
**Methods and Techniques
for Involving Children in
the Design of New
Technology for Children**

Methods and Techniques for Involving Children in the Design of New Technology for Children

Jerry Alan Fails

*Montclair State University, USA
jerry.fails@montclair.edu*

Mona Leigh Guha

*University of Maryland, USA
mona@cs.umd.edu*

Allison Druin

*University of Maryland, USA
allisond@umiacs.umd.edu*

now

the essence of knowledge

Boston – Delft

Foundations and Trends[®] in Human–Computer Interaction

Published, sold and distributed by:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 1024
Hanover, MA 02339
USA
Tel. +1-781-985-4510
www.nowpublishers.com
sales@nowpublishers.com

Outside North America:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 179
2600 AD Delft
The Netherlands
Tel. +31-6-51115274

The preferred citation for this publication is J. A. Fails, M. L. Guha and A. Druin, Methods and Techniques for Involving Children in the Design of New Technology for Children, Foundations and Trends[®] in Human–Computer Interaction, vol 6, no 2, pp 85–166, 2012

ISBN: 978-1-60198-721-1

© 2013 J. A. Fails, M. L. Guha and A. Druin

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Photocopying. In the USA: This journal is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by now Publishers Inc for users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC). The 'services' for users can be found on the internet at: www.copyright.com

For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license, a separate system of payment has been arranged. Authorization does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as that for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. In the rest of the world: Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the copyright owner. Please apply to now Publishers Inc., PO Box 1024, Hanover, MA 02339, USA; Tel. +1-781-871-0245; www.nowpublishers.com; sales@nowpublishers.com

now Publishers Inc. has an exclusive license to publish this material worldwide. Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright license holder. Please apply to now Publishers, PO Box 179, 2600 AD Delft, The Netherlands, www.nowpublishers.com; e-mail: sales@nowpublishers.com

**Foundations and Trends[®] in
Human–Computer Interaction**
Volume 6 Issue 2, 2012
Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief:

Ben Bederson
University of Maryland
United States

Editors

Gregory Abowd
Georgia Institute of Technology

Batya Friedman
University of Washington

Jon Froehlich
University of Maryland

Jonathan Grudin
Microsoft Research

Jason Hong
Carnegie Mellon University

Juan Pablo Hourcade
University of Iowa

Karrie Karahalios
*University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign*

Gary Klein
The MITRE Corporation

Joe Konstan
University of Minnesota

Chris North
Virginia Tech

Yvonne Rogers
University College London

Orit Shaer
Wellesley College

Desney Tan
Microsoft Research

Kentaro Toyama
UC Berkeley

Jacob Wobbrock
University of Washington

Editorial Scope

Topics

Foundations and Trends[®] in Human–Computer Interaction publishes surveys and tutorials on the foundations of human-computer interaction. The scope is broad. The list of topics below is meant to illustrate some of the coverage, and is not intended to be an exhaustive list.

- History of the research community
- Design and evaluation
- Theory
- Technology
- Computer supported cooperative work
- Interdisciplinary influence
- Advanced topics and trends

Information for Librarians

Foundations and Trends[®] in Human–Computer Interaction, 2012, Volume 6, 4 issues. ISSN paper version 1551-3955. ISSN online version 1551-3963. Also available as a combined paper and online subscription.

Foundations and Trends® in
Human-Computer Interaction
Vol. 6, No. 2 (2012) 85-166
© 2013 J. A. Fails, M. L. Guha and A. Druin
DOI: 10.1561/1100000018



Methods and Techniques for Involving Children in the Design of New Technology for Children

Jerry Alan Fails¹, Mona Leigh Guha²
and Allison Druin³

¹ *Montclair State University, USA, jerry.fails@montclair.edu*

² *University of Maryland, USA, mona@cs.umd.edu*

³ *University of Maryland, USA, allisond@umiacs.umd.edu*

Abstract

Children have participated in the design of technologies intended to be used by children with varying degrees of involvement, using diverse methods, and in differing contexts. This participation can be characterized as involving children as *users*, *testers*, *informants*, or *design partners*. It is only relatively recent that researchers around the world have begun to work more substantively with children to design technologies for children. This monograph synthesizes prior work involving children as informants and design partners, and describes the emergence of participatory design methods and techniques for children. We consider the various roles children have played in the design process, with a focus on those that integrally involve children throughout the process. We summarize and provide a pragmatic foundation for fellow

researchers and practitioners to use several methods and techniques for designing technologies with and for children. In this monograph we relate the techniques to the design goals they help fulfill. The monograph concludes with a consideration of working with children in technology design processes as we move into the twenty-first century.

Contents

1 Introduction	1
1.1 Terminology	4
2 Design Process and Goals	9
2.1 Define the Problem	10
2.2 Research the Problem — Gather Requirements	10
2.3 Create Multiple Solutions (Brainstorming)	11
2.4 Evaluate Solutions	11
2.5 Reflect Outcomes, Repeat/Iterate the Design	12
2.6 Design Process and Goals Summary	12
3 Brief Literature Survey: Involving Users in the Design Process	14
3.1 How Have Adult Users Been Involved in the Technology Design Process?	14
3.2 How is Designing for Children Different from Designing for Adults?	17
3.3 How Have Children Been Involved in the Design Process?	20
3.4 Why Co-Design with Children?	28

4	Methods of Designing with Children	31
4.1	Design Approaches that are Mindful of Children	31
4.2	Bluebells	35
4.3	Bonded Design	37
4.4	Distributed Co-Design	38
4.5	Cooperative Inquiry	40
4.6	Children as Software Designers	42
5	Techniques for Designing with Children	43
5.1	Fictional Inquiry (Requirements Gathering, Brainstorming)	44
5.2	Bags of Stuff (Brainstorming)	46
5.3	Mixing Ideas (Brainstorming; Iterating)	49
5.4	Storyboarding/Comicboarding (Brainstorming)	50
5.5	Layered Elaboration (Brainstorming; Iterating)	51
5.6	DisCo (Brainstorming; Iterating)	53
5.7	Sticky Notes (Evaluating)	55
5.8	Fun Toolkit, Surveys, This or That (Iterating; Evaluating)	56
5.9	Focus Groups (Requirements Gathering; Brainstorming; Iterating; Evaluating)	57
5.10	Large Group Discussions Using Whiteboard (Brainstorming; Summarizing Ideas)	60
5.11	Documentation and Design Tools (Requirements Gathering; Iterating; Capturing the Process)	61
5.12	Summarizing the Techniques	63
6	Revisiting the Underlying Dimensions of Child Involvement	64
7	Future Trends in Designing Technology with Children	67

8 Conclusion	70
Acknowledgments	71
References	72

1

Introduction

You walk into a university lab to observe a technology design session. Although the technology to be designed is for children, you expect to see computer scientists working diligently at computers, educators offering their input on the latest developmentally appropriate research on children, and information technology specialists guiding the interface design. The room might be hushed while everyone works diligently. Instead, you witness the following:

The brightly colored lab is abuzz with noise and laughter, not only from the aforementioned hardworking computer scientists, educators, and information technology specialists, but also from children! The group is finishing up eating a snack together, at which point one adult explains that during today's session, the team will be working to solve interface design issues for a major online company. The group is then split up into smaller teams of three to four members, each with adults and children who will work together on the problem.

2 Introduction

These groups disperse across the room and begin to build ideas using giant bags of art supplies. Children and adults are on the floor working together, creating models, discussing possibilities, and devising solutions. As the ideas flow, the activity level in the room increases. Children and adults alike are writing, building, talking, and collaborating. Ideas emerge from each group.

An adult leader calls everyone back together, and children and adults from each group work together to present the ideas they came up with to the large group. From a disco ball interface that would allow combining searches, to redesigned keyboards, to auditory feedback and hints on spelling, the groups have come up with many ideas to solve the problem of how children search for information on the open web.

This scenario describes an actual design session of *Kidsteam*, an intergenerational technology design team using the *Cooperative Inquiry* method of design partnering [28, 29, 32] at the University of Maryland. These child design partners participate in sessions such as the one described above on a regular basis in order to design new technologies for children. We believe it is important to include children in designing technology intended for use by children especially as technology is becoming more and more prevalent in the lives of all children.

Today's technologies in the home are becoming ubiquitous, not just for adults, but also for children of varying ages, in diverse contexts, and in different countries [33]. A 2008 report from the Pew Charitable Trust found that families with children are more likely than other family configurations to have various types of technology in the home. These technologies include computers, the Internet, broadband access, and mobile phones [70], and the use of these technologies is significant. In fact, another study reports that computers were used by 27% of 5–6-year-olds on a daily basis, for an average of 50 minutes [114], 80% of households of children 6-years-old and under owned a computer or

laptop, and approximately 69% of all households with young children had Internet access. Of 3- to 10-year olds in 2011, 55% used handheld gaming devices, 68% played on console gaming devices, and 85% used computers [111]. Even longtime media giants such as the Sesame Workshop have divisions dedicated to interactive technology [100]. Children's technology use in school also continues to increase. This increase exists in early childhood [33], and continues through public schools in kindergarten through twelfth grade. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), in 2009, 97% of teachers in the U.S. reported having a computer in the classroom, and of those, 93% had Internet access [86]. This increased presence of technology in children's lives is also a world-wide. Among children aged 8 to 18 across Japan, India, Paraguay, and Egypt, 69% use mobile phones [49]. Indeed children's use of these technologies in diverse contexts is significant and it continues to increase.

With technology impacting children of many ages and contexts on a global scale, there has been considerable research in the educational sector that has focused on the proliferation of technology and its impact among children both at home [33, 70] and in school [33, 86]. This research leaves an aspect of technology that is sometimes overlooked in research: the design of technology. For a technology to come into being, someone, or some people, somewhere, spent a lot of time and effort first conceiving the idea for the technology, then developing and building the technology, then implementing the technology in the context for which it is intended, and finally testing the new technology with the intended users, which in this case is children.

All technology must be designed and implemented, however it is not given that children are an integral part of the design process [29]. Research has shown that children can be involved in the technology design process in a variety of ways [29]. This monograph reviews the research and practices of involving children in the technology design process, with a particular focus on methods and techniques that integrally involve children in these processes. This monograph offers designers of children's technology motivation and practical ideas for including children in the technology design process.

4 Introduction

1.1 Terminology

Before proceeding, it is necessary to define some of the terms that will be repeatedly used throughout this monograph. While many of these terms seem common in their usage, different readers may have different perspectives and experiences, so we discuss each of these terms as they will be applied in this monograph. Specifically, we define and distinguish what we mean by: *child*, *technology design process*, and *technique vs. method*.

1.1.1 Child

Hourcade [60] expresses that we should consider developmental needs of children in the technologies being designed for them. We extend this notion to also considering the developmental needs of children as they are included in the design process. The age of the children of principal focus in this monograph are elementary school aged children (6 to 12 years of age), and the methods and techniques discussed are primarily for children in this age range. Some of the methods have variations for children who are as young as 3, and as old as 16. Most children involved in reported research on children in technology design processes are in the developmental stage often referred to as middle childhood, ages 7 to 11 years old. Druin [28, p. 596] found that 7–10-year-olds work well as design partners in technology design process contexts as they are “... verbal and self-reflective enough to discuss what they are thinking”. This age range falls within Piaget’s concrete operational stage which is typically children aged 6 to 12 which means they can think logically with concrete information, but have more difficulties with abstract concepts which is why many techniques have concrete objects to help bridge their thinking [75]. Erikson’s industry vs. inferiority stage includes children aged 6 to puberty. During this stage children become more able to cooperate with others thus supporting a collaborative work approach [13]. Therefore, for the purposes of this monograph, when we discuss children in the design process we will generally be referring to children aged 6 to 12. When we discuss adult design processes we are referring to processes involving design partners above the age of 18. Children have views and developmental

needs that are different from those of adults. Techniques for working with children on design teams thus need to be specific to the needs of children. This concept will be expanded later in this monograph.

We will also not directly address design processes intended specifically for teenagers aged 13 to 18 in this monograph. Design for teenagers is a nascent field. As noted by Yarosh et al. [124], teenagers are a population with whom, to date, not much work has been done in the area of participatory design. This is changing, with recent work by Iversen and Smith [63] and a workshop to explore the space of teenagers in design at NordiCHI [95] and at CHI [94]. Adolescents significantly differ enough from children developmentally that design with teenagers should be considered separately from that of children, and thus, teenagers are not included in this monograph.

1.1.2 Technology Design Process

The phrase “technology design process” will be used repeatedly throughout this monograph. The phrase is deceptively simple, but involves two major concepts that must be examined separately — “technology” and “design process”.

In the twenty-first century, we all assume that we know what “technology” is. But if we stop to consider this concept, a concrete definition becomes elusive. A dictionary definition for technology is “a method, process, etc. for handling a specific technical problem” [2]. A similar definition applied to technology in an educational context is that technology is a “... systematic application of behavioral and physical sciences concepts and other knowledge to the solution of problems” [43]. These definitions have much in common; for example, they refer to solving a problem. In the case of technology created for children, the problem might be that children need support in storytelling, or a better way to learn environmental science. Another characteristic of both of these definitions is that they are not specific. Technology is not necessarily defined only by a traditional personal computer with a keyboard and monitor — it can be much more. In fact, Weiser [123] discussed technology that blended into a person’s environment. Technology might refer to traditional mouse, screen, and

6 *Introduction*

keyboard for computer and software [101], media for television [38], Internet websites [5], tangible and mobile technology such as technologically enhanced stuffed animals [46], or tablet computers enhanced to help children on field trips [23].

Ubiquitous technology which blends seamlessly into the environment is becoming more common today, especially for today's children. The technologies that we focus on in this monograph are mainly digital in nature; however, the design processes used for these technologies could also apply to non-digital technologies such as paper books or writing supplies, which also fit our definition of technology.

Technologies can be created in a variety of settings by a variety of people. Technologies for children are developed commercially by companies such as Microsoft [110] or Philips [87], with government-funded agencies such as public television [4] and in academic settings, especially at universities with large HCI communities such as University of Maryland, Carnegie Mellon, Georgia Tech, and others [19, 23, 47]. Regardless of the types of technologies or the places where they are developed, all technologies must be created through some kind of process, and therefore all of them have the potential for including children as a part of the design team.

In the field of technology, the phrase “design process” may at first cause some confusion. It is necessary to distinguish between a “design process” and a “development process”. For the purposes of this monograph, a design process refers to the steps necessary to conceive and develop a technology including defining the problem, researching it, creating multiple solutions, evaluating solutions, reflecting on the lessons learned, and repeating any part of the process to refine the product. When we refer to design process we are not talking about the manufacturing or the mass production of the final product; we are speaking strictly of the process of conceiving and specifying the form and function of the technology. Because of the importance of the design process in this monograph, we elaborate more on these stages or goals in the Section 2. Others may define design process differently, such as the work between the time of requirements gathering and implementation [97]. We accept the validity of this definition and the authors of [97] accept that other definitions of design process, such as the one employed here,

are also valid. The definition used for this monograph is intentionally broad enough to encompass what we believe are all phases of the design process.

The phrase “design process” is chosen for this research as opposed to “development process” for clarity. In the field of computer science, “development” has many other connotations, including coding or programming of software. In addition, “development” in the educational sense is often used to refer to a child’s gains in cognitive, social, emotional, and motor domains. Therefore, to reduce confusion, the term “design process” will be used instead of “development process”.

Thus, combining the definitions of “technology” and “design process”, a definition of “technology design process” can be reached: a technology design process is all of the work done from beginning to end in the creation of new problem-solving tools, which can range from creating software for a personal computer to designing physical technologies such as robots. This monograph focuses on methods and techniques employed when creating technology for children, especially those that involve children throughout the entirety of the design process.

1.1.3 Method vs. Technique

It is important for the purposes of this monograph to distinguish between how we use the terms *method* and *technique* in regard to designing technology. We define *technique* narrowly. A technique is defined as an activity that a design team participates in while creating a technology. The application of a technique can be very brief and may last in terms of duration a fraction of a single design session to two or more design sessions. We refer to these applications as *design activities*. Walsh et al. [122, p. 2893] define a technique as “a creative endeavor that is meant to communicate design ideas and system requirements to a larger group”. Examples of techniques include brainstorming using art supplies, or critiquing technology using sticky notes. We define a *method*, on the other hand, quite broadly. We again employ Walsh et al.’s [122, p. 2893] definition of a method, which is a “collection of techniques used in conjunction with a larger design philosophy”. Thus, a method includes the overall philosophy of a design team. It refers to

8 *Introduction*

the overall system that a team uses to design technology. A method can include one or many techniques, but it is more than a collection of techniques that makes up a method. It includes the attitude and values that the team brings to designing technology.

In Section 2, we present a general model of the design process with its accompanying goals. We use this to provide context to the subsequent sections. After discussing the design process and goals, in Section 3 we survey how designers have historically worked with users in technology design processes. Section 4 presents various design methods for working with children in the design process. Section 5 addresses the specifics on how and when to employ various design techniques. In Section 6, we revisit the underlying dimensions of child involvement and we conclude, in Section 7, by summarizing our vision for the future of designing technologies with and for children.

References

- [1] C. Abras, D. Maloney-Krichmar, and J. Preece, *User-Centered Design*. Berkshire Publishing Group, 2005.
- [2] M. Agnes and D. B. Guralnik, *Webster's New World College Dictionary*. Wiley Publishing, Inc., 2002.
- [3] H. Alborzi, A. Druin, J. Montemayor, M. Platner, J. Porteous, L. Sherman, A. Boltman, G. Taxén, J. Best, J. Hammer, A. Kruskal, A. Lal, T. P. Schwenn, L. Sumida, R. Wagner, and J. Hendler, "Designing StoryRooms: interactive storytelling spaces for children," in *Conference on Designing Interactive Systems (DIS)*, New York City, New York, 2000.
- [4] A. Antle, "Case study: The design of CBC4Kids' StoryBuilder," in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2003: Small Users — Big Ideas*, pp. 59–68, 2003.
- [5] A. Antle, "Supporting children's emotional expression and exploration in online environments," in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2004: Building a Community*, pp. 97–104, 2004.
- [6] A. Antle, "Child-personas: fact or fiction?," in *Designing Interactive Systems (DIS)*, University Park, PA, USA, 2006.
- [7] A. Antle, "Child-based personas: need, ability, and experience," *Cognition, Technology, and Work*, Special Child Computer Interaction: Methodological Research, 2007.
- [8] M. Barry and I. Pitt, "Interaction design: A multidimensional approach for learners with autism," in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children*, pp. 33–36, 2006.

- [9] B. Bederson, A. Quinn, and A. Druin, “Designing the reading experience for scanned multi-lingual picture books on mobile phones,” in *Proceedings of the Joint Conference on Digital Libraries (JCDL 2009)*, 2009. in press.
- [10] M. Bekker, J. Beusmans, D. Keyson, and P. Lloyd, “KidReporter: A method for engaging children in making a newspaper to gather user requirements,” in *Proceedings of the International Workshop “Interaction Design and Children”*, pp. 138–143, 2002.
- [11] L. Benton, H. Johnson, E. Ashwin, M. Brosnan, and B. Grawemeyer, “Developing IDEAS: Supporting children with autism within a participatory design team,” in *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI)*, Austin, Texas, USA, 2012.
- [12] L. Benton, H. Johnson, M. Brosnan, E. Ashwin, and B. Grawemeyer, “IDEAS: An interface design experience for the autistic spectrum,” in *Conference Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI-EA)*, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2011.
- [13] L. E. Berk, *Child Development*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1991.
- [14] H. Beyer and K. Holtzblatt, *Contextual design: Defining customer-centered systems*. Morgan Kaufman, 1998.
- [15] H. Beyer and K. Holtzblatt, *Contextual design*. Vol. 6, ACM Interactions, 1999.
- [16] G. Bjercknes, P. Ehn, and M. Kyung, *Computers and Democracy: A Scandinavian Challenge*. Aldershot, UK: Alebury, 1987.
- [17] S. Bødker, P. Ehn, D. Sjögren, and Y. Sundblad, “Co-operative design — perspectives on 20 years with ‘the Scandinavian IT Design Model’,” in *Proceedings of NordiCHI*, pp. 1–9, 2000.
- [18] B. Brederode, P. Markopoulos, M. Gielen, A. Vermeeren, and H. de Ridder, “Powerball: The design of a novel mixed-reality game for children with mixed abilities,” in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2005: Toward a More Expansive View of Technology and Children’s Activities*, pp. 32–39, 2005.
- [19] J. Cassell, “Towards a model of technology and literacy development: Story listening systems,” *Applied Developmental Psychology*, vol. 25, pp. 75–105, 2004.
- [20] Census Bureau, United States, *Internet Use in the United States: October 2009*. U.S. Census Bureau, 2009.
- [21] G. Chipman, *Tangible Flags: A Framework to Support the Collaborative Construction of Knowledge Artifacts by Young Children Exploring Real World Environments*. University of Maryland, 2005.
- [22] G. Chipman, *Collaborative Technology for Young Children’s Outdoor Education*. College Park: University of Maryland, 2007.
- [23] G. Chipman, A. Druin, D. Beer, J. A. Fails, M. L. Guha, and S. Simms, “A case study of Tangible Flags: A collaborative technology to enhance field trips,” in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children*, pp. 1–8, 2006.
- [24] A. Cooper and R. Reimann, *About Face 2.0: The Essentials of Interaction Design*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons, 2003.

74 References

- [25] G. De Leo and G. Leroy, "Smartphones to facilitate communication and improve social skills of children with severe autism spectrum disorder: Special education teachers as proxies," in *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Interaction Design and Children*, pp. 45–48, 2008.
- [26] C. Dindler, E. Eriksson, O. S. Iversen, A. Lykke-Olesen, and M. Ludvigsen, "Mission from Mars — A method for exploring user requirements for children in a narrative space," in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2005: Toward a More Expansive View of Technology and Children's Activities*, pp. 40–47, 2005.
- [27] A. Druin, "A place called childhood," *Interactions*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 17–22, January 1996.
- [28] A. Druin, "Cooperative inquiry: Developing new technologies for children with children," in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems: The CHI is the Limit*, pp. 592–599, 1999.
- [29] A. Druin, "The role of children in the design of new technology," *Behaviour and Information Technology (BIT)*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–25, 2002.
- [30] A. Druin, "What children can teach us: Developing digital libraries for children with children," *Library Quarterly*, vol. 75, no. 1, pp. 20–41, 2005.
- [31] A. Druin, B. Bederson, A. Boltman, A. Miura, D. Knotts-Callahan, and M. Platt, *Children as our Technology Design Partners*. Morgan Kaufman, 1999.
- [32] A. Druin, B. Bederson, A. Rose, and A. Weeks, "From New Zealand to Mongolia: Co-designing and deploying a digital library for the world's children," *Children, Youth and Environment: Special Issue on Children in Technological Environments*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 34–57, 2009.
- [33] L. M. Espinosa, J. M. Laffey, T. Whittaker, and Y. Sheng, "Technology in the home and the achievement of young children: Findings from the early childhood longitudinal study," *Early Education and Development*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 421–441, 2006.
- [34] J. A. Fails, *Mobile Collaboration for Young Children: Reading and Creating Stories*. College Park: University of Maryland, 2009.
- [35] J. A. Fails, A. Druin, and M. L. Guha, "Interactive storytelling: Interacting with people, environment, and technology," in *Interactive Storytelling Workshop in coordination with Interaction Design and Children (IDC)*, Barcelona, Spain, June 12 2010.
- [36] J. A. Fails, A. Druin, and M. L. Guha, "Mobile collaboration: Collaboratively reading and creating children's stories on mobile devices," in *Interaction Design and Children (IDC)*, Barcelona, Spain, June 9–12 2010.
- [37] A. Farber, A. Druin, G. Chipman, D. Julian, and S. Somashekhar, "How young can our design partners be?," in *Proceedings of the Participatory Design Conference*, pp. 127–131, June 2002.
- [38] S. M. Fisch, "What's so 'new' about 'new media'?": Comparing effective features of children's educational software, television, and magazines," in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2004: Building a Community*, pp. 105–111, 2004.

- [39] C. Floyd, W.-M. Mehl, F.-M. Reisin, G. Schmidt, and G. Wolf, “Out of scandinavia: Alternative approaches to software design and system development,” *Human-Computer Interaction*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 253–350, 1989.
- [40] C. Frauenberger, J. Good, and A. Alcorn, “Challenges, opportunities and future perspectives in including children with disabilities in the design of interactive technology,” in *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Interaction Design and Children*, Bremen, Germany, 2012.
- [41] C. Frauenberger, J. Good, A. Alcorn, and H. Pain, “Supporting the design contributions of children with autism spectrum conditions,” in *International Conference on Interaction Design and Children (IDC)*, Bremen, Germany, 2012.
- [42] H. Gelderblom and P. Kotzé, “Ten design lessons from the literature on child development and children’s use of technology,” in *Interaction Design and Children (IDC)*, Como, Italy, 2009.
- [43] C. G. Gentry, *Educational Technology: A Question of Meaning*. Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1995.
- [44] F. Gibson, “Conducting focus groups with children and young people: Strategies for success,” *Journal of Research in Nursing*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 473–483, September 1 2007.
- [45] L. Gibson, P. Gregor, and S. Milne, “Case study: Designing with ‘difficult’ children,” in *Proceedings of the International Workshop “Interaction Design and Children”*, pp. 42–52, 2002.
- [46] J. W. Glos and J. Cassell, “Rosebud: Technological toys for storytelling,” *CHI ’97 Extended abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems: Looking to the Future*, pp. 359–360, 1997.
- [47] J. Good and J. Robertson, “Children’s contributions to new technology: The design of Adventureauthor,” in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2003: Small Users — Big Ideas*, p. 153, 2003.
- [48] J. Green and L. Hart, *The Impact of Context on Data*. Sage, 1999.
- [49] GSMA, *Children’s Use of Mobile Phones: An International Comparison 2011*. GSM Association & Mobile Society Research Institute within NTT DOCOMO, 2011.
- [50] M. L. Guha, *Understanding the Social and Cognitive Experiences of Children Involved in Technology Design Processes*. College Park: University of Maryland, 2010.
- [51] M. L. Guha, A. Druin, G. Chipman, and J. A. Fails, “The role of children in the development of new technology,” in *International Symposium on New Technologies for Children’s Play*, Odense, Denmark, October 24 2003.
- [52] M. L. Guha, A. Druin, G. Chipman, J. A. Fails, S. Simms, and A. Farber, “Mixing ideas: A new technique for working with young children as design partners,” in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2004: Building a Community*, pp. 35–42, 2004.
- [53] M. L. Guha, A. Druin, and J. A. Fails, “Cooperative inquiry revisited: Reflections of the past and guidelines for the future of intergenerational co-design,” *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction*, 2012.

76 References

- [54] M. L. Guha, A. Druin, and J. A. Fails, “Designing *with* and *for* children with special needs: An inclusionary model,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Interaction Design and Children*, pp. 61–64, 2008.
- [55] J. Hart, *The Art of the Storyboard for Film, TV, and Animation*. Focal Press, 1999.
- [56] V. Henderson, S. Lee, H. Brashear, H. Hamilton, T. Starner, and S. Hamilton, “Development of an American Sign Language game for deaf children,” in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2005: Toward a More Expansive View of Technology and Children’s Activities*, pp. 70–79, 2005.
- [57] M. Hill, “Children’s voices on ways of having a voice,” *Childhood*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 69–89, February 1 2006.
- [58] M. J. Hoppe, E. A. Wells, D. M. Morrison, M. R. Gillmore, and A. Wilsdon, “Using focus groups to discuss sensitive topics with children,” *Evaluation Review*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 102–114, February 1 1995.
- [59] A. Hornof, “Working with children with severe motor impairments as design partners,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Interaction Design and Children*, pp. 69–72, 2008.
- [60] J. P. Hourcade, “Interaction design and children,” *Foundations and Trends in Human-Computer Interaction*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 277–392, 2008.
- [61] O. S. Iversen, “Designing with children: The video camera as an instrument of provocation,” in *Proceedings of the International Workshop “Interaction Design and Children”*, pp. 73–81, 2002.
- [62] O. S. Iversen, K. J. Kortbek, K. R. Nielsen, and L. Aagaard, “Stepstone: An interactive floor application for hearing impaired children with a cochlear implant,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference for Interaction Design and Children*, pp. 117–124, 2007.
- [63] O. S. Iversen and R. C. Smith, “Scandinavian participatory design: Dialogic curation with teenagers,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Interaction Design and Children*, Bremen, Germany, 2012.
- [64] C. Jones, L. McIver, L. Gibson, and P. Gregor, “Experiences obtained from designing with children,” in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2003: Small Users — Big Ideas*, pp. 69–74, 2003.
- [65] Y. B. Kafai, “Software by kids for kids,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 38–39, April 1996.
- [66] Y. B. Kafai, *Children as Designers, Testers, and Evaluators of Educational Software*. Morgan Kaufman, 1999.
- [67] Y. B. Kafai, “Children designing software for children — what can we learn?,” in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2003: Small Users — Big Ideas*, pp. 11–12, July 1–3 2003.
- [68] S. R. Kelly, E. Mazzone, M. Horton, and J. Read, “Bluebells: A design method for child-centered product development,” in *NordiCHI 2006*, Oslo, Norway, October 14–18 2006.
- [69] C. Kennedy, S. Kools, and R. Krueger, “Methodological considerations in children’s focus groups,” *Nursing Research*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 184–187, 2001.

- [70] T. Kennedy, A. Smith, A. T. Wells, and B. Wellman, "Pew," *Networked Families*, (Accessed: February 24), 2008.
- [71] R. A. Krueger and M. A. Casey, *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 2000.
- [72] K. K. Lamberty and J. K. Kolodner, "Camera talk: Making the camera a partial participant," in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 839–848, 2005.
- [73] A. Large, L. Bowler, J. Beheshti, and V. Nettet, "Creating web portals with children as designers: Bonded design and the zone of proximal development," *McGill Journal of Education*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 61–82, Winter 2007.
- [74] A. Large, V. Nettet, J. Beheshti, and L. Bowler, "'Bonded Design': A novel approach to intergenerational information technology design," *Library & Information Science Research*, vol. 28, pp. 64–82, 2006.
- [75] R. M. Lerner, *Concepts and Theories of Human Development*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002.
- [76] T. W. Malone, "Heuristics for designing enjoyable user interfaces: Lessons from computer games," in *Proceedings of the 1982 Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA, 1982.
- [77] E. Mazzone, J. Read, and R. Beale, "Design with and for disaffected teenagers," in *Proceedings: NordiCHI*, pp. 290–297, 2008.
- [78] J. McElligott and L. van Leeuwen, "Designing sound toys for blind and visually impaired children," in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2004: Building a Community*, pp. 65–72, 2004.
- [79] L. Michell, *Combining Focus Groups and Interviews: Telling How it is; Telling How it Feels*. Sage, 1999.
- [80] L. Millen, S. Cobb, and H. Patel, "A method for involving children with autism in design," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Interaction Design and Children*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 2011.
- [81] J. Montemayor, A. Druin, G. Chipman, A. Farber, and M. L. Guha, "Tools for children to create physical interactive storyrooms," *Computers in Entertainment (CIE)*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 12–35, 2004.
- [82] J. Montemayor, A. Druin, and J. Hendler, *PETS: A Personal Electronic Teller of Stories*. Morgan Kaufman, 2000.
- [83] N. Moraveji, J. Li, J. Ding, P. O'Kelley, and S. Woolf, "Comicboarding: Using comics as proxies for participatory design with children," in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*, pp. 1371–1374, 2007.
- [84] M. Morgan, S. Gibbs, K. Maxwell, and N. Britten, "Hearing children's voices: Methodological issues in conducting focus groups with children aged 7–11 years," *Qualitative Research*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 5–20, April 1 2002.
- [85] M. J. Muller and S. Kuhn, "Taxonomy of PD Practices: a brief practitioner's guide," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 24–28, 1993.
- [86] NCES, *Internet Access in US Public Schools and Classrooms: 1994–2005*. 2006. (Accessed: February 19).

78 References

- [87] R. Oosterholt, M. Kusano, and G. de Vries, "Interaction design and human factors support in the development of a personal communicator for children," *CHI 96 Design Briefings*, pp. 450–457, 1996.
- [88] S. Papert, *Child Power: Keys to the New Learning of the Digital Century. Keynote Address*. London: Imperial College, 1998.
- [89] N. Parés, A. Carreras, J. Durany, J. Ferrer, P. Freixa, D. Gómez, O. Kruglanski, R. Parés, J. I. Ribas, M. Soler, and A. Sanjurjo, "Promotion of creative activity in children with severe autism through visuals in an interactive multisensory environment," in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2005: Toward a More Expansive View of Technology and Children's Activities*, pp. 110–116, 2005.
- [90] J. Piaget, *To Understand is to Invent: The Future of Education*. Grossman, New York, 1973.
- [91] J. Piaget, H. E. Gruber, and J. J. Vonèche, *The Essential Piaget*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- [92] D. Ramachandran, M. Kam, J. Chiu, J. Canny, and J. L. Frankel, "Social dynamics of early stage co-design in developing regions," in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*, pp. 1087–1096, 2007.
- [93] J. Randolph and P. Eronen, "Developing the Learning Door: A case study in youth participatory program planning," *Education and Program Planning*, vol. 30, pp. 55–65, 2007.
- [94] J. Read, M. Horton, O. S. Iversen, D. Fitton, and L. Little, "Methods of Working with Teenagers in Interaction Design (Workshop)," in *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI)*, Paris, France, 2013.
- [95] J. Read and O. S. Iversen, "Designing interactive technology for teens (Workshop)," in *NordiCHI 2012*, Copenhagen, Denmark, 2012.
- [96] J. Read, S. MacFarlane, and C. Casey, "Endurability, engagement, and expectations," in *Interaction Design and Children (IDC)*, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, August 28–29 2002.
- [97] J. Read, S. MacFarlane, and P. Gregory, "Requirements for the design of a handwriting recognition based writing interface for children," in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2004: Building a Community*, pp. 81–88, 2004.
- [98] J. C. Read and P. Markopoulos, "Lifelong Interactions: Understanding children's interactions: Evaluating children's interactive products," *interactions*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 26–29, 2008.
- [99] J. C. Read and P. Markopoulos, "Evaluating children's interactive products (Course Notes)," in *Human Factors on Computing Systems (CHI)*, Vancouver, Canada, 2011.
- [100] G. L. Reville, L. Medoff, and E. Strommen, *Interactive Technologies Research at Children's Television Workshop*. Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001.
- [101] J. Robertson, "Experiences of designing with children and teachers in the StoryStation project," in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2003: Small Users — Big Ideas*, pp. 29–41, 2002.

- [102] M. Scaife and Y. Rogers, *Kids as Informants: Telling Us What We Didn't Know or Confirming What We Knew Already?* Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, 1999.
- [103] M. Scaife, Y. Rogers, F. Aldrich, and M. Davies, "Designing for or designing with? Informant design for interactive learning environments," in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems: Looking to the Future*, pp. 343–350, 1997.
- [104] G. Sim and M. Horton, "Investigating children's opinions of games: Fun toolkit vs. this or that," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Interaction Design and Children*, Bremen, Germany, 2012.
- [105] W. S. Sluis-Thiescheffer, "How to optimize early design methods with children?," *IDC*, pp. 201–204, 2007.
- [106] W. S. Sluis-Thiescheffer, M. Bekker, and B. Eggen, "Comparing early design methods for children," in *Proceedings of the International Conference for Interaction Design and Children*, pp. 17–24, 2007.
- [107] A. Smith, *Americans and Their Cell Phones*. Pew Internet, 2011.
- [108] E. Soloway, M. Guzdial, and K. E. Hay, "Learner-centered design: The challenge for HCI in the 21st century," *Interactions*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 36–48, April 1994.
- [109] E. Soloway, S. L. Jackson, J. Klein, C. Quintana, J. Reed, J. Spitulnik, S. J. Stratford, S. Studer, J. Eng, and N. Scala, "Learning theory in practice: Case studies of learner-centered design," in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems: Common Ground*, pp. 189–196, 1996.
- [110] E. Strommen, "When the interface is a talking dinosaur: Learning across media with Actimates Barney," in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*, pp. 288–295, 1998.
- [111] L. M. Takeuchi, *Families Matter: Designing Media for a Digital Age*. New York, NY: The Joan Ganz Cooney Center at Sesame Workshop, 2011.
- [112] N. Tarrin, G. Petit, and D. Chene, "Network force-feedback applications for hospitalized children in sterile room," in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children*, pp. 157–160, 2006.
- [113] S. Tucker, "The diary of the future: Defining a self-documentation system with child design partners," in *Proceedings of Interaction Design and Children 2004: Building a Community*, pp. 133–134, 2004.
- [114] E. A. Vandewater, V. J. Rideout, E. A. Wartella, X. Huang, J. H. Lee, and M.-S. Shim, "Digital childhood: Electronic media and technology use among infants, toddlers, and preschoolers," *Pediatrics*, vol. 119, no. 5, pp. e1006–e1015, 2007.
- [115] A. Veale, *Creative Methodologies in Participatory Research with Children*. Sage, 2005.
- [116] L. S. Vygotsky, *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- [117] S. Wahid, D. S. McCrickard, J. DeGol, N. Elias, and S. Harrison, "Don't drop it!: Pick it up and storyboard," in *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI)*, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2011.

80 References

- [118] R. Wallace, E. Soloway, J. Krajcik, N. Bos, J. Hoffman, H. E. Hunter, D. Kiskis, E. Klann, G. Peters, D. Richardson, and O. Ronen, "ARTEMIS: Learner-centered design of an information seeking environment for K-12 education," in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 195–202, 1998.
- [119] G. Walsh, "Distributed participatory design," in *Conference Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI-EA)*, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2011.
- [120] G. Walsh, A. Druin, M. L. Guha, E. Bonsignore, E. Foss, J. C. Yip, E. Golub, T. Clegg, Q. Brown, R. Brewer, A. Joshi, and R. Brown, "DisCo: A co-design online tool for asynchronous distributed child and adult design partners," in *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Interaction Design and Children*, Bremen, Germany, 2012.
- [121] G. Walsh, A. Druin, M. L. Guha, E. Foss, E. Golub, L. Hatley, E. Bonsignore, and S. Franckel, "Layered elaboration: A new technique for co-design with children," in *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI)*, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 2010.
- [122] G. Walsh, E. Foss, J. Yip, and A. Druin, "FACIT PD: Framework for analysis and creation of intergenerational techniques for participatory design," in *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI)*, Paris, France, 2013.
- [123] M. Weiser, "The computer for the twenty-first century," *Scientific American*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 94–104, 1991.
- [124] S. Yarosh, I. Radu, S. Hunter, and E. Rosenbaum, "Examining values: An analysis of nine years of IDC research," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Interaction Design and Children*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 2011.