Participatory design is a long-lived tradition of systems design with active user participation in Scandinavia and elsewhere. The tradition has its roots in the work of Kristen Nygaard and Olav-Terje Bergo with the Norwegian Iron and Metal Workers Union in the 1970s. This era was characterized by a highly political focus, and a fierce debate with the sociotechnical design tradition. The Norwegian approach inspired other projects, such as the Demos project in Sweden and the DUE project in Denmark, and at the late 1970s, the Nordic UTOPIA project, through which the focus of research and design was moved from political debate and local union work to constructive design of technological alternatives with and for future users. In parallel, the researchers from this tradition worked to more specifically address the methods and work settings of professional systems developers.

With the UTOPIA project came a focus on design methodology emphasizing the active collaboration between users and designers; an approach that caught significant attention outside Scandinavia, particularly in North America. The move was famously phrased in Liam Bannon’s paper: “From human factors to human actors” (Bannon 1991). This paper was a part of Joan Greenbaum and Morten Kyng’s Design at Work (1991) writing project, connecting researchers from the Scandinavian and North American scene. At the same time Participatory Design Conference series was initiated by Lucy Suchman and others. In addition to internationalization, participatory design drew a growing attention across research disciplines, starting from Human-
Computer Interaction, diversifying and finding its ways into Information Systems, and into the emerging field of Computer Supported Cooperative Work.

In the 1990s there was a strong push by Scandinavian funding agencies and researchers to make participatory design even more useful in research projects that had direct collaboration with commercial partners. This opened up and tightened cooperation with commercial partners. However, at the same time the fundamentals of participatory design changed. Participatory design was, and is, often seen as an approach to systems design most suited for work settings, and indeed this is where it has its roots. However, it has been challenged by more recent research that addresses the use of technologies in different settings and means of participation of users, also in non-work settings (cf., Iivari 2007; Iivari et al. 2010).

The pace of technological development and the changes in organizational environment have had an impact also on participatory design approach. For example the 2008 Participatory Design Conference had papers on large-scale systems (Simonsen and Herzum 2008), community design (Karasti & Baker 2008), participatory organizations (Jones 2008) and urban planning (Nuojua et al. 2008), among many others. Also a recent SJIS special issue on distributed participatory design demonstrated the means and challenges of conducting distributed research and design (cf., SJIS 2009).

The diversifying outside of its traditional has dispersed the participatory design approach. The term has gained different connotations, and different communities do not necessarily share the same publication outlets—this resembles the development of HCI field (cf. Grudin 2006). User participation, nevertheless, has become more important than ever, and the need for interdisciplinary debate and knowledge sharing remains.

Even though participatory design has a fundamental characteristic of being close the users, it has been used only for small scale projects (e.g., Oostveen & van den Besselaar 2004). This is slightly surprising as systems development projects regularly fail in meeting the user requirements (cf. Hansen et al. 2008) and as research communities regularly debate about the relevance of their research (Ramiller et al. 2008; Baskerville & Myers 2009; Gill & Bhattacherjee 2009). Yet participatory design would solve these problems as, by default, by so doing it is possible to gain in-depth understanding about the future users and their needs. This inevitably makes it easier to understand the user and the use context—either for developing better systems or for conducting more relevant research.

There is also another issue related to the researchers’ work. As Mathiassen and Nielsen (2008) stated, ever more dominating publish or perish trend has had an impact on Scandinavian IS tradition. As action research is endangered (see also Simonsen 2009), also the researchers’ interest, means, and opportunities of conducting longitudinal and intensive research by using participatory design approach might be at risk. In order to cope with contradictory forces of publishing regularly, conducting longitudinal and rigor research, and working with commercial partners in different settings sets new requirements for participatory design as a method, as an approach, and as a philosophy.

The author of the debate article, Morten Kyng, has made his journey with the participatory design tradition from the very beginning. He has played a significant role in each step: He was initiator and one of the main researchers of the DUE and the Utopia projects, and he played a significant role in spreading the ideas of participatory design from Scandinavia to the rest of the world, through the so-called Aarhus conferences and their proceedings (1985, 1995 and 2005),
through the *Design at Work* book, and his keynote lectures at PDC 1994 and CHI (with Joan Greenbaum 1995). He went on to take a leading role in providing new funding schemes for collaboration between research and industry, and has now returned to university research where he heads a centre focusing on health and care technologies, with participating users outside classical work settings. His debate article highlights different elements of participatory design, their historical roots and current states, and presents participatory design for the future: the next practices of participatory design. This view is challenged by the debate forum commentators Dan Shapiro, Ellen Balka and Helena Karasti in their articles. Enjoy the debate forum.

1 **References**


