

## Designed Engagement

Gemma Teal<sup>a\*</sup>, Tara French<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Institute of Design Innovation, The Glasgow School of Art

\*Corresponding author e-mail: g.teal@gsa.ac.uk

**Abstract:** Designed Engagement uses design methods and skills to transform the way we talk to people in the community. We go to where people are: designing positive and thought provoking public engagement to stimulate creative dialogue and explore new ways of addressing societal challenges. Involving the public in dialogue around changes to policy and the design of services is a key target for policy makers, however traditional approaches offer little scope for creativity and meaningful engagement. Design brings a wealth of expertise to create engaging experiences, facilitate dialogue, and translate insights into tangible outputs for decision makers. We discuss public engagement literature and previous examples of design within this context. We introduce ‘Designed Engagement’ to denote design-led approaches to public engagement, illustrated through two examples of pop-up Designed Engagement. We discuss advantages, limitations and implications for design, concluding with the need for further research to evaluate and demonstrate the contribution and value of design in public engagement.

**Keywords:** participatory; engagement; dialogue; asset-based

### 1. Introduction

Politicians and policy makers are placing a growing importance on involving the public in decisions which have an impact on their wellbeing and livelihood, both in terms of informing changes to policy and designing services to meet their needs (Scottish Government, 2009; Christie, 2011). In addition to harnessing the collective intelligence or ‘wisdom of the crowd’, public engagement in decision making achieves “public legitimacy that encompasses trust and compliance” (Pieczka and Escobar, 2012, p.1). Building on the success of her work to transform public service delivery using relational models, Cottam (2015, p.144) calls for a similar transformation in politics to engage politicians and the public in dialogue:

“Politics needs to create the conditions for new forms of creative, developmental conversation - just as between the front line and families - beyond the traditional



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

political meeting, the focus group or the complaint form. It is through this new conversation that something shared, collective and relational will be grown.”

Scotland’s independence referendum in 2014 saw a record 97% of the electorate registered to vote and turnout of 84.6% (The Electoral Commission, 2014), the highest for any UK electoral event since the introduction of universal suffrage (Tierney, 2014). The level of public engagement was highly visible: at meetings and demonstrations, grassroots festivals and events (Webber, 2014) and in social media usage (Quinlan, Shephard & Paterson, 2015), challenging perceived voter apathy and citizen disengagement in political debate. Understanding the reasons for this surge in public engagement in political issues has been the subject of a number of articles, reports and debates (Kirkaldy, 2015); it is suggested that voters felt empowered by making a meaningful choice that could lead to a “material difference to what would happen in the future”. Positive and creative campaigns framed conversations about the future in hopeful terms and engaged people who would not normally be involved in political debate (Andreou, 2014; Ascherson, 2014). Voters saw a clear link between their activism and their lives; by campaigning for political change, the result would impact on the issues that matter to them.

“It is clear the debate in Scotland has re-energised our politics and, in doing so, challenged our politicians to respond to the expectations and aspirations of our citizens.” (Hislop, 2014)

The Scottish Government is committed to providing opportunities to create a successful and flourishing country through “increasing sustainable economic growth” (Scottish Government, 2015a, p.4). One of the key aims of the recent economic strategy is to tackle inequality by focussing on four priority actions: investing in people and infrastructure, fostering a culture of innovation, promoting inclusive growth, and internationalisation (ibid). It is recognised that collaboration and working together with stakeholders and communities is crucial to the success of achieving a strong and sustainable economy (ibid). Therefore, being able to engage people in a meaningful way to take action is vital to implement real change.

Design brings a wealth of expertise and methods to creatively harness public energy and make the resulting insights tangible for decision makers. In this paper, we position Designed Engagement as a participatory and design-led approach to public engagement that generates meaningful dialogue and explores creative ways of tackling societal challenges.

## **2. Engagement**

### *2.1 Engaging people in decision making*

Traditional approaches to engaging with the public have been criticised for a lack of meaningful dialogue (Escobar, 2011). The ‘top-down’ Decide, Announce, Defend (DAD) approach sees authorities presenting the community with pre-determined options, and offering them no opportunity to influence the agenda. Public sector innovation is driven by the political process whereby politicians are responsible for coming up with new ideas and

the public vote for the party whose policies best represent their views (Murray, 2009). Public consultations are often rigid and formal, appealing to a narrow section of the population and generating limited originality in responses (Local Government Improvement and Development, 2010). Participatory approaches to politics offer a 'ground-up' approach giving people greater opportunities to influence decision making and improve the public services they use (ibid; Bate, Robert & Bevan, 2004; Cope & Kalantzis, 2011).

Rowe and Frewer's (2005) typology splits public engagement mechanisms into three distinct modes: communication, consultation and participation, based on the flow of information and the nature of the engagement with the public. Escobar (2011) further distinguishes between the purpose of engagement: public *dialogue* or public *deliberation*, with the latter concerned with reaching decisions and coming to conclusions, and the former seeking collaborative inquiry to explore the issues, ideas and public feeling. This paper is concerned with *participative* modes of engagement and public *dialogue* around societal challenges to inform change in the design of public services.

## 2.2 Engaging people in participatory design and research

Cope and Kalantzis (2011, p.46, 49) call upon designers to "broaden our repertoire of design practices" to respond to dramatic social and economic changes and contexts of design work. They conceive of design as a "foundational paradigm for representation and action" and an "engine of change", working to shift the balance of agency. They highlight the need for facilitation skills and the importance of participatory and user centred design methods in building relationships with users. Sanders (2001, p.1) describes a new role for designers in creating "scaffolds or infrastructures upon which non-designers can express their creativity" for societal and commercial benefit.

Participatory design is based on the beliefs that involving end users and stakeholders in the design process ensures better results, and stakeholders have a democratic right to be included in its design and will be empowered through participation (Bowen, 2009). Participatory design researchers and practitioners have developed a large body of knowledge, expertise and tools to engage stakeholders in "collective creativity" (Sanders & Stappers, 2008, p.2), tailored to suit the context and based on an empathic understanding of the people involved. As participatory design is increasingly being seen as a strategy for addressing societal change, the contexts and stakeholders become the general public and our approaches to engage people in participatory design need to evolve to access this wider resource and the opportunities it presents. Addressing participatory approaches to service design, Sangiorgi (2011, p.30) argues that the discipline is becoming "an engine for wider societal transformations" through increased capacity and resource for communities to change themselves.

Contrary to conventional research approaches, participatory approaches differ primarily in terms of the "alignment of power" within the process (Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995, p.1668). Various modes of participation exist including contractual: where people are contracted to

take part in experiments, consultative: where people are asked to give their opinions and views prior to the design or development of interventions, collaborative: where researchers and people collaborate together on projects which are controlled by the researchers and collegiate: where researchers and people are considered as colleagues, working together using their various skills through mutual learning and control of the project lies with the people (Biggs, cited in Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995). Designed Engagement aims to engage with people at the collaborative and collegiate modes of participation, to empower those involved to feel a level ownership over what evolves.

Informed by Participatory Action Research (Reason & Bradbury, 2008, p.1) our approach aims to “create participative communities of inquiry in which quality of engagement, curiosity and question posing are brought to bear on significant practical issues”. We aim to provide the conditions and opportunities for new communicative spaces and experiential learning among those participating.

### *2.3 Dialogical approaches to public engagement*

Highlighting the confusion caused by overuse, Escobar (2011, p.16, 9,) reserves the term *dialogue* in public engagement to refer to “the kind of relationship which broadens worldviews, reshapes perspectives and speaks to both our cognitive and emotional capacities for mutual engagement”. He quotes Anderson, Cissna and Arnett (1994),

“Dialogue implies more than a simple back-and-forthness of messages in interaction; it points to a particular process and quality of communication in which the participants ‘meet’, which allows for changing and being changed. In dialogue, we do not know exactly what we are going to say, and we can surprise not only the other but even ourselves.”

He helpfully contrasts *transmission* models of communication, i.e. “conveying and receiving messages accurately” with *dialogic* models; communication that seeks to build and sustain relationships allowing multiple voices to be heard and tensions to be explored. Listing key dynamics of dialogue he considers the need for openness, respect, listening, storytelling, finding common ground and exploring differences, whilst balancing advocacy and inquiry, and building a safe space for collaboration.

Wright and McCarthy (2008, p.639) introduce dialogical approaches to engaging with users to understand their perspectives and design empathic user interfaces. They argue that “In an empathic relationship the ‘designer’ does not relinquish his/her position to ‘become the user’, a position from which nothing new can be created, rather the designer responds to what they see as the user’s world from their own perspective as designer”. While the output of meaningful dialogue in public engagement with social scientists or policymakers can be an understanding of viewpoints and collective problem solving, when designers are part of the conversation the outputs have the potential to be tangible outcomes such as design concepts for new products or services or insights which inspire further design inquiry.

## *2.4 Asset-based approaches to engagement*

Asset-based approaches promote the self esteem and coping abilities of individuals and communities, emphasising their positive capacity to identify opportunities and activate solutions, eventually leading to less dependency on professional services (Morgan & Ziglio, 2007; Foot & Hopkins, 2010; McLean, 2011). Asset-based approaches aim to promote health through the identification of 'health assets' which foster health and wellbeing in individuals and communities. The *assets* referred to can be anything that enhances wellbeing; examples include the skills, interests, networks, places and organisations that exist within a community. These approaches are inspired by the work of Aaron Antonovsky (1979) and his concept of salutogenesis, which states that it is "more important to focus peoples' resources and capacity to create health than the classic focus on risks, ill health, and disease". Public services set out to 'fix' these problems and take away control by making people passive recipients of services rather than active agents in their own lives (Foot & Hopkins, 2010). Asset-based approaches aim to build social capital within the community, as high levels of social capital are "correlated with positive health outcomes, well-being and resilience" (ibid, p.6).

Asset-based approaches underpin Designed Engagement; shaping the questions we ask, the conversations we share with communities and also how we present our findings. Through Designed Engagement we aim to shift the focus from passive participation to a more active dialogue with individuals and communities to enable positive human flourishing.

## *2.5 Asset-based approaches to design*

Design is inherently optimistic (Brown & Wyatt, 2010), as designers seek to tackle social challenges and improve quality of life, imagining a "preferable future" (Dunne & Raby, 2013; McAra-McWilliam, 2014, p.25). Sklar and Gilmore (2004) urge a positive approach to designing within multi-disciplinary teams, referencing the growing movement of positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Carr, 2011) as inspiration for their approach to design. They suggest new ways of eliciting user feedback during the design process using positive questioning, e.g. "What is the one thing about this you would want us to keep, regardless?" and suggest phrasing negative findings as new goals for the design team. Instead of identifying design problems, a positive approach "aims to remove constraints and present new opportunities" (Sklar & Gilmore, 2004, p.32, 33).

In the practice of participatory design, we aim to harness the expert knowledge and creativity of the people we are designing with and for. By focusing on what a participant can do rather than things they can't, and the coping strategies they employ to overcome difficulties, we create a positive and empowering space for participants to share their experiences and ideas. We adopt an asset-based mind-set in all stages of the design process: reframing questions and language positively, ensuring products and services build on individual and community assets and empower participants to realise their resilience and creativity in meeting the challenges of everyday living.

### 3. Designed Engagement

We introduce the term ‘Designed Engagement’ to refer to the application of design methods and skills to transform the way we talk to people in the community. By creating bespoke and engaging experiences we can design for meaningful dialogue that encourages people to reflect and share with us the things that matter to them. The focus of design expertise might be: face to face interaction, objects designed to provoke dialogue (Wallace et al, 2013; Coombes, 2015), games (Blythe & Wright, 2008), film (Briggs et al, 2012), cultural probes (Gaver, Dunne & Pacenti, 1999), digital tools (Open Lab, 2014; Taylor & Cheverst, 2010) or social media (Drummond, 2014): anything designed to start an open dialogue and build relationships with a community for the purpose of designing change. Strategies for this type of design activity include: ludic design (Gaver et al, 2004), reflective design (Sengers, Boehner, David & Kaye, 2005), critical design (Bowen, 2009), metaphors and storytelling (Muller, 2003), and appealing visuals. As such, Designed Engagement can involve any number of different design disciplines and benefits from cross-disciplinary working.

Designed Engagement aims to not only engage people in dialogue to collaboratively explore ideas and differences in views, but to engage them in creative exploration of new ways of doing things to work towards preferable futures.

#### *3.1 Designed Engagement: Pop-up approaches*

In order to demonstrate what we mean by Designed Engagement with practical examples, we introduce the ‘pop-up’ approach. Pop-ups use bespoke, portable materials to create a physical presence within a public location. We go to where people are: e.g. community centres, libraries, hospitals and shopping centres, and our materials are designed to be intriguing to attract attention. Several design researchers facilitate the pop-up and use a thought provoking or surprising opening question as a hook to begin a conversation around the topic or theme of exploration.

Pop-up approaches are not new to design (Maxwell, Woods & Prior, 2013; GUK, 2015). The term pop-up is increasingly used to describe short-term commercial outlets such as restaurants or concept shops for big brands. In the commercial world, pop-up approaches may be used to test the market prior to investment in a permanent space, promote a brand and sell products at temporary events such as festivals, and/or create curiosity and novelty in retail experiences (Niehm, Fiore, Jeong & Kim, 2006). While there are similarities in the physical materials being designed, the aims and approaches of pop-up engagement and its commercial siblings differ significantly. Where commercial pop-ups seek to promote, sell or gather market research on an existing or proposed venture, public engagement aims to start a conversation without an agenda. Pop-up engagement has some similarity to ‘vox populi’ or ‘man on the street’, used by journalists to gather opinions from members of the public in response to topical issues. Parallels can also be drawn with interactive art installations (Morrison, Mitchell & Brereton, 2007), although our definition of pop-up engagement in this paper refers to a face-to-face interaction.

Similarly, Lindsay, Taylor and Olivier (2012) use the term 'opportunistic engagement' or 'design on the street' and advocate this as a fast and effective way of exploring design ideas or gathering requirements when the products or topics being explored have a broad interest to the general public. They highlight the difficulty of recruiting for participatory design events and propose this as a way of engaging with the public in the early stages of a design process, with potential to recruit participants for subsequent design sessions. In the pilot study they provide to illustrate this approach, a retail unit in a city centre location is used to gain feedback from the general public on a new concept for assisted living for older adults. Participants were asked to look at visual materials explaining the concept and reflect on how it might work for an older family member or friend living alone, voting with coloured dots on the visuals they found more appealing and informative. The researchers found it challenging to engage large numbers of participants (15 people over a total of 10 hours), but found that the feedback generated was pertinent and candid, and the immediacy of the method enabled researchers to explore comments and evolve the study materials to build on feedback in conversations with subsequent participants.

When designing a pop-up for public engagement, design efforts are focused on conceiving an engaging overall concept for the pop-up experience, which may include ambiguous visual materials or 'props' that spark curiosity and intrigue, placing something unexpected in a familiar community space. Opening questions are designed to be equally intriguing and inviting; using open, reflective and asset-based questions, aiming to ensure participants leave the pop-up feeling positive. We find it important to introduce ourselves and our academic institution to establish that we are not campaigning, selling or fundraising. Given that many commercial organisations compete for attention in public spaces, not everyone may be inclined to stop to chat. It is the role of the pop-up design and facilitation to establish legitimacy and communicate that this is something different: *giving* an opportunity to share their opinions and experiences without a *'take'* or financial agenda. Following the opening question the designer facilitator listens and relates the responses to the broader topic, following up with questions and prompts to unpick the insights. Stickers and other 'gifts' are designed for each pop-up, giving the participants something fun to take away from the experience as a thank you and to provoke subsequent conversations with friends and family.

We have used pop-up approaches across a range of different projects, all related to the theme of individual and collective wellbeing. We will consider two discrete examples that demonstrate the use of research-driven pop-ups for different aims and at different stages of the design process.

### 3.2 Example of pop-up approaches 1: What's your Hidden Talent?



Figure 1: What's your Hidden Talents? The results of our engagement with members of the public were written on leaf tags and hung on a wooden tree (photo: Gemma Teal).

The aim of this pop-up was to reveal untapped 'assets' in the community and understand people's willingness and preferred methods of connecting with their local community. This was the first engagement for a new technology project to be co-designed with five regional communities in Scotland. The programme aimed to explore how advances in technology can support transformational change in our health and social care services. The experience was designed to be welcoming and fun, to stimulate and challenge existing thinking. The insights from this initial stage were used to inform the overall vision and to shape the design of subsequent participatory design methodologies.

The pop-up was deliberately designed to avoid explicit reference to technology, to avoid any potential barriers to engagement such as a lack of awareness or aversion to new technologies. The participants were asked to reveal their 'hidden talents' and consider whether, in the context of a world where money is problematic, would they be willing to trade their talents with others in their local community? They were also asked, what if anything would make life better for them? The participants were invited to write their contributions on 'leaves' and attach them to a freestanding tree (figure 1). Participants were rewarded with a sticker and a pen before the purpose of the engagement was explained. Finally the participants were invited to stay connected with the project by leaving contact details.

The pop-up locations were a community-based shopping centre, a 'destination' shopping centre and a busy hospital entrance area: across the three events (each lasting



approximately four hours) three facilitators were able to directly engage with over 250 people. Initially almost everyone answered the question “What is your Hidden Talent?” with the reply “I don’t have one”. However through discussion, and more often than not with a laugh, people began to discuss their talents and seemed to appreciate talking about positive aspects of their life. Despite the different locations and different motivations for people being there, the Hidden Talents theme and materials worked well, striking a chord with local people, creating a talking point and attracting the curious. The leaves were retained for analysis, and design researchers who facilitated the events wrote up their field notes describing memorable stories and interactions. Analysis revealed a wide range of local talents and interests, and identified themes subsequently explored in a series of co-design workshops (Geddes & Teal, 2013).

### 3.3 Example of pop-up approaches 2: What’s your favourite place in Glasgow?



Figure 2: What’s your favourite place in Glasgow? Pop-up engagement using a large illustrated map of the city to meet citizens and recruit them as community researchers (photo: Rebecca Phipps).

The pop-up approach was more recently used to recruit ‘community researchers’ to a new research programme which aimed to capture in near to real time the lived experiences and perspectives of citizens of Glasgow using a digital system of data gathering tools (Glasgow Centre for Population Health, 2016). The overall aim of the research programme was to pilot

the system and understand it's potential to support policy makers to involve the public's views in their decision making, with a secondary aim of testing methods for recruitment.

The pop-up aimed to attract the curious with a hand drawn illustrated map of the city showing key landmarks, main roads and rivers, printed on a large banner stand alongside an illustrated banner explaining the research project (figure 2). The pop-up had a high table for completing recruitment paperwork, and a jug of fresh, brightly coloured flowers. Pop-up facilitators asked passers-by the opening question "What is your favourite place in Glasgow?" and invited them to add a sticker to their chosen location on the map. Following a discussion around the map and the participant's favourite places, facilitators followed up to ascertain if they lived in the city and were eligible to be recruited to the study. Facilitators explained the research programme and if eligible, interested participants completed the necessary paperwork and were recruited to the study.

Over the course of seven recruitment events (each lasting four hours) at different community locations across the city, 128 community researchers were recruited to meet a quota that approximately represented the demographics of the city in terms of age, gender, ethnicity and deprivation level (Scottish Government, 2012). The main study is currently in progress and results will be reported in detail in subsequent papers.

## **4. Discussion**

### *4.1 Reflections on Pop-up approaches*

Pop-up engagement offers many advantages to designers seeking to gain understanding and build empathy with members of the public. It is fast and accessible, allows for high levels of engagement and surprisingly honest and considered dialogue despite the brief nature of the encounter. Based on anecdotal evidence, it offers the opportunity to engage with members of the public who would not normally take part in research, and can be tailored to a particular audience based on pop-up location, timing and through the design of engagement materials.

The pop-up approach is suitable in the early stages of a design process, when there is a broad topic to be explored, to get early feedback to shape a design concept or to engage and recruit participants for further research. When designing pop-up engagement tools it is important to be playful, and consider addressing the topic indirectly to surprise and attract passers by. Visual props like the tree (figure 1) or the map (figure 2) help to make the pop-up stand out and create a means of capturing conversations, with subsequent participants keen to see the responses from others in their community. In this way the props are both a way of generating and capturing conversation. Within our multi-disciplinary team we have product, communication, branding, interior, service and design research expertise; collaborators from social sciences and the voluntary sector. Pop-up design and facilitation benefits from this range of expertise and creative input.

When facilitating pop-up engagement it is important to be open to where the participant wants to take the conversation, listening for insights and asking relevant follow up questions to understand their perspective. Designers as facilitators bring their perspective and skillset to the dialogue, prompting with design ideas to explore the insight and identify opportunities with participants. Asset-based interviewing techniques ensure that the participant can be encouraged to see the positives and value in their response, for example highlighting resilience in overcoming personal challenges. We receive an overwhelmingly positive response, with participants genuinely surprised to be asked to talk about a positive aspect of their life, in a place where they would normally be talked *at* or asked for money.

Maxwell et al (2013) discuss the role of the researcher (in their case ethnographer) within the context of pop-up environments for design research, and highlight the need to be adaptive and move between the role of facilitator, expert, participant or observer to suit the context. Although the examples given refer to pre-invited participants rather than spontaneous encounters with members of the public, their insights resonate with our experience and we would also highlight the importance of recruiting pop-up facilitators who are empathic, warm and understand the value of asset-based approaches.

Challenges of pop-up engagement include the need to quickly establish credibility and differentiate the pop-up facilitators from salespeople and on street fundraisers. It is important to choose locations where people are not in a hurry and may want to 'linger', avoiding, for example, shopping areas where the majority of people are on their lunch break, supermarkets where people are trying to achieve a chore as quickly as possible or busy thoroughfares. Pop-up approaches will not capture the voices of people who are housebound or ill, and therefore should be used in combination with other approaches to ensure engagement is inclusive.

#### *4.2 Discussion of Designed Engagement*

Designers bring a fresh perspective to the question of how to engage the public in dialogue, and an understanding of how to convey information in an accessible and appealing format. Design tools and approaches can make ideas and options tangible, allowing feedback to be used to shape project direction. As facilitators in dialogue with the public, designers can build empathy and identify insights that can be translated into opportunities with the potential to address complex societal challenges.

The influence of design can be seen in public engagement literature (Local Government Improvement and Development, 2010) and in recent consultations led by the Scottish Government. The 'Fairer Scotland' and 'Healthier Scotland' consultations are examples of openness and creativity in consultation, alongside a 'ground up' approach to fostering ideas (Scottish Government, 2015b). Materials include a card game to stimulate discussion and a deck of visual slides for inspiration, and funding is available for communities to hold their own local meetings to generate responses to the open and asset-based question "What should a fairer/healthier Scotland look like in 2030?".

Within the context of the challenges facing Scotland, particularly within healthcare where there is a drive towards individuals becoming more responsible for their own health, Designed Engagement approaches have a role in ensuring our public services can support and empower individuals by involving them from the beginning of the process.

Challenges for designers working in this area are a bias towards quantitative information and the need to achieve representativeness in the data gathered as 'evidence' of engagement in decision making. Qualitative methods and open engagement are not intended to be representative, and while Designed Engagement can achieve high levels of participation from the general public, the views and ideas gathered cannot be representative. However, the increasing complexity in research has led to an increased use of a combination of qualitative and quantitative forms of data collection and mixed methods approaches are becoming more recognised and valued, particularly in the field of healthcare evaluation (Cresswell, Klassen, Plano Clark & Smith, 2011).

A further challenge is in ensuring decision makers are prepared to ask open questions and listen to the results of Designed Engagement, which may challenge their existing assumptions and current ways of working. While designers inherently "embrace uncertainty and ambiguity" (Michlewski, 2015, p.53), it can be difficult for policy makers and public servants to feel comfortable opening up their decisions and challenges to public engagement without offering pre-determined options, asking closed questions and therefore receiving predictable results and feedback. To overcome this, it is the role of the designer as external to the issue to ensure decision makers take an active part in the Designed Engagement process, and to carefully consider how to record and communicate the findings to ensure the stories, insights and ideas meaningfully influence the direction taken. The designer as researcher can present both an objective view of the insights to inform decisions, and tangible opportunities to respond. In these complex social contexts, the humble designer (Slavin, 2016) is not the 'top-down' creative, but the conduit for dialogue between the public and their representatives. Given reducing budgets and increasing demand on public services, it can be difficult for management to allocate sufficient funding to the engagement process and design researchers and practitioners must demonstrate the value of their approach through innovative outcomes for people and communities.

## **5. Conclusions**

Designed Engagement offers a real alternative to traditional approaches: not consulting around a range of pre-determined options or closed questions, but truly engaging with the public to understand what is important to them and what could support individuals and communities to thrive. Designers can bring a wealth of expertise and skills to public engagement to tap into the assets and ideas of the public and together creatively address social problems. This ensures that innovation is rooted in an understanding of people and developed with their input and ownership: leading to public services that reflect the aspirations of those who will use them.

Designed Engagement can be applied across a range of projects that aim to encourage participation with the public. Although the examples of projects presented in this paper are within the context of healthcare and social innovation, we propose that the pop-up approach has a range of applications, and can be used to engage with individuals and diverse communities across sectors for economic, educational or cultural advantage. The empathic approach of the designer ensures that the type of engagement is tailored to the individual or target group.

Future research offers the opportunity to develop different types of Designed Engagement given some of the limitations of the pop-up approach, for example, developing ways in which to engage with those who would not be reached through pop-up approaches or technology. There is also a need to develop evaluation methods that are appropriate to the engagement in order to gauge success. The impact of the Designed Engagement on the outcome of the subsequent research is another area of focus in terms of how it shapes the research, service or policy being considered.

**Acknowledgements:** The ‘What’s your Hidden Talent?’ pop-up described in 3.2 was a collaboration with Kevin Geddes of The Health and Social Care Alliance Scotland, undertaken as part of the Living it Up project, led by NHS 24 and funded by the Scottish Government, the Technology Strategy Board, Scottish Enterprise and Highlands and Islands Enterprise. The ‘What’s your favourite place in Glasgow?’ pop-up described in 3.3 was undertaken as part of the Right Here Right Now project funded by NHS Health Scotland and the Glasgow Centre for Population Health. This pop-up was designed in collaboration with Rebecca Phipps, also of The Glasgow School of Art.

## 6. References

- Anderson, R., Cissna, K.N. and Arnett, R.C. (1994) *The Reach of Dialogue: Confirmation, Voice, and Community*, Hapton Press, Cresskill, N.J.
- Andreou, A. (2014, September) 5 reasons to be cheerful – even if you voted yes for Scottish independence, *The Guardian*, 19th September 2014, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/orprpm4>.
- Antonovsky, A. (1979) *Health, stress, and coping*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ascherson, N. (2014, September) Scottish independence: the biggest surge of creative democratic energy the country has ever seen must not go to waste, *The Guardian*, 21st September 2014, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/knnw6lt>.
- Bate, P., Robert, G. and Bevan, H. (2004) The next phase of healthcare improvement: what can we learn from social movements?, *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, 13(1), pp.62-66.
- Blythe, M., and Wright, P. (2008) Technology scruples: why intimidation will not save the recording industry and how enchantment might, *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing*, 12(5), 411-420.
- Bowen, S.J. (2009) *A critical artefact methodology: Using provocative conceptual designs to foster human-centred innovation*, PhD dissertation, Sheffield Hallam University, 2009.
- Briggs, P., Blythe, M., Vines, J., Lindsay, S., Dunphy, P., Nicholson, J., Green, D., Kitson, J., Monk, A. and Olivier, P. (2012) Invisible design: Exploring insights and ideas through ambiguous film scenarios, In *Proceedings of the Designing Interactive Systems Conference* (pp. 534-543), ACM.
- Brown, T. and Wyatt, J.(2010) Design Thinking and Social Innovation, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter: 30–5.

- Carr, A. (2011) *Positive Psychology: The Science of Happiness and Human Strengths*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Routledge.
- Christie, C. (2011) *Commission on the Future Delivery of Public Services*, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/o22zhec>.
- Coombes, M. (2015). Dialogical Props and Individuals with Dementia, *Proceedings of the 3rd European Conference on Design4Health*, Sheffield 13th-16th July 2015.
- Cope, B. and Kalantzis, M. (2011) 'Design' in Principle and Practice: A Reconsideration of the Terms of Design Engagement, *The Design Journal*, 14:1, 45-63.
- Cornwall, A. and Jewkes, R. (1995) What is participatory research? *Social Science Medicine*, 41(12), p. 1667-1676.
- Cottam, H. (2015) *Relational Welfare*, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/qegogst>
- Creswell, J. W., Klassen, A., Plano Clark, V. L., and Smith, K. (2011) *Best practices for mixed methods research in the health sciences*, Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research, National Institutes of Health.
- Drummond, S. (2014) *Dearest Scotland*, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/pfwyn5k>.
- Dunne, A. and Raby, F. (2013) *Speculative everything: design, fiction, and social dreaming*, MIT Press.
- The Electoral Commission. (2014) *Scottish Independence Referendum: Report on the Referendum held on 18 September 2014*, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/pv8wyx5>
- Escobar, O. (2011) *Public Dialogue and Deliberation: A communication perspective for public engagement practitioners*, Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh Beltane – UK Beacons for Public Engagement, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/nz4jgzn>.
- Foot, J. and Hopkins, T. (2010) *A glass half full: how an asset approach can improve community health and wellbeing*, London: Improvement and Development Agency.
- Gaver, B., Dunne, T. and Pacenti, E. (1999) Design: Cultural probes, *Interactions*, 6, 21-29.
- Gaver, B., Bowers, J., Boucher, A., Gellerson, H., Pennington, S., Schmidt, A., Steed, A., Villars, N. and Walker, B. (2004) The Drift Table: Designing for Ludic Engagement, *CHI'04 extended abstracts on Human factors in computing systems*, p. 885-900. ACM.
- Geddes, K. and Teal, G. (2013) *Community Co-Design Year One Report*, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/z8dkous>.
- Glasgow Centre for Population Health. (2016) <http://tinyurl.com/huec6sq> (Accessed 9 March, 2016).
- GUK, (2015). Guerrilla testing: Getting input into products and services. Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/ocqjp87>.
- Hislop, F. (2014, 30th October) *The Scottish Referendum, and the Prospects for Constitutional Reform*, Speech given at the Irish Institute of International and European Affairs: Dublin. Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/obq5bjp>
- Kirkaldy, L. (2015, February) Will the energy brought by the referendum be maintained in May, *Holyrood Magazine*, 9th February 2015. Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/njclsms>
- Lindsay, S., Taylor, N. and Olivier, P. (2012) Opportunistic Engagement by Designing on the Street, *CHI '12 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, p.1709-1714. ACM.
- Local Government Improvement and Development. (2010) *Not another consultation! Making community engagement informal and fun*, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/cfh375k>.
- Maxwell, D., Woods, M. and Prior, S. (2013) The pop-up ethnographer: Roles of the researcher in temporary spaces, *EPIC Proceedings 2013*.
- McAra-McWilliam, I. (2014) untitled, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/odual6h>

- McLean, J. (2011) *Asset Based Approaches for Health Improvement: Redressing the Balance*, Glasgow Centre for Population Health, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/prq8s25> (Accessed 1st March 2016).
- Michlewski, K. (2015) *Design Attitude*, Farnham: Gower.
- Morgan, A. and Ziglio, E. (2007). Revitalising the evidence base for public health: an assets model. *Promotion and Education*; 14:17.
- Morrison, A., Mitchell, P. and Brereton, M. (2007) The Lens of Ludic Engagement: Evaluating Participation in Interactive Art Installations, *Proceedings of the 15th international conference on Multimedia*, p. 509-512. ACM.
- Mullar, M.J. (2003) Participatory design: the third space in HCI, In *The Human Computer Interaction Handbook*. Erlbaum, p. 1051-1068.
- Murray, R. (2009) *Danger and Opportunity; Crisis and the New Social Economy*, NESTA 2009.
- Niehm, L.S, Fiore, A.M, Jeong, M. and Kim, H.J. (2006) Pop-up Retail's Acceptability as an Innovative Business Strategy and Enhancer of the Consumer Shopping Experience, *Apparel, Events and Hospitality Management Publications and Papers*. Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/pw3qx7s>.
- Open Lab. (2014) *MyPlace*, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/q9ph6rb>.
- Pieczka, M. and Escobar, O. (2012) Dialogic and science: Innovation in policy-making and the discourse of public engagement in the UK, *Science and Public Policy*, 40, 113-126.
- Reason, P. and Bradbury, H. (2008) *The SAGE Handbook of Action Research*, London: Sage Publications Inc.
- Rowe, G. and Frewer, L.J. (2005) A typology of public engagement mechanisms, *Science, technology & human values*, 30.2, 251-290.
- Sanders, E.B.N. (2001) Collective creativity, *LOOP: AIGA Journal of Interaction Design Education* 3: 1-6.
- Sanders, E.B.N. and Stappers, P.J. (2008) Co-creation and the new landscapes of design, *CoDesign: International Journal of CoCreation in Design and the Arts*, 4(1), p. 5-18.
- Sangiorgi, D. (2011) Transformative services and transformation design, *International Journal of Design*, 5(2), 29-40.
- Scottish Government. (2009) *Community Empowerment Action Plan*, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/puw4lkl>.
- Scottish Government. (2012) *Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation*, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/omrozm>
- Scottish Government. (2015a) *Scotland's Economic Strategy*, Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/leuwnv>
- Scottish Government. (2015b) *Creating a Fairer Scotland*, Retrieved from: <http://fairer.scot>
- Seligman, M.E.P. and Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000) Positive psychology: An introduction, *American Psychologist*, Vol 55(1), 5-14.
- Sengers, P., Boehner, K., David, S., & Kaye, J. (2005) Reflective Design, *Proceedings of the 4th decennial conference on Critical Computing: between sense and sensibility*, p. 49-58. ACM
- Sklar, A. and Gilmore, D. (2004) Are You Positive?, *Interactions*, 11 (3), 28-33.
- Slavin, K. (2016) Design as Participation, *Journal of Design and Science*, PubPub. Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/h47q7xg>
- Taylor, N. and Cheverst, K. (2010) Creating a Rural Community Display with Local Engagement, *Proceedings of the 8th ACM Conference on Designing Interactive Systems*, p. 218-227. ACM.

Tierney, S. (2014) And the winner is... the referendum': Scottish Independence and the Deliberative Participation of Citizens, *UK Constitutional Law Association Blog*, 29th September 2014. Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/oqxsqd4>

Wallace, J., Wright, P., McCarthy, J., Green, D.P., Thomas, J. and Olivier, P. (2013) A design-led inquiry into personhood in dementia, *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, p. 2617-2626. ACM.

Webber, E. (2014, 12th September) *Scottish independence: Can anything be learnt from the Scotland debate?*, BBC News. Retrieved from: <http://tinyurl.com/q2r93bc>

Wright, P. and McCarthy, J. (2008) Empathy and Experience in HCI, *Proceedings of CHI 2008*, April 5-10, Florence, Italy. ACM.

#### About the Authors:

**Author 1** Gemma Teal is a Research Fellow at the Institute of Design Innovation at The Glasgow School of Art, working in the area of health and wellbeing. Her work focuses on opening up the design process to meaningfully engage academic researchers from other disciplines, industry partners, health professionals, people with health conditions or members of the public.

**Author 2** Tara French is a Research Fellow at the Institute of Design Innovation, The Glasgow School of Art. Tara is a Primary Researcher on the Experience Labs, tackling health and social care challenges using Design Innovation approaches. Tara leads projects that are centred on enhancing wellbeing and quality of life.