amiralstaden process and Kunskapsalliansen. It was made with the purpose to elicit concepts for how citizens and Malmö city, in this case SBK could be more visible to each other. The workshop framing were the key insights from the research phase and the follow up reflective questions and annotations from the interviews between citizens and civil servants from SBK. The workshop that was performed at the end of this design research process was a combination between the highly structured Future workshop, (Jungk and Mullert, 1987), and a “Crazy eights” workshop. The future workshop consists of three phases; The critique phase, the fantasy phase and the implementation phase. These phases include a problem formulation phase and then a solution phase and lastly an, ”How do we do this?” phase. This is a generative workshop that produces future suggestions via problem formulation, brainstorming and pragmatist suggestions on future solutions. A Crazy eights workshop is a brainstorming session where the participants is told to produce eight ideas in a very limited time frame. This to ensure that the ideas are spontaneous and not critically reviewed beforehand. The workgroup combined these two into
one by dividing 15 participants into three groups, instructing them to produce eight ideas in 5 minutes, around the theme question, in between them. After that the participants changed tables and iterated on the other groups ideas. This produced an iteration of the first idea and a collaborative produced a concept. Lastly they rotated once again to another table and were told to pick out and name three concepts. Finally they then presented the three concepts to the rest of the workshop participants. This produced in total 9 concepts.

- One of the concepts was about to open up the first floor of the city hall and make it into an open meeting place for citizens and civil servants.
- One concept was about having civil servants go out where the people are. The given example was, to find committed citizens at the big Muslim post Ramadan fasting festival of EID, and mingle with citizens and spread the Co-design word. Thus making civil servants more visible to the citizens.

![Figure 9 Concepts from workshop](image)

### 8 Design Process

Coming in to this design context was a real treat for my workgroup, (the Service designer/product designer that worked pro bono and an Interior architect that came as a refugee from Syria in 2016, that was employed by Malmö city on a project basis working by the hour). A Co-design stage had already been set up, partly with ingredients from my previous student project with fellow students and of course by other stakeholders. We had pre-existing knowledge of the domain, the Amiralstaden process, and some of the design challenges in the process. Furthermore, we had an understanding of how the infrastructure was set up. But our design team did not know each other on beforehand. My motifs to be a part of this process was my prior engagement with the Amiralstaden process plus writing this thesis and also
the learning opportunities that laid ahead. The team already had my understanding and findings from the previous engagement with the Amiralstaden process. The Interior architect had also been mapping and interviewing citizens in the Amiralstaden area for the “Kunskapsalliansen 3”. So we decided to dive right into it and get to meet the citizens of Amiralstaden. The first ideation sessions were about finding a strategy for the Action research process and the first stage of the process; the interviews. For the interviews we made use of the tools of:

- Active listening method
- Sensitizing assignments
- Conversation pieces/Triggers.

8.1 Field work

8.1.1 Interviews

All in all, we performed 12 interviews but it was the first two interviews that set us on our course. The first interview session was first meant to be an informal group workshop, at one of the participant’s home, where we wanted to have informal discussions about urban planning and the Amiralstaden process. This first meeting was with immigrants from Syria who wanted to participate. Unfortunately, only the host of the group meeting (informal workshop) showed up. The reasons for not showing up was several but the lack of time was the primary reason together with a general uncertainty about what the group meeting was about. That was of course our fault, not to inform properly, but this was the first time for us so this was the context where we would get key insights from. The first two interviews took place at the citizen’s homes. Previous to the interviews we sent out the sensitizing assignments and also took some photos ourselves as a backup and for research understanding purposes. We had talked about how important it was for us to introduce our selves properly and to really communicate our mission. But the interview object (citizen), a single Muslim woman in her 40’s, who had previously worked with public relations in the United Arab Emirates, and who came to Sweden as a refugee from Syria in 2016, took over the session, and we discussed more indirect about the subject; Communication about the neighbourhood architecture.

The interview grew into a discussion about more personal questions from the citizen and we discovered that we really had no answers for most of the questions. The citizen viewed us as Malmö City civil servants and as such we had no proper answers to give. The interview grew into a chat about who we were and the meeting took more of a personal “get to know each other” character. This informal and personal “phase” of the interview gave us a whole lot of information. Both about our interview subject but also about our own role as designers and an understanding of the power of interpersonal self-disclosure and a transparency about what we did know and what we did not know. Basically we did not try to act as something that we were not. Revealing more about our personal life’s and our lack of understanding how Malmö city works. After the meeting we met up with a
neighbour in the stairwell of the building (who should have been at the interview) and asked her why she couldn’t come to the meeting. She said that it was because she had to walk her dogs. She also pointed out things to improve in her apartment and told us she had no idea that there was a train station being built, although the train station was just around the corner.

The second planned interview was with a married couple, Architect and artist, who came as refugees from Syria in 2016. The wife, architect understood but did not speak adequate Swedish. The husband, artist did not speak and understand adequate Swedish, thus, we did the interview in English. We had learned from the first interview to better introduce ourselves and to communicate our role and our mission. But this interview, which took place at the interview objects home, quickly went the same way as the first interview. In the spotlight of the analysis from these first encounters with citizens from this target group was, in no specific order:

- They had little to none knowledge of the Amiralstaden process
- They had little to none knowledge about the Malmö City organisation – “Malmö city and the Swedish government were seen as the same organisation”.
- The informal “At home” meetings were great for a more informal interpersonal process
- Self-disclosure from our side opens up the dialogue
- The Sensitizing assignments was partly a success – It made the participant reflect about the subject and our meeting beforehand
- The conversation pieces, photos from the sensitizing assignments was partly a success – It provided us with a framing and as a basis – “Ice breaker” for discussion.
- Using active listening as a tool to understand and to open up the interview object worked well.
- Using self-disclosure as a tool to deepen the conversation and to create a more personal affinity. A personal affinity that can help making the participant more motivated to continue with his/her commitment in the process.

Interviews/meetings between citizens and SBK civil servants

Right after these interview/meeting we also thought that SBK should participate more directly as Co-design participants in this process. This in order to get the first hand perspective and also to influence the process from the start. Making our role, the design team, into facilitators of the Co-design process and SBK and the citizens as first hand owners of the process.

The participants were given an “home assignment” to reflect over three questions about the communication process between the two parties. The civil servants and the citizens could choose together to do the interview at their own homes, at a café or public space, Amiralstaden office or at the SBK office. This to ensure that the citizens at all time was in the driving seat of the process and not felt intimidated by the occasion. The participants were told to reflect upon questions about communication with each other before the meeting. This to build a basis for the coming interview. During the interview the discussion topic were how the two participants communicate
today. And after the interview they were told to summarize the meeting and send the notes to us. These notes and the reflection emails functioned as a basis for the content of the workshop.

8.1.2 The role of our design team

When we initiated the Co-design process we just wanted to dig in and do some basic field work, like interviews, infrastructure, background research and coming together as a design team. We did interviews with both citizens and civil servants from SBK, plus additional interviews with other stakeholders, (like Co-design experts from Malmö University and an architect that worked with youths in a Co-design urban planning process for the city of Sjöbo municipal). These contextual inquiries, in the context of Amiralstaden process gave our design team a first-hand perspective on the Co-design process. The first hand perspective is all good but there were other stakeholders that would also benefit from getting the first hand perspective, and that was the citizens and the SBK civil servants. The design team discovered that we were a “noise-factor” in the communication process and we also interpreted the derived material from the citizen inquiries in the communication process between the citizens and SBK. In order to turn this process into a proper Co-design process we needed to step back and to take the role of facilitating communicators of the Co-design process. We also needed to make sure that the citizens and the SBK, civil servants were the ones that got the first hand perspective and immersive experience. This is important for both parties to be able to learn from each other and to get a practice based “Know-how”. A “Know-how” that could travel within communities via citizens, and within organisations via civil servants. So, we took a step back and asked if there were SBK-civil servants that wanted to be first hand perspective participants and have a more direct chance of influencing the process. The replay was not what we had hoped for. No civil servant wanted to take a direct place in the process we were facilitating, (as a team member that is). Maybe it was of no surprise to us because the civil servants had not been prepared for this type of engagement and was not ready to participate directly in the process. But the civil servants agreed to our suggestion to meet and do interviews with the citizens. This enabled the civil servants to get the first hand perspective and a more immersive participation. One civil servant from SBK participated in the Kunskapsalliansen, and directly influenced the process, but did not take part in the interviews/meetings/discussion and workshop with the citizens, which we as facilitators see as an important learning opportunity. So, all in all, SBK participated and were represented in and throughout the whole process. What we did was:

- The civil servants from SBK, primarily from the communication department, participated directly in the Co-design process with the citizens and contributed directly in the Co-design process.

The idea of Co-design is to have citizens influence and ownership throughout the whole process. There should be no closed doors where there is no access for the participation of the citizens. In this process there were
many closed doors where the participants did not have access. The questioner in this process was SBK and our design team were the facilitators. Facilitators that had a great influence on the whole process and because of that we aimed to decrease our role and take a step back in order to engage in a role more like that of “Observing facilitators” or communicators, that observed the process to get a birds’ eye view of the whole process. To summarize, we initiated the process and participated in a first-hand perspective manner, but then took a step back and became more like communicators, coordinators, researchers, moderators and interpreters.

- Our roles changed as the process evolved into a deeper Co-design process. We took the roles of coordinators, researchers, translators and mediators. Moderating workshops, collecting and analysing material.

8.2 Letters

8.2.1 Letter package to citizen

- Letter of consent

This letter is to ensure that the Co-design facilitators and in this case Malmö University is protecting the citizens’ rights to leave the process whenever they choose to and not to use the contributions in a way that is without the consent of the citizen. It is important that we protect the citizens who participate in the process. As designers and facilitators we are the ones that welcomes and guides the citizens during this process. By doing so both us as a design team and the citizens are taking a risk. When we engage ourselves as facilitators and mediators to engage citizens, then we are the first hand representatives of the public organisations with whom they meet. If the citizens are left being disappointed or disillusioned by events in the process, we are the ones that would be personally responsible. One cannot hide behind the work title as interaction designers, facilitators or civil servants. We have to make sure that these relations are fruitful and respectful. And as facilitators, somehow anticipate and work preventive. (See appendix for letters)

- Welcome letter – Process information – Letter

8.2.2 Letter package to Civil servants at SBK

- Welcome letter – Process information - Letter
- Thank you for your commitment – letter – See appendix
- Interpersonal meetings strategy – letter – See appendix

8.3 Reflective emails

Emails with a reflective question was sent to each participant after the interviews and after the workshop. The question after the meetings were:
• What did you think before, under and after the interviews?

The analysis of these reflections was a basis for the general question for the workshop. These reflections produced three themes and three questions:

• Personal meetings - How does SBK and citizens want to meet?
• Feedback - How do SBK and citizens want their answers to their questions?
• Visibility - How could SBK and citizens become more visible to each other?

After this feedback the design team and other stakeholders choose one question to focus on at the workshop:

• How, where and where can citizens and SBK become more visible to each other?

8.4 Outcome of the workshop

The workshop was performed as it were written in the Co-design methods section. The concept outcomes from the workshops will be presented at a design thing and documented. They will also be given to the SBK communicators as proposals for pilot projects. A reflective email was also sent to the participants. Those reflections will be documented elsewhere. A ‘Design thing’, is in this case, a reflective informal meeting (party) where the involved stakeholders meet and present their concepts, learnings and design process to the public. The design thing is open for the public and is a part of the exit strategy. The design thing took place after the submission of this thesis so it is documented elsewhere.

9 The tangible outcomes of the design process

Co-design communication process & methods

In the following section I will display the main tangible outcomes in bullet points. These bullet points will describe the Co-design communication process and methods. This process and methods follow a timeline when things should be done. It starts with ‘Face-to-face’ meetings and ends with the design thing.
The ‘Kunskapsalliansen’ is an early prototype of a municipal organisation being formed. Malmö city, in this case SBK, but it could be any department, are looking for ways to become a more collaborative organisation. Collaborative as in involving citizens in the urban planning process. To do this a Living Lab has been set up and is told to be an experimental zone for Co-design processes between SBK, citizens and other quadruple helix group stakeholders. A key insight in this process has been that this experimental zone should be kept intact as an experimental zone. But the Experimental Living lab of Amiralstaden meeting place and the quadruple helix group of Kunskapsalliansen, becomes a copy pasted structure from Malmö city and the SBK organisation. So, SBK is shaping a tiny copy of itself within the experimental zone. Malmö City is a strict hierarchy based, top-down, vertical structure where the titles of the civil servants show their rank in the hierarchy. The essence of an experimental zone is to allow a certain amount of chaos, a certain amount of uncertainty and to allow people within the experimental zone to help evolve new ways of thinking, new ways of governance. When the committed citizen, with all their dreams, hopes and fears, gets involved with an organisational structure that is based on strict hierarchy there is a chance that this meeting becomes a clash between committed, idealistic citizens and a top-down based organisation. Building sustainable relations between municipal organisations and committed citizens and to keep the Living Lab as an experimental zone might require the removing of certain aspects of the municipal organisation. This top-down hierarchy based structure formation in the helix group is a counter force against the Living Lab as an agonistic design place where agonistic arguments produce sustainable design. But to be able to be agonistic, the participant needs to feel secure enough to express themselves. The intrinsic and intrinsic motivations of the citizens can in itself be a hinder for an open
agonistic debate, but adding the top-down organisational structure of a Malmö city organisation to the equation, turns the Living Lab into a counterproductive place for Co-design process. And the only thing it sustains might be the Malmö city organisational structure. When different stakeholders enter the Living lab experimental zone they should leave their “guns”, in this case their titles, outside of the experimental zone. The citizens are the experts of their domain, no matter their age, background or profession. The civil servants that take part in the Co-design process are experts of their domain and often participate on voluntarily basis as committed civil servants in these processes and their interests should be equally protected just as the citizen’s interests. Our design team of three is also persons filled with intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. As a student I am looking for career opportunities and the others in the design team have their motivations. This combination of strict organisation and top-down hierarchy based structure and human intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to participate, produces a hinder for the creation of sustainable Co-design relations between citizens and city operations. Also, the unspoken ambitions of the helix group members, are a source of non-transparency. So a key finding and a suggestion to the ‘Kunskapsalliansen’ is that the Living Lab, the experimental zone, should be protected from the hierarchy based structure formation of the municipal organisations it performs the experiments on. A healthy agonistic process can turn into a counterproductive and degrading antagonism between stakeholders. The citizens should at all time be protected in this process so that they want to stay committed and engaged in Co-design processes with municipal organisations.

- Flat hierarchy structure
- The removal of professional titles
- A general understanding of the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations to participate

The ‘Kunskapsalliansen’ is a Quadruple Helix group of experts from various fields in Malmö city. The 4th piece of this helix group is the citizens of Amiralstaden. These citizens come into the group with different agendas. Agendas that is biased by their intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. These citizens are committed to participate for various reasons, and they have stepped forward to participate in a process that is unknown to them. And they do not come into the process empty handed, they come into the process with dreams, hopes and ambitions. The intrinsic values are, in this case, an important motivation and should be designed for when inviting citizens into the Co-design process. The citizens are giving away their free time and their commitment. Conflicts, that can arise from not being aware of the intrinsic or extrinsic motivation and values, should be avoided. To build a sustainable citizen participation in a participatory community or participatory governance, these aspects should be focused on by the design team, the civil servants and the city operations. When a Co-design facilitator is designing a process and a Co-design stage, these aspects should be as important as the outcome itself. A full Co-design experience should incorporate these motivational triggers when the process is being planned. So, make plans for how to meet the intrinsic motivations and plans to meet the extrinsic
motivations. This ‘motivational architecture’ turns the designers, the civil servants and the organisations into a role of ‘Motivational architects’. The intrinsic motivations can be:

- Having fun
- Creative development
- Socializing
- Self-developing
- Improving Self-image
- Meeting new friends and partners

The extrinsic motivations could for instance be that of a citizen that is unemployed or looking for job opportunities, there are real hands on ambitions that can lay as a blocking filter for the Co-design process. The job seeking volunteer might not speak from the heart but rather adjust them self to fit in and not take any risks of ruining a possible job opportunity, and this precautious behaviour might produce a less sustainable outcome. This aspect goes for the students and other volunteers in the process as well. The extrinsic motivations could be:

- Job opportunities
- Other career opportunities
- Money
- Free food

9.1 Co-design communication strategies for interaction designers, civil servants and civic operations

- Interaction designer as a facilitators/communicators of the Co-design process

To be an interaction designer that is a Co-design facilitator means one is both involved directly in the process and leads the process. This can be a bit tricky so in this case we thought that SBK should participate more directly as Co-design participants in this process. This in order to get the first hand perspective and also to influence the process from the start. But also to create the practice based know-how into a Co-design, design thinking skill set that could be brought into the organisation and spread on to other future stakeholders. Making our role, the design team, into both observers, communicators and facilitators of the Co-design process and SBK and the citizens as first hand owners of the process.

- Co-design communication strategies for the civic operations

Collaborative organisations must have strategies on how to engage and prepare for Co-design processes. The civil servants in the organisation needs to have a fundament of tools they can use in the process. And the
organisation need to learn how to form themselves, both in the quadruple helix group but also in the experimental zone i.e the Living lab. They might need to prepare themselves and educate themselves in design research processes and basic Social psychology. Communication factors to consider are:

- Transparency – Self-disclosure
- Active listening
- Learn how to create and sustain experimental zones
- Education of civil servants in basic user centred design thinking and Social psychology, interpersonal skills.
- Behaviour economics strategies for use in digital communication platforms.

- Co-design interpersonal strategies for the civil servant

It can be quite difficult for the civil servant to know what role to take in a Co-design process. One one hand, they should be both participants and observers, and also document the practice based learnings. And on another hand they are citizens, people with intrinsic motivations and extrinsic motivations. And as such they have different reasons and personal qualities that might lay as a hinder for themselves and the Co-design process. In the Co-design process, practiced in an experimental zone of the Living lab, the civil servants might not have clear defined roles and therefore they have to step out of their normal professional role. In this context they should be able to go in and out of different roles. The roles they could take on could be that of, participants, observers, facilitators, designers and more. Because it might be the civil servants job to participate as a civil person, to observe and document the process, to help facilitate the process, to design new processes (workshops, ethnographical research and such), to be able to understand the basics of social psychology so that they can prepare human/human strategies. Finding new strategies and approaches for both the individual civil servant and for civil servants as a group might be necessary. And they as a group might have to chisel their way through the process and learn how to reflect in action and discuss upon these interpersonal matters and motivations. These motivations can create a cognitive dissonance i.e, two opposite attitudes that creates an internal conflict of interest. If the civil servant has a reluctant attitude towards participation in the process, it can create unhealthy tensions in the process as opposite to a healthy agonistic process. A practice based learning can create a shift in the attitude of the reluctant participant to adapt a more positive attitude towards Co-design processes or in worst case produce the opposite attitude. Proposed tools to learn and to make use of in the Co-design process:

- Active listening
- Self-disclosure
- Design thinking
- Co-design facilitation
• Storytelling and multi media

Who is going to take over when the design team leaves the process? In order to let the process, grow and live on after the designers leave the scene it is a good idea to encourage various exit strategies. To start of the stakeholders are the ones that carry the process and various stakeholders can be brought together to find new ways of collaboration and to push the process further and in to the future. As an exit strategy and documentation of the design procedure a video was produced, with a narrative that displays individual stories into a storytelling video, about how to agree on shared values and to elicit a common know-how of how to produce social innovation in a Co-design process, (Sanders & Stappers, 2012). This to get people interested in what processes they can get involved in and to produce a learning material that could be easily spread and understood. The Co-design process outcome and this thesis, will also live on in the Kunskapsalliansen and its future collaborations with the Co-design course at Malmö University.

A video about the whole Co-design process will be available here:

https://vimeo.com/270136252

• A common language

To have one common intelligible language between all stakeholders in a quadruple helix can be difficult. Since this Co-design process involves citizens and civil servants with various backgrounds, it is difficult to get a message through and understood to all stakeholders. But it is a proposal that the use of an intelligible language throughout the processes is communicated amongst all stakeholders. And that the intelligible language is implemented right from the start and implemented with the citizen’s involvement in the formulation stages of urban development projects.

9.1.1 24/7 open inquiry service

A finding from the process was that every stakeholder did not receive and understand all the given information. To ensure a common understanding throughout the process it could be a good practice to have an open and transparent receiving of stakeholder inquires throughout the whole process. Some stakeholders will have means to receive and process the given information but some stakeholders might have, for example little time to process the information. The stakeholders all have different needs and capabilities to process the information, thus they need to be individually met, at all times, with their specific inquires during the Co-design process. This openness to inquiries could be expressed multiple times at all stages of the process. Some of the information might be too much for one stakeholder to process and another stakeholder has a wish to understand the whole process. Both these types of stakeholders should be given the chance to have an insight of the whole process. It could be of interest to categorize many stakeholder needs regarding the ability to process information. But in this
case the stakeholders are given the chance to, at all time, process and find an open door to process the existing information.

- Transparency of information
- Meet every citizen, according to their needs, at all time in the process

### 9.2 The Communication process for SBK

- The letter – *Letter package with interpersonal tools*
- Interpersonal meetings – *Face-to-face meetings/interviews with citizens*
- *Letter of consent for the citizens and letter of motivation to the civil servants*
- *Active listening tools to use in meetings with citizens*
- Reflective emails – *Open ended questions after each step*
- Workshop – *Workshop methods for collaborative generative design*
- Choice architecture & Nudging – *How to influence people’s behaviour without taking away their choices*

### 9.3 The Co-design communication strategy for interaction designers and civil servants

- Self-disclosure – *How to open up discussion with citizens in order to build trustful relations*
- Interpersonal skills - Active listening
- *Personas with Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations* – Learn to elicit these motivations/values through surveys and interviews and to use them as a basis for design
- *Gate keeping of the experimental zone as an experimental, agonistic design space*

### 9.4 Digital Communication strategies

The Malmö website as compared to the Paris website, and proposed development of communication strategies for citizen involvement processes.
The Malmö city official start webpage does not display and promote citizen involvement. There are no narratives and no photos. The website does not reveal anything of what Malmö city is about. It is almost like the only reason the website exists is because there have to be one. When one compares the Paris website first page to the Malmö city website first page, it is quite obvious that Malmö city has no strategies to encourage citizen involvement, no “Active listening” and no particular ambition to appear as a transparent operation other than what is ordered by law. The Malmö Initiative is a
platform where citizens can submit initiatives for changes in the urban development. This service is hard to find via the website and should, by following the Paris website standards, be the focal point on the Malmö city first page website. This to communicate that Malmö city means business with citizen involvement. What I have learned from comparing the Paris website to the Malmö website:

- Malmö city has no apparent strategy or preparation for citizen involvement
- Malmö city has no apparent dialogue strategy behind their website
- Malmö city has no citizen dialogue via the website
- The Paris website displays strong narratives to capture the city agenda. The narratives are at the top of the website hierarchal structure.
- The Paris website displays a Choice architecture strategy by placing a “Participate” button at the upper right corner.
- The Paris website displays self-disclosure (and dialogue) by, amongst others, having a twitter account where all sorts of inquiries can be made.
- The Paris website paves the way for citizen participation by guiding the citizens into the city operations, guiding the citizens into submitting ideas, guiding the citizens via the website out into NGO’s and volunteer organisations.
- Display descriptive norms content, i.e. photos, videos and narratives that leads citizens to conclusions that citizen involvement is the norm. This can have long term effects on both citizen attitude towards the city and citizen involvement, and also be an incentive to change behaviour. This also displays ‘libertarian paternalism, i.e. in the way that it gives suggestions and a ‘Nudge’ about what is beneficial for both the citizens and the city.
9.4.1 Communication strategy for citizen inquiries via the digital platform

When a citizen wants to file a complaint or make a suggestion it is not easy to know where to submit the inquiry. And if the citizen manages to submit an inquiry, it might take a long time to get a response and the reply usually does not lead the resident further into the process. There are too many closed doors in the inquiry process. When a reply is constructed it should be of both a self-disclosure nature and giving feedback via an active listening strategy that guides the citizens through a set of options, e.g. – “At the moment we are not working in that area but will do so in six months. If you are interested we can contact you then and you can participate with your feedback to our civil servants. If you do not want to do that there is a number of organizations in the city that needs volunteers and your influence.”. This is guidance into citizens involvement processes and being open with whatever information there is to give to the citizens, not closing any doors at any time in the inquiry process and further lead the citizen either into Co-design processes, workshops with the city operations or lead the citizen into NGO’s or other volunteer organizations in the city, that needs volunteer workers. Then the committed citizen or just any citizen that wants to file a complaint has a full view of what the Malmö city operations can offer.

9.5 The digital prototype

*The website prototype/sketch/not finished product/open for critique*
A website prototype with the applied key findings and inspiration from the design process theory and related works i.e the Paris website.

![Prototype Image]

Figure 14 Malmö city web site Prototype

- Active listening via the Chatbot
- Self-disclosure via the Chatbot
- Design for behavioural change via normative messages, nudging and choice architecture.
- Intrinsic values displayed

10 Conclusion

There are ways to increase the understandings of interpersonal communication in Co-design processes via the obtainment and implementation of knowledge parts from the fields of Social psychology and Behavioural economics. These two fields together with interaction design methods and processes, produces a merging of new roles for the interaction designer and the civil servants.

*Interaction designer/Civil servant as a ‘Motivational architect/designer’*

The interaction designer and civil servant designs and plans the communication of the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations in the Co-design process with citizens and civil servants. The interaction designer also plans for how to connect the intrinsic values to the extrinsic values, this in order to plan for how to report the benefits of the intrinsic values to other stakeholders i.e decision makers and capital contributors. This in order to visualize and communicate the importance of these values as social benefits
but also as potential financial benefits. Furthermore, the interaction designer/Civil servant plans on how to craft normative messages that can lay as a basis for citizen and civil servants’ beliefs, in order to change attitudes and behaviours on citizen involvement in urban development processes.

The Co-design context, the quadruple helix, the Amiralstaden meeting place/office, that is the Living Lab, could be at any location on a permanent basis or an impermanent basis. The quadruple helix group that forms the Living-lab is made up by stakeholders and Co-designers and these Co-designers should be able to come in at any time and be a part of an ongoing Co-design process. The Co-designers should be able to choose from various processes to engage themselves in. The ‘Motivational architect/designer that facilitates and package the Co-design processes so that it meets the intrinsic and extrinsic values expectations and ambitions from citizens and decision makers, 

*and balances the municipal, vertical and hegemonic-structure so that it does not overtake the experimental qualities of the Living lab as an experimental zone. One future suggestion is to try to produce an evolutionary road that leads to a horizontal Co-design process within the living lab. Experienced citizens and other stakeholders should act as norm setters, guides and door openers for others to engage in the Co-design community. So when stakeholders/citizens choose to leave the process there are always a constant stream of Co-design participants, i.e citizens and civil servants available in the Living lab.*

*Interaction designer and civil servants’ as interpersonal strategists*

Playing the role of a warm welcoming person that has the citizens best as their primary focus should always be a number one priority. An interaction designer and a civil servant should not display an attitude of distance between the citizens and themselves in Co-design processes. A civil servant should act precisely like the title says; A servant to the civilians and to the civil community. That should be the top priority for the civil servants and the public operations and should at all time be communicated and outspoken throughout the process. Therefore, it can be to a high degree of use to educate civil servants (and interaction designers) in basic interpersonal skills in order to create sustainable relations with citizens. These interpersonal skills and theories should be thought from the fields of:

- Social psychology – Active listening, Self-disclosure
- Attitude formation and behaviour change (how beliefs and attitudes are shaped and how behaviours can be changed through attitude change)

*Communication methods and strategies*

This design process also produced communication methods and communication strategies that can be used by SBK- Stadsbyggnadskontoret. This in order to understand how to facilitate, perform and communicate the
Co-design process and thus producing a transformation to become a more citizen collaborative city operation.

**A collection of digital strategies as design guidelines for the Malmö city website**

As shown in the ‘tangible design outcome’ section, the framing of the research data & values from the interdisciplinary theory and this design research process, can be used as design criteria/guidelines for digital strategies. The framing is as follows:

- Extrinsic, extrinsic motivation
- Active listening, self-disclosure
- Normative descriptive messages
- Behaviour economics/Paternalistic liberalism
- Choice architecture
- Interpersonal skills
- Intelligible language use

**Education package**

As a participant and a facilitator in these three described immersive, practice-based Co-design processes, I learned to package the key findings as know-how from the merged efforts of Co-design processes and interdisciplinary theories of Social psychology and Behaviour economics. This into a package of interpersonal communication strategies and methods that amongst others formed the content of educational material for civil servants and other stakeholders in the Amiralstaden process. This education material was presented by me, as part of a programme of ‘Educational lunches’, that was open for the public and organized by the ‘Kunskapsalliansen’.
11 Reflections

There are multiple factors to take into account when engaging as an interaction designer in Co-design processes within quadruple helixes with citizens and civil servants. To consider all factors in a design context is difficult and maybe not even desirable, but the factors that have been examined and scrutinized in this thesis are very important design opportunities that should not be ignored. They are the obscure, introverted and unspoken factors that has a high degree of influence on the design process and the outcome of the tangible design. These factors cannot be ignored by an interaction designer, in a Co-design process, that wants to create a sustainable design for the end user i.e. the citizens, the civil servants and the city operations in urban development processes.

12 Future possibilities

I would like to suggest, that the findings and outcome from this research process, come to fruition in a pilot project, or should be implemented, as a whole or by parts, in existing processes within city operations, that aims to prototype a Co-design process or constitute a Co-design process. This to make use of the communication methods and strategies, as design
guidelines, in future Co-design processes within quadruple helixes, with citizens, civil servants, civic operations and interaction designers.
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13 Appendix

Information letter to citizens:

Amiralssstaden: Vill du utveckla kommunikationen mellan stad och invånare?


Tanken med samarbetet är att du som bor i Amiralssstaden träffar en person från stadsbyggnadskontoret. Först träffas ni två och två där ni diskuterar några frågor om kommunikation. Sen kommer ni träffa alla som deltar i samarbetet för en gemensam workshop och efter det har vi en avslutningsfest där vi diskuterar våra upplevelser av processen.

Så här kommer mötena se ut:

1. Invånare möter tjänsteperson från stadsbyggnadskontoret. Vi från Amiralssstaden hjälper er att hitta ett datum och ni väljer själva plats att träffas på.
2. Workshop där vi gemensamt tänker till hur vi ska kommunicera med varandra. Förslag på datum för workshop: 10april 17.00-19.00 och 11april 17.00-19.00
3. En avslutningsfest där vi på något sätt sammanställer vad vi fått fram.

Inför det första mötet för du gärna fundera på följande frågor:
• Hur kommunicerar ni (stad och invånare) med varandra idag?
• Vad kommunicerar ni om idag?
• Vad vill ni ha mer kommunikation om i framtiden?

Det är de här frågorna som ni kommer prata om under det första mötet. Det är också bra om du tar med dig papper och penna till det första mötet.
gärna att ni lämnar in korta anteckningar om vad ni kom fram till under mötet.

Vänligen,
Rebecca, Sultan, och Marcus på Amiralsstaden.

Kontakt:
E-post:
Adress: kopparbergsgatan 4C i Malmö

Amiralsstaden drivs av Malmö stad och är en del av Malmö Innovationsarena och finansieras därför till viss del av den Europeiska regionala utvecklingsfonden (ERUF).
Samtyckesbrev – Letter of consent
Jag är villig att delta i denna process med Malmö stad och EU. Jag förstår att Malmö stad vill utforska hur man skapar samskapande processer för att ta reda på hur medborgare och Malmö stad ska kommunicera om medborgarnas involvering.

Jag förstår att jag kommer att delta i samskapande aktiviteter och workshops, dessa workshops kan komma att dokumenteras genom ljudinspelningar, video och bilder. Jag kommer att bli omeddatt att dela med mig av mina idéer och att bidra i workshops. Denna process kommer att äga rum i Malmö stads lokaler eller där det tillsammans bestäms och ska ta ca 2 x 3 h av min tid.

Jag deltar för att jag vill. Jag har fått höra att jag kan sluta när som helst och om jag inte gillar en fråga eller en aktivitet behöver jag inte delta. Mina bidrag behandlas anonymt och kommer inte att användas i andra sammanhang utan min tillåtelse.

Namn: __________________________________________________________


Signatur: _______________________________________________________

Plats och datum: _________________________________________________
Aktivt lyssnande – *Active listening – Interpersonal skills*

**Tips att tänka på under intervjun:**


Aktiv lyssning kan innebära att lyssna och förstå, att återberätta vad som sagts, att förydliga detaljer i det som sagts, att bygga vidare på vad talaren sagt, att ge icke-dömande feedback och att i slutet ge en sammanfattning.

Under samtalet kan aktivt lyssnande se ut så här:

**Återberätta**

När du lyssnat kan du försöka återberätta vad talaren sagt:

- Om jag förstår dig rätt så...

**Förydliga detaljer**

Du kan också försöka få talaren att förydliga vad som sagts genom att kanske fråga så här:

- Kan du berätta lite mer om detta?
- Vad hände mer?

**Utveckla**

Bygg gärna vidare på vad talaren säger genom att dela med dig av dina egna tankar om vad som sagts:

- Det du sade om… Var verkligen intressant och det tycker jag att vi ska diskutera mer om.
- Dina tankar om just det där får mig att tänka på..
Ge feedback till talaren, gärna genom att visa vad du känner om vad som sagts. Feedbacken ska vara:

- Icke dömande
- Så tydlig som möjligt
- Ärlig
- Kortvarig

**Sammanfatta**

När mötet börjar nå sitt slut kan det vara en bra idé att sammanfatta vad som sagts. Detta är ett sätt för talare och lyssnare att klargöra och förstärka vad som sagts:

- Ska vi försöka sammanfatta vad vi sagt och vad vi förstår?
- Ska vi försöka skriva ned det viktigaste av det vi pratat om?

Annan att som du kan tänka på under samtalet är:

Berätta lite om dig själv så får du reda på mer om den andre. Detta öppnar upp samtalet och ni kan lättare dela tankar.


Ett annat tips, som kan verka självklart, är att försöka vara så närvarande som möjligt i mötet. Stäng av mobilen, försök att ignorera omgivningen och fokusera på situationen och talaren.

Försök att vara så transparant som möjligt om vad du vet som tjänsteförb. Men utan att känna att du avslöjar sekretessbelagd information.

Lycka till!
Tack för ditt engagemang! – Thanks for your commitment (civil servants)


Stadsbyggnadskontorets övergripande frågeställning I den här processen är:

“Hur kan vi förbättra kommunikationen mellan Malmö stad och invånare?”

De här frågorna ska du tänka på lite innan du möter invånaren. Det är också dessa frågor ni ska diskutera I mötet. Din samtalspartner har fått samma frågor att tänka över.

1) Hur kommunicerar ni idag?

2) Vad kommunicerar ni om?

3) Vad vill ni ha mer kommunikation om i framtiden?

På mötet kan det vara bra att ha med papper och penna så att ni kan sammanfatta lite om vad ni pratat om och ge de anteckningarna till oss. Vi kommer att e-maila dig några dagar efter mötet för att höra dina reflektioner.
Efter mötet så bjuder vi in till en workshop som kommer att äga rum runt den ... april på kvällstid och tar ca 3 timmar. Någon tid efter det så har vi en gemensam träff/fest där också andra inbjudna kommer att närvara. Mer ingående information om både workshop och träff/fest kommer senare.

Ett stort tack för din medverkan!

Marcus, Rebecka och Sultan på Amiralsstaden