

**Public participation in futuring  
A systematic literature review**

Barendregt, Laura; Bendor, Roy; van Eekelen, Bregje F.

**DOI**

[10.1016/j.futures.2024.103346](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2024.103346)

**Publication date**

2024

**Document Version**

Final published version

**Published in**

Futures

**Citation (APA)**

Barendregt, L., Bendor, R., & van Eekelen, B. F. (2024). Public participation in futuring: A systematic literature review. *Futures*, 158, Article 103346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2024.103346>

**Important note**

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).  
Please check the document version above.

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

**Takedown policy**

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.  
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# Public participation in futuring: A systematic literature review

Laura Barendregt<sup>a,\*</sup>, Roy Bendor<sup>a</sup>, Bregje F. van Eekelen<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Human Centred Design, Faculty of Industrial Design Engineering, Delft University of Technology, Landbergstraat 15, 2628 CE Delft, the Netherlands

<sup>b</sup> Department of Sociology, School of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Burgemeester Oudlaan 50, 3062 PA Rotterdam, the Netherlands

## ARTICLE INFO

### Keywords:

Participatory futuring  
Public  
Inclusion  
Empowerment  
Democratize  
Literature review  
critical futures

## ABSTRACT

Against the background of continuous calls to democratize futures research and practice, this paper reports the results of a systematic literature review of the involvement of publics in participatory futuring processes. The paper considers three key research questions: Who participates in public futuring processes? Why are publics included in these processes? And what roles do they occupy? By considering practices of participation in futuring, we aim to build a comprehensive picture of the participatory futuring landscape and highlight elements of process design that may enhance or diminish a process's democratic potential. We conclude by suggesting directions for possible future research that could serve the field's continuing desire to democratize and further integrate participatory and critical approaches to futuring.

## 1. Introduction: democratizing the future

Since its consolidation as a field of research and practice in the 1960s, Futures have included a democratizing impulse, even as the mainstream of the field was occupied with strategic foresight, planning and war gaming (Andersson, 2018). Early contributors to Futures Studies, Robert Jungk and Norbert R. Mullert (1987) asserted, "the man in the street has practically no say when it comes to jobs, the environment or the way the future is shaped. All these aspects of our lives are in the hands of the politicians, the industrialists and the experts" (p. 51). In an effort to "remedy this non-democratic state of affairs" (ibid.), they, along with others like Alvin Toffler (1970) and Ian Miles (1975), proposed formats of futuring that involved members of the public in imagining desirable futures and creating plans for their realization. While in the intervening years the field has professionalized (Andersson, 2018) and technocratic, positivist and unitarian traditions have continued to dominate (Ahlqvist & Rhisiart, 2015; Inayatullah, 1990; Maze, 2019), calls for the democratization of futures and futuring practices have grown (Ende et al., 2021; Goode & Godhe, 2017; Loveridge & Street, 2005; Nikolova, 2014; Perna, 2017; Ramos et al., 2019). Democratization and pluralization, these researchers and practitioners argue, is the key to creating and sustaining a "rich futural public sphere" (Goode & Godhe, 2017, p. 6).

But what does it mean to 'democratize' the future and futuring? For many futures scholars and practitioners this entails opening up futuring processes to non-professional, non-expert, public participants (Ende et al., 2021; Loveridge & Street, 2005; Ramos et al., 2019). In other words, to democratize futures is to render futuring more participatory. Ramos and colleagues (2019) describe "Participatory futures" as "a range of approaches that can help unblock decision-making and action on contentious, long-term challenges by involving citizens in exploring or shaping potential futures" (p. 7). Adopting a participatory approach and involving the

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [l.e.barendregt@tudelft.nl](mailto:l.e.barendregt@tudelft.nl) (L. Barendregt).

public is then positioned as a necessary condition to democratizing futuring – necessary, but not sufficient. As Ann Light (2021) points out, “While participating in a workshop rarely makes a transformation, it can start one” (p. 12). That said, the mere equation of democratization with participation in futuring processes raises important questions: What does a participatory approach entail? How inclusive are these processes? Who participates in them? Why are they selected? How do people participate? What is the relationship between expert, professional and public participants in these processes? Is it enough for the public just to be present, or is something more required? Critical scholars working in futures, pedagogy, participation, and design would argue that inclusion alone is not enough to democratize. An effort must be made to ensure that diverse publics can play an active and empowered role in imagining and realizing their desirable futures, and this requires organizers to consider how issues and interests of power shape and manifest in participatory futuring processes (Andersen et al., 2021; Bisht, 2017; Light, 2021).

In this paper, we report the results of a systematic literature review that focuses on how participation occurs in futuring processes that involve publics. Our review considers the following key questions: Who participates in these futuring processes? Why are publics included? And what roles do they occupy when they participate? After outlining our method in Section 2, in Sections 3, 4 and 5 we report and consider data associated with each question. In Section 6 we discuss our findings and identify some ways power can manifest in participatory futuring processes and may enhance or restrict a process’s democratic potential. We conclude by suggesting directions for future research that could serve the desire to democratize and further integrate participatory and critical approaches to futuring.

## 2. Method

The aim of this paper is to build a comprehensive picture of the participatory futuring landscape and consider how participatory futuring practices may contribute to a broader democratization of the field. For this reason, we chose to conduct a systematic literature review (Pittway, 2008) of peer-reviewed journal articles in order to first describe and then offer a critique of the field (Xiao & Watson, 2019). We acknowledge that ample futures work happens outside of academic research, however, the details of processes that take place in corporate, industrial, or military contexts often remain secret or proprietary. Additional limitations of the study include language (we limited ourselves to peer-reviewed journal articles published in English), the period of the survey (ending in January 2022) and the archival practices of the databases we used (the first paper dates to 1997). These decisions made the search more manageable and helped ensure we had some quality criteria concerning the material we surveyed.

We began with a preliminary scoping review, which enabled us to develop an initial sense of the field, identify key literature, define research questions, keywords, and inclusion-exclusion criteria, and decide on data extraction and analysis procedures (Jesson et al., 2012). We conducted an initial search of key futures publications (including *Futures*, *Journal of Futures Studies*, *European Journal of Futures Research*, *Foresight* and *STI Governance, Foresight, Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *World Futures* and *World Futures Review*) with the keywords “participation” OR “participatory”, followed by a second search of Web of Science for articles outside of these publications with the keyword string “futures studies” OR “futures research” OR “futuring” AND “participation” OR “participatory”. Combined, these searches yielded a total of 933 papers. Out of these only 191 papers gave actual accounts of participatory futuring processes.

A second scanning of papers revealed that while many of the papers framed themselves as participatory, authors often describe participants in terms of their formal expertise or the professional position they occupy (e.g., involving experts, researchers, policy makers, etc.). While this may indicate that the field understands a participatory approach as involving people outside the ‘core team’ who are charged with conducting the futuring process, Gudowsky and Rosa (2019) argue that there are essential differences between ‘citizen-’ and ‘expert-based’ foresight processes (see also Rosa et al., 2021). Experts and professional participants are often involved in the hope that their participation will improve the outcomes of the process and the likelihood of implementation. Participation in this instance is justified on what Stirling (2006) calls ‘substantive’ or ‘instrumental’ grounds. In contrast, including citizens in participatory futuring processes can often evoke a different, normative justification. The public is seen to have a right to be involved or at least consulted regarding decisions that concern their well-being and livelihood (Stirling, 2006). Additionally, public participation is seen as a way to address “the effects of wider power inequalities” in a context where big decisions are made behind closed doors (Stirling, 2008, p. 274). We may wonder, then, whether without the direct engagement of the public, participatory futuring processes are democratic at all, and are capable of evoking public imagination (Candy, 2017). In light of these arguments, we decided to narrow the focus of the review to papers that gave an account of processes that involved people as citizens, publics or non-experts. These projects sought to deepen democracy through greater inclusion and therefore had the most to offer our study goal.

Nonetheless, a question remains: how to select and analyze papers reporting processes that involve people in these positionalities given the complexity of these concepts and limitations of the accounts available? ‘The public’, for example, is a contentious concept, with many scholars arguing that ‘the public’ should not be understood as a single or pre-existing entity that can be captured and represented through ‘good techniques’. Instead, they argue rather than ‘the public’, we should consider ‘publics’ as plural and constructed around specific issues, actions or processes (Mahony & Stephansen 2016); see also Dewey (1946); DiSalvo (2009); Marres (2012); Warner (2002). Similar arguments exist for terms like ‘citizens’, ‘(non)-experts’ and ‘expertise’ (Gudowsky & Rosa, 2019; Haraway, 1988; Wynne, 1992). In this literature review we are limited to what the authors report, and so we take the terms authors use to describe their participants as indicators of how participants were positioned in the processes. We acknowledge and seek to highlight in our discussion that the matter of participant positionality is far more complex, but believe this is a good starting point for considering matters of participation and inclusion in futuring. Within the paper, we use both terms, ‘the public’ and ‘publics’, choosing one term or another based on which understanding we are evoking.

Through an iterative process, we developed a list of synonyms for citizens, publics and non-experts and included papers only if they

described participants in the following ways: Publics, the public, members of the public; Citizen(s); Non-expert(s), non-professional(s), lay person(s), lay people; Community members, community representatives, community or traditional leaders; Residents, inhabitants, households, local population; Indigenous peoples, traditionally marginalized peoples; Youth, young people, young adults, children. Note that many of these terms connote positionalities related to participants' lived experience rather than a professional position or formal expertise.

This second filtering process yielded a final corpus of 85 papers (see Appendix; they will be referred to in the text with the prefix PAPER). The corpus of papers was then coded and subjected to thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Saldaña, 2013). Our analysis is therefore qualitative and interpretive, though we do report on quantities where relevant.

### 3. Who participates?

The first question we sought to answer with our review is seemingly trivial: who participates in public participatory futuring processes? Answers, however, are all but trivial. We found that authors are not always forthcoming about the identity of participants (and do not specify whether this is due to privacy concerns), but the labels and terms authors used to describe participants give us substantial hints. Table 1 lists the most common labels used by authors to describe participants. Terms were initially counted independently before being aggregated with synonymous and associated terms.

As illustrated by Table 1, the majority of papers in our corpus reported participatory futuring processes that included publics alongside experts and decision makers. Authors applied the label of 'expert' to professional participants from industry and government, but more often when referring to researchers. The term 'stakeholder', a popular import from the fields of strategic management, public engagement, and participatory planning, was used to refer to a range of participants including experts, publics, decision makers and representatives from various sectors and domains. Several papers referred to the same group of participants with more than one label. 'Student' and 'youth', for instance, were labels that were often applied to the same group and in some instances treated as synonymous. 'Resident' was generally applied to publics and citizens but PAPER 54 reports on a participatory futuring process that deliberately recruited experts who lived in a specific area and were therefore both "experts" and "local residents". PAPER 1 noted that "In many cases, participants fulfilled criteria of more than one role group (particularly as they were nearly all local residents, and many were working for local businesses)" (p. 147). While the authors note that the dual positionality of these participants "did not cause any methodological problems", it did make participants "worry" about whether they "were representing the 'wrong' role group" (ibid.) We return to this issue in Section 4.1.1.

Another way to approach the question of who participates is to consider where participatory futuring processes take place. Papers reported geographic details in various scales – organization (often a university), village, town, municipality, city, province, and country. This data was later coded at a regional/continental level during our analysis, which is visualized in Fig. 1.

Our findings show that the vast majority of processes in our corpus took place in the Global North (Western Europe, North America, Australia and New Zealand) with Europe as the clear forerunner. Within Europe, the United Kingdom, Germany, and Finland were the most prevalent sites for participatory processes, and Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, France, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Slovakia were the least prevalent. Understanding why this is the case is beyond the scope of this paper, but the dominance of participatory futuring in Western European contexts confirms what others have pointed to as the enduring Western-centric characteristic of futures studies and research (Bisht, 2017; Gunnarsson-Östling, 2011; Sardar, 1993). Additionally, while decolonizing futures implies much more than asking questions about where futuring activities take place and who participates in them (Escobar, 2018), this continued dominance of the Global North, shows that there is more work to be done if futuring is to be 'equally distributed', that is, decolonized as well as democratized.

### 4. Why are they selected?

The second question we sought to answer with the review has to do with the reasons for recruiting and selecting public participants. This is a key design decision (Ende et al., 2021) not only because it impacts the procedures and protocols of the process, but also

**Table 1**  
Labels used to describe participants.

Label	# papers
"Stakeholder"	55
"Expert" (inc. "professional", "specialist", "academic", "researcher", "scientist")	50
"Citizen"	49
"Decision maker" (inc. "policy maker", "planner", "government" representative)	40
Representative of "business" (inc. "industry", "private sector")	30
"Public"	30
"Resident" (inc. "inhabitant", "local population", "local people")	28
"Non-expert" (inc. "non-professional", "non-specialist", "lay expert", "lay citizen", "lay public")	27
"Student"	25
"Youth" (inc. "young people", "young adult", "adolescents", "children", "boys and girls")	20
"Women" (inc. "woman", "female", "girl")	18
"Men" (inc. "man", "male", "boy")	14




Fig. 1. Geographic Distribution of public participatory processes (adapted template from Tammy Adendorff's Team, Canva).

because it embodies the democratizing mission of participatory futuring. What is at stake is not just questions of legitimacy – an ‘instrumental’ justification for including the public in decision making processes (Stirling, 2006) – but also questions of representation, voice, and identity (Andersen et al., 2021; Turnhout et al., 2020). Why are certain people and groups selected to join participatory futuring processes as publics (and thus become effectively recognized as stakeholders by the organizers)? How do organizers approach the task of creating public participant groups? Do they allow space for a variety of potentially conflicting identities and interests to emerge or interact?

While we were not able to answer all these questions with equal detail (we are limited by what authors report), we were able to identify several heuristics for selecting public participants (Table 2). These rationales were not mutually exclusive; some organizers chose to engage a specific group they deemed relevant (e.g., young people, residents, non-experts) but pursued diversity, representation, or balance in terms of other identifiable variables (e.g., gender, occupation, education, age, in for instance, PAPERS 24, 46, 81, 85). Of the 85 papers in our corpus, 15 did not provide information about the rationale behind the organizers' selection of participants.

#### 4.1. Engagement with specific groups

The most common approach to recruiting participants present in the papers we analyzed is to seek out specific groups deemed particularly relevant by process organizers. Table 3 lists the most prevalent and relevant factors considered and arguments given by authors for selecting specific groups of public participants. We distinguish this from the labels used to describe participants presented in Table 1. These factors are not mutually exclusive, a point we will discuss below.

##### 4.1.1. The question of knowledge and expertise

Despite not being a recognized demographic category, expertise was a dominant variable through which participants were identified and recruited. The question of expertise is particularly pertinent in the context of participatory processes – whether they have an explicit future orientation or not – and is often coupled to concerns about authority, transparency, and accountability (Chilvers & Kearnes, 2016). Recognized experts are prone to leverage their authority and influence the protocols and outcomes of participatory processes, thus marginalizing other forms of knowledge and precluding broader oversight (Fung, 2006; Wynne, 1992 stands out as a

**Table 2**  
Rationales in selecting public participants.

Rationales for selecting public participants	# papers
Engage specific groups	54
Pursue diversity	38
Representative sample	10
Balance of participants	10
No data	15

**Table 3**  
Groups and factors targeted for participation.

Groups and factors specifically selected for with regard to public participants	# papers
Those who can contribute relevant, non-expert knowledge or perspectives	15
Younger people (those aged 0-35)	15
Potential 'protagonists of the future' (those who have some agency or potential to shape the future)	14
Potential 'victims of the future' (those likely to be impacted by the outcomes of the process)	13
Those who are vulnerable or marginalized	8
Those who are local to the process	8
People who can help enable free, creative, open thinking	3
People who have a 'right to be involved'	2

particularly insightful analysis of such an instance). Knowledge often connotes, justifies, or precipitates power (Flyvbjerg, 1998; Foucault, 1980), and by controlling the flow of knowledge and the standards of its production, experts and elites are able to exert power over others (Freire, 2005; Turnhout et al., 2020).

As mentioned in Section 3, the majority of papers reported processes that included *both* expert and non-expert participants, raising the question of whether non-experts were recruited to support experts (Turnhout et al., 2020) or the other way around. As Ahlqvist and Rhisiart (2015) note, while different types of knowledge may be recognized as valid within participatory processes, "it is not [always] clear what the relations are between those types of knowledge, and how they interact (collaborate, compete) as soon as they meet" (p. 9). While many processes reported in our corpus did seek to involve multiple types of knowledge by including non-experts or publics, several papers effectively redefined the meaning of expertise from indicating a formal qualification to indicating relevance. In these cases, referring back to Stirling's (2006) terms, non-experts were included because of 'substantive' rather than 'normative' reasons (that is, to improve the outcomes and not to merely include all those affected). For example, PAPER 77 defines experts as "persons selected for their extended knowledge of specific issues *at the local level*" (p. 651; emphasis added), PAPER 2 defines an expert as someone with knowledge of and experience with daily life and work, and PAPER 24 argues for the inclusion of maker practitioners instead of researchers because "the best experts in rapidly changing nascent practices [...] are likely those who are closely engaged with making them happen rather than those tracking it at some higher level" (p. 210). In addition to having knowledge relevant to the process, another substantive justification for selecting non-expert participants was that they provide a means to promote creativity within the process (PAPER 53).

Of course, and as noted in Section 2, expertise is situated and relational, and being an expert in one thing does not preclude one from being a non-expert (or plain "citizen") in something else (Gudowsky and Rosa, 2019). Even when acting as "experts", people draw on experiences and insights from their lives as "citizens", and it can often be difficult to separate these two identities in practice. As we mentioned in Section 3, several papers applied multiple labels to the same group of participants. While some authors disqualified people with domain specific expertise from participating as citizens (PAPERS 46, 75), others did not (PAPERS 41, 79, 83), thus allowing mixed positionalities. PAPER 75 went even further and attempted to do away with the question of expertise altogether. The authors stress that although most participants were "healthcare or related professionals, technologists and designers [...] being a member of these professions was not a requirement" and that participants were invited "to contribute their whole self with no emphasis on their profession or technology capability in the process" (p. 6). As there is reason to suspect that expertise carries through even when people are recruited as citizens or members of publics, these instances of dual or multiple positionalities raise serious questions: how can organizers account for the privilege and disadvantage that comes with different forms of expertise without reducing participants' positionality to a single type of expertise? And more broadly, what is the role of authority figures and other privileged positionalities in processes that seek to democratize, empower marginalized groups, or foster transformative change?

#### 4.1.2. Subjects of the future

Aside from (non-)experts, an additional group that was often targeted for recruitment is what we refer to as 'subjects of the future'. As illustrated in Table 3, this group includes both participants who are potentially 'victims' of the future (those who will likely be impacted by the futures discussed during participatory futuring processes and are understood as lacking the capacity to act on those futures), and those identified as 'protagonists' of the future (those who are inversely positioned as active shapers of the future, often the purview of "politicians, the industrialists and the experts" (Jungk & Mullert, 1987)). Generally speaking, by including the first group, participatory futuring processes seek to turn victims of the future into its protagonists. While this positioning of participants may recognize the public's "right to be involved" (Hickey & Mohan, 2004), the reasons for this inclusion are not always couched in moral terms. PAPER 30, for instance, justifies the active involvement of "citizen-consumers" not so much on the grounds that they would be impacted in the future, but rather because they "would be the ultimate adopters or 'practitioners' in any future eating scenarios" (p. 8). The imperative behind their inclusion, therefore, is instrumental rather than normative (Stirling, 2006), and based on participants' *current* positions and access to resources that enable them to be drivers of change.

Young people make for an interesting case in this context. Several papers position younger people as marginalized, arguing that young people tend to be overlooked in both futuring and decision-making contexts (PAPERS 11, 19, 64, 76). Due to their age, young people are often left out of formal decision making and democratic processes (such as voting), despite having the "largest share of any future" (PAPER 64, p. 370). While not all papers that involved young people labelled them as marginalized, if we follow this logic then we can say all papers that described participants in terms of "youth" can be said to be engaging with a marginalized group in a futuring and political context. At the same time, several authors also position young people as protagonists of the future. PAPER 27 labels them

as "decision makers in the future" (p. 47) and PAPER 20 considers them as "one of the main players in this task of building the society of the future" (p. 1). Young people are included in these instances not because of their perceived lack of capacity to act *in the present*, but rather because of their potential to effect change by occupying positions of power *in the future*. They are, in other words, marginalized in the present but potentially powerful in the future. This further supports the argument that the identities of participants in participatory futuring processes are not and should not be seen as one-dimensional (Gudowsky & Rosa, 2019) or fixed. As we argue in Section 6, the rich multidimensionality of participants should be seen as a major strength of participatory futuring processes and a cornerstone of a critical approach to participatory futuring.

#### 4.1.3. Attention to marginalized peoples and communities

While existing participatory futuring frameworks emphasize the inclusion of citizens and diverse groups in order to be representative (Andersen et al., 2021; Ende et al., 2021; Ramos et al., 2019), critical scholars of pedagogy, participatory design and futures argue that if a process wants to disrupt conventional arrangements and relationships of power then it must involve marginalized peoples (Björvinsson et al., 2012; Freire, 2005; Jungk & Mullert, 1987; Luck, 2018). Democratizing through participation, then, requires attention not just to involving 'the public', but involving marginalized people who are rarely consulted, often dismissed, most vulnerable to changes in policy and for whom participating can be "particularly significant" (Mitlin, 2021, p. 299) – while remaining vigilant of 'participation' and 'research fatigue' (Clark, 2008; Tshishonga, 2020).

As illustrated in Table 3, eight papers specifically selected participants because they were part of a vulnerable, disadvantaged, or marginalized group. An additional six papers referred to their participants as marginalized but did not indicate that they were selected because of this. Table 4 shows the factors that indicated this marginalization according to the authors. However, after conducting our own reading of participant labels to see which conventionally marginalized groups were involved in this process even if they were not identified as such by authors, we found that 39 papers actually addressed marginalized groups (see Table 4).

While several papers specify the involvement of women, only one (PAPER 85) positions women as a marginalized group within political (and futuring) processes. Similarly, while a number of authors considered factors related to class, only five papers were explicit about involving participants of a lower class or socioeconomic status, and only four of them framed this as an indication of marginalization.

Despite growing calls to decolonize futures research and practice (Bisht, 2017, 2020; Gesturing Towards Decolonial Futures (n.d.)), only seven papers describe processes that involved indigenous people. These included participants from the Niniichik Village Tribe (in Alaska), First Nations of Clayoquot Sound in Canada, "ethnic" Dayak and Malay, Boru Indigenous communities (in Indonesia), Sambilog leaders (in the Philippines), iwi (indigenous New Zealand Māori), and from Vilhelmina Northern Sami Village (in Sweden). However, only two papers referred to indigenous participants as marginalized. Both papers did so while reflecting on the shared colonial legacy of western futuring, planning and knowledge production approaches (see also Jackson et al., 2017), and how indigenous people have been "subjugated" through "colonization and [...] unethical research practices" (PAPER 73, p. 240; see also PAPER 68).

One paper described their participants as being "academic refugees" (PAPER 62, p. 107). However, they were not purposely recruited for this reason but are positioned alongside other groups of participants such as "teenage mothers, policy makers, [...] the cultural proletariat, environmental NGOs, goal-driven CEOs and unsuspecting festival visitors" as "people from all walks of life" (ibid). One paper described their participants as being immigrants, using the terms "foreigners" and "foreign citizens" (PAPER 2, p. 541), but the topic of migration was present in several processes. PAPER 2 additionally specified the involvement of unemployed persons.

#### 4.2. Seeking diversity, representation or balance

Futures researchers and practitioners have been calling for more diversity in futuring processes. They argue that engaging a broad range of people allows better insight into a community or context of intervention, which in turn, enables better policy to be developed (Ende et al., 2021), reduces blind spots by allowing (often competing) assumptions to be surfaced (Ramos et al., 2019), and "helps to broaden standard lenses and conventional perspectives and, in doing so, provokes challenge" (Andersen et al., 2021, p. 11). Others have argued for the need to diversify the knowledges, perspectives and approaches that shape futuring processes and their outcomes

**Table 4**  
Indications of marginalization.

Indications of marginalization	# papers that describe participants as marginalized in this way	# papers that include these marginalized groups (in our reading)
Youth	5	20
Lower socioeconomic status	4	5
Indigenous peoples	2	7
Gendered female	1	18
People of color (not including indigenous peoples)	0	3
Refugees	0	1
Immigrants	0	1
Unemployed	0	1
Underspecified	6	-

(Goode & Godhe, 2017). Within our corpus, authors couched their desire for diversity in a range of arguments that cut across categories of identity, expertise, and cultural background. Present in 10 papers, the most prevalent argument for pursuing diversity was that it leads to a higher variety of different perspectives emerging in the process and its outcomes. Other arguments included avoiding tunnel vision and bias (PAPERS 21, 34), ensuring the process is democratic and fosters "radical thinking" (PAPER 21, p. 5), leading to more robust decisions and strategies (PAPER 46), enabling a broader dissemination of educational goals and testing of tools designed in the process (PAPER 55), and expanding the non-expert perspective beyond that of the 'user' (PAPER 34).

While several papers explained that their pursuit of diversity was meant to create maximal heterogeneity among participants, others looked to create a smaller sample of participants that adequately represented the demographic variables or interests of a larger group. For example, PAPER 25 employed a "targeted outreach process" to create a group of "participants who were representative of the Chicago region, in terms of race/ethnicity, gender, and geography" (p. 28). In other cases, organizers expressed a desire for a balance in group composition – either by reiterating issues of representative proportionality or by pointing to the dynamics of the process itself. For example, PAPER 85 describes how organizers "ensured a balanced gender distribution of participants" in order "to counteract the problem that politics are often 'monopolized' by men" (p. 35). In many instances, the goal of these related but distinct rationales of diversity, proportional representation and balance was to decrease the chance that any single participant or group of participants would dominate the process.

But how diverse were the groups of participants in these processes? Table 5 lists the prevalent variables authors used to describe participants, providing us with an indication of how diversity was operationalized. Here we see a great deal of attention is paid to participants' occupations, the expertise they may be able to contribute to the process, and age. However, less attention is given to factors like gender, race, or class.

Regarding gender, authors seemed to understand and apply gender in a rather binary fashion, that is, with no mention of trans or non-binary people. Some papers use the description of gender (a social/cultural category referring to gender performance) and others that of sex (a biological category). Nowhere is a distinction between these two categories made. We suspect the lack of consideration of gender is not because it has ceased to be grounds on which people are discriminated against, and see it as a missed opportunity to understand and reflect participant positionalities and intersectionalities in more dynamic, fluid ways (Broto, 2021; Fleener & Coble, 2022).

While factors like occupation, place of residency, level of education, property ownership and income were considered to varying degrees by many authors, they did not translate into an explicit consideration of socioeconomic class. In fact, class was only used as an identifying category by one paper in the corpus. PAPER 28 described their participants as being of "social class ABC1" (p. 134) but did not elaborate further. The organization the authors reference explains this social classification system is based on occupation (National Readership Survey (n.d.)). Additionally, while the authors of PAPER 67 did not describe participants in terms of class, they do note that tensions in the community the process intervened in were "rooted in class and racial disparities" (p. 695), and they describe participants through the variables of race and income level. This lack of explicit attention to class across the corpus may be due to the term's going out of fashion, or the complexity of applying class as an analytic category (Bull & Galimberti, 2022; Eidlin & McCarthy, 2020). Regardless, we believe this constitutes another missed opportunity for a deeper understanding of participant positionalities because class indicates not only material affluence but cultural and political influence (or a lack thereof), and can draw attention not only to marginalization but also privilege. We have noted that 14 papers described participants as marginalized, however, six papers conversely position their participants as being part of a privileged or elite group.

## 5. How do they participate?

As our review illustrates, many participatory futuring processes actively seek diversity. But even when publics or marginalized and vulnerable groups are included, just being 'in the room' is not sufficient in and of itself for meaningful participation. Loveridge and Street (2005) argue that the potential for a process to be truly inclusive depends on whether actors come together to define its aims and consider its means. This observation echoes Sherry Arnstein's (2019) influential 'ladder of participation' – a framework that links participant roles with a process's democratic potential. As illustrated by Arnstein's ladder and more recent attempts to formulate

**Table 5**  
Variables used to describe participants.

Variables used to describe participants	# papers
Occupation, profession, place of employment	59
Forms of expertise (i.e. professional, disciplinary or lay/non-expert)	49
Age	48
Place of residency	37
Gender (or sex)	29
Level of education	17
Marginalization	14
Race, ethnicity	13
Nationality	7
Privileged	6
Property ownership	5
Income, affluence	5
Class	1



spectrums of participation (Cardullo & Kitchin, 2019; Farias et al., 2022; International Association of Public Participation, 2018), the ways in which participants are involved heavily influence the extent to which their voice will be heard and, by extension, their capacity to impact the aims and means of the participatory process. The sharing of power in participatory processes, it follows, is subtended not only by questions of access (who participates), but also by roles and rules (Goodwill et al., 2021; Luck, 2018; Robertson & Simonsen, 2013).

While specific protocols and micro-dynamics that shaped each of the processes were not consistently reported in our corpus, papers included important clues about the formal role participants took. This allows us to explore the extent to which these participatory futuring processes empowered participants to become active protagonists of the future. While some suggestions for understanding citizen participation and empowerment in futuring are beginning to emerge from practice (e.g. Ramos et al., 2019), they are not sufficiently grounded in participatory theory and critical futures literature, and this has consequences for addressing larger power dynamics and potentials for transformational change. Therefore, while we acknowledge existing critiques and limitations of Arnstein's model (it's simple and hierarchical format, and focus on institutional forms of participation), we use it here as a starting point for thinking about participation and power (Varwell, 2022) and to derive an initial understanding of power dynamics (see Table 6). As our analysis is interpretive, this categorization should be taken only as a general indication of the roles public participants occupied in relation to decision making within these processes. Some processes were either very difficult to classify or could be placed on more than one rung. In the case of the latter, we placed the process on the highest rung possible.

### 5.1. Non-participation and tokenism

Arnstein describes "non-participation" as denoting the mobilization of the rhetoric of participation while controlling participants who are often assumed to be passive or incapable. While none of the papers describe their processes in ways that suggest non-participation, we do know that this happens, even when organizers have the best intentions. Against this background, PAPER 6 is exceptional because its author admits that despite the fact that organizers made initial promises to partner with the local community, they did not deliver on them. The process then results in something that resembles poor consultation rather than a true partnership.

The majority of processes fell into the categories of 'placation' and 'consultation'. Arnstein labels these forms of participation as 'tokenistic' because they allow participants to "have a voice" or shape ideas, but do not grant them "the power to insure [sic] that their views will be heeded by the powerful" (2019, p. 25). In other words, participant voices and actions are mediated to a greater degree by organizers, funders, and other decision makers.

Within the rungs of tokenism, many of the processes involved publics meaningfully only in the middle stages of the process, sandwiching them between organizers' goals and experts' analysis, assessment, and translation. If during the process itself public participants were able to contribute to the creation of future visions, scenarios or policy pathways, participants had little or no say in whether these outcomes would be acted on at the end of the process. PAPER 1 reflects on these limitations, stating: "It genuinely was an environment in which policy makers, technology experts, residents and business people played an equal role in discussions and the generation of ideas. However, the methodology only allowed a certain number of those ideas to be taken up [... and ...] there was no clear way for participants to take this initiative forward; it was dependent on the Council itself to take action" (p. 153–4). As many public participation scholars and practitioners show, this is sadly quite common and can lead to disappointment with (formalized) participation processes and impact peoples' willingness to be involved in future processes (Arnstein, 2019; Lee, 2015; Silvonon, 2021; Vukšanović-Macura & Mišević, 2021). Futuring processes, it seems, are not immune to this.

### 5.2. Citizen power

16 of the 85 papers operate in the top sections of Arnstein's ladder. This requires that they enable greater degrees of citizen power over the process and its outcomes. One way processes achieved this in our corpus was by virtue of being initiated by public participants themselves (PAPERS 35, 49, 84). In two instances community leaders appear to have leveraged their professional networks and position to initiate the process. Alternatively, the process reported in PAPER 35 was initiated by "A group of involved citizens ('Future Initiative Korneuburg') [who] felt the urge for a common orientation for future, and convinced the municipal government to develop a mission statement for urban planning in close collaboration with citizens and external experts" (p. 58). This process was later co-

**Table 6**  
Public participatory futuring processes ranked according to Arnstein's (2019) Ladder of Participation.

Groups	Rung of Ladder	# papers
Citizen power	Citizen control	2
	Delegated power	3
	Partnership	11
Tokenism	Placation	19
	Consultation	24
	Informing	1
Non-participation	Therapy	0
	Manipulation	0
Resists classification		25

financed by the city and involved a number of additional stakeholder groups, but the citizens were able to maintain a significant degree of ownership over the process through the creation of a steering committee “who collaborated on the project and were entitled to vote in project matters” (p. 63). This is an indicative example of the forms of citizen power that Arnstein locates at the top of the ladder.

A few other processes included steering and budgeting committees that included public participants (PAPERS 13, 24, 35, 36). Other processes more informally involved public and community leaders in decisions regarding the aims and design of the process, or simply delegated such tasks to them without creating a committee (PAPERS 3, 11, 13, 31, 68, 73). Some papers provided evidence that public participants were able to take charge of follow-up activities or implement recommendations (PAPERS 11, 29, 52, 85), and were effective in acting on ideas generated during the process. PAPER 46 offers an example of a process that started with citizen visioning, moved on to expert analysis of the vision, and ended with citizens validating final recommendations. While voices of the public were mediated by experts, the bookending of the process with public engagement means that participants had a greater capacity to shape the process and its outcomes. Additionally, PAPER 49 recruited and trained facilitators from the local community and organizations.

### 5.3. Resisting classification

One important and interesting finding of our analysis was the high number of papers and processes we were unable to classify using Arnstein’s ladder. This was generally due to the fact that the ladder proved to be not entirely adequate for evaluating processes that were framed in terms of research or education rather than action through planning or policy development (the original context for Arnstein’s work). Such papers reported on research into assumptions and images people hold about the future (e.g. PAPERS 37, 60, 64), and explored formats and methods for participatory futuring, often in educational environments (e.g. PAPERS 33, 57, 60, 80, 83). They may have been explicit about their aims to democratize through greater inclusivity or to empower participants, but it was often unclear how the procedures and outcomes of the process would have led to this. For example, PAPER 20 reports a research study of “cultural values and message sources that can influence the way in which we look at the (expected and desired) future” (p. 1). The authors claim that having this understanding of how “images of the future [move] through social networks will empower new generations to cope with the challenge of building a desired future” (p. 1), but they do not explain how the process worked to achieve this. There is a chance, then, that processes such as the one reported in PAPER 20 were actually instances of “non-participation”. But there is also a chance that participatory futuring empowers in ways that Arnstein’s framework does not capture (a known critique of the framework often attributed to its simplicity and focus on institutionalized forms of participation (Varwell, 2022)). We intend to explore this further in future research and suggest possibilities for doing so in Section 6.

## 6. Conclusions

This paper has examined a corpus of participatory futuring processes reported on in peer-reviewed academic literature in English. In order to map current practices of participation in futuring and consider how they may intersect with broader desires to democratize futuring, our analysis has focused on three main elements: (1) who participates in these processes and how participant identity is reported in these academic outputs; (2) what motivations were provided for including different public participants; and (3) what roles public participants occupied when they participated in these processes. In this section, we recap our main findings and put them in conversation with literature from fields such as public engagement, participatory design, science and technology studies and political theory. We focus on the questions of inclusion and empowerment.

### 6.1. How inclusive?

Our review began by considering who participates in participatory futuring processes and why they are selected to participate. These questions provide an initial indication of how inclusive a process may be. While establishing the scope of our study we found that much participatory futuring is only inclusive of experts and professionals, and during the study we found that a majority of participatory futuring with publics involves them alongside people participating in an expert or professional capacity. Additionally, despite an expressed desire for – and in some cases a commitment to – diversity, our analysis shows that participatory futuring processes appear quite limited in their consideration of what makes a group of participants diverse. As illustrated in Sections 3 and 4, labels and descriptions used by authors drew attention to participants’ occupation, age, and forms of expertise, while a deeper consideration of variables such as gender, race and class was lacking. While we acknowledge that some indicators may be withheld due to valid privacy concerns – consistent with careful participatory research – based on the data we have, participatory futuring processes rarely offer intersectional analyses of identity (Crenshaw, 1989).

Failing to attend to dimensions of identity like gender, race, and class – identity categories that historically served to marginalize – means that organizers run the risk of perpetuating discrimination and reinscribing unjust power relations. As our analysis shows, only a handful of papers explicitly understood participant identity in terms of marginalization or privilege, and only a small number of marginalized and vulnerable peoples were involved. However, being too reductive in understanding participant identity raises an additional concern. Writing in the context of statistics, Ian Hacking (1990) suggests that “defining new classes of people” (which can be done through labelling) “has consequences for the ways in which we conceive of others and think of our own possibilities and potentialities” (p. 6). If, as Dave Beech (2010) argues, “participation always involves a specific invitation and a specific formation of the participant’s subjectivity” (see also Keshavarz & Maze, 2013), there is a real risk that the identities that led to participant selection become fixed and essentialized, thus locking participants into predetermined ways to respond to the issues. In such cases, the epistemological benefits of engaging with a diverse set of participants may be lost (Broto, 2021).

One way of navigating these tensions could be to recognize that the very act of participating in futuring processes is generative, and view participation in futuring through an “emergence-oriented” perspective (Mahony & Stephansen, 2016). To be invited to join a participatory process may provide one with formal recognition that they are indeed a stakeholder of the issue at hand. Furthermore, as Noortje Marres (2012) illustrates, “the composition of the public – which entities and relations it is made up of – must be understood as partly the outcome of, and as something that is at stake in, the process of issue articulation” (p. 55; see also Dewey, 1946; DiSalvo, 2009). In other words, there is a possibility that in and through participatory futuring processes new identities, new communities, and new publics may emerge. Mitlin (2021) argues that being open to emergent identities as well as being inclusive of marginalized groups also “holds the promise of improving the process by broadening the assumptions on which it is based” and enabling a more reflexive stance (p. 301; see also Broto, 2021; Mangnus et al., 2021). The identity position of ‘subject of the future’ may help foster this generative approach as it draws attention to how people occupy different positions and roles in society and generally change over time. While no papers in our corpus seemed to recognize their processes as opportunities for new identities to be configured, many included creating new relationships, networks, or communities among their goals. This could hold potential for building both participants’ and organizers’ “relational capital” (Mitlin, 2021), a key ingredient in processes of democratization.

## 6.2. How empowering?

The second focus of this paper has been on the ways in which public participants may have been empowered through their involvement in the process. As we illustrated in Section 5, most of the “agenda-setting and gatekeeping powers” (Goode & Godhe, 2017, p. 16) are not in the hands of public participants but rather remain in the hands of organizers, who were often researchers or civil servants. Public engagement scholars have documented the gap between the discourse and practice of citizen engagement, observing authorities who promote democratization and empowerment through participation in theory but are reluctant to “give up power” in practice (Mitlin, 2021, p. 303; see also Pimentel Walker & Friendly, 2021; Cooke & Kothari, 2001). However, a number of processes in our corpus did share decision making with public participants by involving them in the early stages of process design and assigning them with impactful organizational roles. By sharing rather than concentrating the power to define and design the process, organizers reduce the chance of participatory processes becoming instrumental (Ahlqvist & Rhisiart, 2015; Stirling, 2008), performative, or mere “window-dressing” (Arnstein, 2019, p. 28), and increase the process’s potential to empower marginalized participants (Turnhout et al., 2020).

That said, occupying a particular organizational role does not immediately equate to having more power over the process, and often requires an additional investment of time and resources. Unlike their professional counterparts, publics often participate on a voluntary basis (Frantzeskaki & Rok, 2018), and having to perform this additional, unpaid labor may make people uncomfortable, render participating a burden, or exacerbate ‘participation fatigue’ (Tshishonga, 2020). This may reduce the number of participants and their commitment, and have ramifications for the inclusive and democratic potential of the process (Turnhout et al., 2020). Mitlin (2013) reflects that while the formalization of participation can widen the resources available to communities, it also has the potential to limit their autonomy as they are required to work within systems set out by funding and organizational bodies. We observed instances of this in the processes coded in the ‘tokenistic’ rungs of the ladder, but are unable to assess to what extent this may have also been the case with processes that enabled higher degrees of citizen power.

Furthermore, as we remark in Section 5.3, the fact that a considerable number of processes took place under research or education agendas meant that roles were less clearly defined and intentions to empower were muddled. Arnstein (2019) generally acknowledges that things are more complex in practice, but does not consider how the overall framing and orientation of the citizen participation process may result in different roles or different potentials to act. To fully assess the degree to which participatory futuring processes empower their participants would therefore require a much deeper analysis of the micro-dynamics of processes, in-depth and longitudinal studies of the impact that participating may have on the public and related policy, and clear categories for evaluation informed by critical futures theory and public participation scholarship, and insights from participatory futuring practice. Additionally, any attempt to adapt Arnstein’s framework would need to consider these potentials and limitations for empowerment within a participatory process framed explicitly in terms of futuring. These remain beyond the scope of this but represent pressing needs for the community if it is to pour real meaning into statements about democratizing futures.

## 6.3. Towards critical participatory futuring

In this paper, we presented the results of a systematic literature review that aimed to map the current landscape of participatory futuring processes, from an understanding that such processes play an important part in the field’s broader desire to democratize. There are, however, other elements that may expand or constrain a futuring process’s inclusive, empowering, and therefore democratic potential.

While we have examined practices of participation in futuring it was beyond the scope of this paper to also directly address the question and place of futures in these processes. In other words, the issues raised here regarding inclusion and empowerment are not exclusive to futuring, but common to participatory processes in general. While we have identified the category of ‘subject of the future’ as being specific to participatory futuring processes, many more questions remain: How do participants’ and organizers’ sense of futurity and time (Maze, 2019) and their anticipatory assumptions (Miller, 2018) shape what they think is possible or preferable within a given context, thus moving them to pursue specific future possibilities? How are futures literacies or repertoires conditioned by existing structures of power (such as colonialism, neoliberalism, and ideas about expertise)? And how can they be opened up to create space for transformative change and democratization?

Not all participatory futuring processes aim for change in the same way, nor do they mobilize the same theory of change. Some processes explicitly aim to be transformative while others may be more ameliorative. Problems emerge particularly when the process is not clear about its intention, potentially bogging down because of “tensions between those who hold to the radical goals of institutional reinvention and those who believe piecemeal reform is their best hope” (Goode & Godhe, 2017, p. 10). The capacity to democratize futuring processes, accordingly, is inseparable from the capacity of futures work in general to address injustice and catalyze transformative change. We contend that you cannot have one without the other, and that a deeper consideration of the different theories and narratives of change that inform futuring processes is needed to understand how they enhance or restrict a process’s inclusive, empowering, and democratic potential.

Further questions arise in the context of the futuring tools and methods used within participatory futuring processes. Some tools are more intuitive while others require a heavier involvement of facilitators. What matters here is not only the choice of ‘the right tool for the right job’, but the capacity of facilitators to reflect honestly on their choices (Mangnus et al., 2021). Democratizing futures, it follows, requires a degree of critical reflexivity about the aims, protocols and tools used in participatory futuring processes – about the fit between process and context, and between process and aims (Andersen et al., 2021; Goode & Godhe, 2017; Muiderman et al., 2020). Furthermore, we may not be able to promote the democratization of futures without taking a close look at the forms of temporality, spatiality and agency that are embedded (and thus reflected) in the tools used in futuring (Bisht, 2017; Goode & Godhe, 2017; Howell et al., 2021; Mangnus et al., 2021). What types of information, issues, outcomes, and modes of interaction do they privilege? What level of society do they focus on and attempt to intervene in? These questions are important not just because they have the potential to expand or constrain participation in futuring, but they also condition the range of futures that are imagined and could be pursued. There is clearly more work to be done if futures research and practice is to truly democratize.

### CRediT authorship contribution statement

**Laura Barendregt:** Conceptualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Roy Bendor:** Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing. **Bregje F. van Eekelen:** Writing – review & editing.

### Declaration of Competing Interest

None.

### Appendix A. - List of papers in corpus

Paper #	Citation in APA 7th format
1	Street, P. (1997). Scenario workshops: A participatory approach to sustainable urban living? <i>Futures</i> , 29(2), 139-158.
2	Mettler, P. H., & Baumgartner, T. (1998). Large-scale participatory co-shaping of technological developments. <i>Futures</i> , 30(6), 535-554.
3	Robinson, J. (2003). Future subjunctive: Backcasting as social learning. <i>Futures</i> , 35(8), 839-856.
4	Niewöhner, J., Wiedemann, P., Karger, C., Schicktanz, S., & Tannert, C. (2005). Participatory prognostics in Germany—Developing citizen scenarios for the relationship between biomedicine and the economy in 2014. <i>Technological Forecasting &amp; Social Change</i> , 72(2), 195-211. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2004.01.006">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2004.01.006</a>
5	Nováky, E. (2006). Action oriented futures studies in Hungary. <i>Futures</i> , 38(6), 685-695. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2005.10.007">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2005.10.007</a>
6	Gould, S. (2009). Learning from the politics of futures. <i>Journal of Futures Studies</i> , 13(4), 105-122. <a href="https://research.usc.edu.au/discovery/fulldisplay/alma99449757202621/61USC_INST:ResearchRepository">https://research.usc.edu.au/discovery/fulldisplay/alma99449757202621/61USC_INST:ResearchRepository</a>
7	Raven, R. P. J. M., Jolivet, E., Mourik, R. M., & Feenstra, Y. C. F. J. (2009). ESTEEM: Managing societal acceptance in new energy projects: A toolbox method for project managers. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i> , 76(7), 963-977. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2009.02.005">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2009.02.005</a>
8	Lange, E., & Hehl-Lange, S. (2010). Making visions visible for long-term landscape management. <i>Futures</i> , 42(7), 693-699. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2010.04.006">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2010.04.006</a>
9	Ramos, I. L. (2010). ‘Exploratory landscape scenarios’ in the formulation of ‘landscape quality objectives’. <i>Futures</i> , 42(7), 682-692. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2010.04.005">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2010.04.005</a>
10	Celino, A., & Concilio, G. (2010). Participation in environmental spatial planning: Structuring-scenario to manage knowledge in action. <i>Futures</i> , 42(7), 733-742. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2010.04.020">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2010.04.020</a>
11	Mallan, K., & Greenaway, R. (2011). ‘Radiant with possibility’: Involving young people in creating a vision for the future of their community. <i>Futures</i> , 43(4), 374-386. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.01.008">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.01.008</a>
12	Chakraborty, A. (2011). Enhancing the role of participatory scenario planning processes: Lessons from Reality Check exercises. <i>Futures</i> , 43(4), 387-399. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.01.004">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.01.004</a>
13	Quist, J., Thissen, W., & Vergragt, P. J. (2011). The impact and spin-off of participatory backcasting: From vision to niche. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i> , 78(5), 883-897. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2011.01.011">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2011.01.011</a>
14	Robinson, J., Burch, S., Talwar, S., O’Shea, M., & Walsh, M. (2011). Envisioning sustainability: Recent progress in the use of participatory backcasting approaches for sustainability research. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i> , 78(5), 756-768. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2010.12.006">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2010.12.006</a>
15	Smith, T. F., Daffara, P., O’Toole, K., Matthews, J., Thomsen, D. C., Inayatullah, S., Fien, J., & Graymore, M. (2011). A method for building community resilience to climate change in emerging coastal cities. <i>Futures</i> , 43(7), 673-679. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.05.008">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.05.008</a>
16	Kaltenborn, B. P., Thomassen, J., & Linnell, J. D. C. (2012). Island futures—Does a participatory scenario process capture the common view of local residents? <i>Futures</i> , 44(4), 328-337. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.11.001">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.11.001</a>
17	van der Voorn, T., Pahl-Wostl, C., & Quist, J. (2012). Combining backcasting and adaptive management for climate adaptation in coastal regions: A methodology and a South African case study. <i>Futures</i> , 44(4), 346-364. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.11.003">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.11.003</a>

(continued on next page)

(continued)

Paper #	Citation in APA 7th format
18	Albert, C., Zimmermann, T., Knieling, J., & von Haaren, C. (2012). Social learning can benefit decision-making in landscape planning: Gartow case study on climate change adaptation, Elbe valley biosphere reserve. <i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i> , 105(4), 347-360. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2011.12.024">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2011.12.024</a>
19	Karuri-Sebina, G., & Rosenzweig, L. (2012). A case study on localising foresight in South Africa: Using foresight in the context of local government participatory planning. <i>Foresight</i> , 14(1), 26-40. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1108/14636681211210341">https://doi.org/10.1108/14636681211210341</a>
20	Guillo, M. (2013). Futures, communication and social innovation: Using participatory foresight and social media platforms as tools for evaluating images of the future among young people. <i>European Journal of Futures Research</i> , 1(1), 1-7. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-013-0017-2">https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-013-0017-2</a>
21	Heinonen, S., & Ruotsalainen, J. (2013). Futures Clinique—Method for promoting futures learning and provoking radical futures. <i>European Journal of Futures Research</i> , 1(1), 1-11. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-013-0007-4">https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-013-0007-4</a>
22	Serrao-Neumann, S., Di Giulio, G. M., Ferreira, L. C., & Low Choy, D. (2013). Climate change adaptation: Is there a role for intervention research? <i>Futures</i> , 53, 86-97. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2013.08.002">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2013.08.002</a>
23	Šantrůčková, M., Weber, M., Lipský, Z., & Stroblová, L. (2013). Participative landscape planning in rural areas: A case study from Novodvorsk, Žehušicko, Czech Republic. <i>Futures</i> , 51, 3-18. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2013.04.005">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2013.04.005</a>
24	Hyysalo, S., Kohtala, C., Helminen, P., Mäkinen, S., Miettinen, V., & Muurinen, L. (2014). Collaborative futuring with and by makers. <i>CoDesign</i> , 10(3-4), 209-228. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/15710882.2014.983937">https://doi.org/10.1080/15710882.2014.983937</a>
25	Haas Lyons, S., Walsh, M., Aleman, E., & Robinson, J. (2014). Exploring regional futures: Lessons from Metropolitan Chicago's online MetroQuest. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i> , 82, 23-33. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.05.009">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.05.009</a>
26	Spickermann, A., Grienitz, V., & von der Gracht, H. A. (2014). Heading towards a multimodal city of the future?: Multi-stakeholder scenarios for urban mobility. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i> , 89, 201-221. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.08.036">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.08.036</a>
27	Tuominen, A., Tapio, P., Varho, V., Järvi, T., & Banister, D. (2014). Pluralistic backcasting: Integrating multiple visions with policy packages for transport climate policy. <i>Futures</i> , 60, 41-58. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2014.04.014">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2014.04.014</a>
28	Upham, P., Carney, S., & Klapper, R. (2014). Scaffolding, software and scenarios: Applying Bruner's learning theory to energy scenario development with the public. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i> , 81, 131-142. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.05.001">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.05.001</a>
29	Bhagat, A. (2014). The Myanmar Futures Exchange: Development at the cross-roads. <i>Journal of Futures Studies</i> , 19(1), 97-106.
30	Davies, A. R. (2014). Co-creating sustainable eating futures: Technology, ICT and citizen-consumer ambivalence. <i>Futures</i> , 62, 181-193.
31	Folhes, R. T., Aguiar, A. P. D. d., Stoll, E., Dalla-Nora, E. L., Araújo, R., Coelho, A., & Canto, O. d. (2015). Multi-scale participatory scenario methods and territorial planning in the Brazilian Amazon. <i>Futures</i> , 73, 86-99. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2015.08.005">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2015.08.005</a>
32	Bas, E., & Guillo, M. (2015). Participatory foresight for social innovation. FLUX-3D method (Forward Looking User Experience), a tool for evaluating innovations. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i> , 101, 275-290. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.06.016">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.06.016</a>
33	Kelliher, A., & Byrne, D. (2015). Design futures in action: Documenting experiential futures for participatory audiences. <i>Futures</i> , 70, 36-47. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2014.12.004">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2014.12.004</a>
34	Heidingsfelder, M., Kimpel, K., Best, K., & Schraudner, M. (2015). Shaping Future — Adapting design know-how to reorient innovation towards public preferences. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i> , 101, 291-298. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.03.009">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.03.009</a>
35	Schauppenlehner-Kloyber, E., & Penker, M. (2015). Managing group processes in transdisciplinary future studies: How to facilitate social learning and capacity building for self-organised action towards sustainable urban development? <i>Futures</i> , 65, 57-71. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2014.08.012">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2014.08.012</a>
36	Soste, L., Wang, Q. J., Robertson, D., Chaffe, R., Handley, S., & Wei, Y. (2015). Engendering stakeholder ownership in scenario planning. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i> , 91, 250-263. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2014.03.002">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2014.03.002</a>
37	Spieß, H., Lobsiger-Kägi, E., Carabias-Hütter, V., & Marcolla, A. (2015). Future acceptance of wind energy production: Exploring future local acceptance of wind energy production in a Swiss alpine region. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i> , 101, 263-274. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.06.042">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.06.042</a>
38	Stratigea, A., & Katsoni, V. (2015). A strategic policy scenario analysis framework for the sustainable tourist development of peripheral small island areas - The case of Lefkada-Greece Island. <i>European Journal of Futures Research</i> , 3(1), 1-17. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-015-0063-z">https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-015-0063-z</a>
39	Carlsson, J., Eriksson, L. O., Öhman, K., & Nordström, E.-M. (2015). Combining scientific and stakeholder knowledge in future scenario development — A forest landscape case study in northern Sweden. <i>Forest Policy and Economics</i> , 61, 122-134. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2015.08.008">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2015.08.008</a>
40	Gudowsky, N., & Peissl, W. (2016). Human centred science and technology— Transdisciplinary foresight and co-creation as tools for active needs-based innovation governance. <i>European Journal of Futures Research</i> , 4(1), 1-10. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-016-0090-4">https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-016-0090-4</a>
41	Kabst, R., Walther, F., & Vogt, S. (2016). A strategic foresight about future public service developments from the citizens' perspective. <i>International Journal of Public Administration in the Digital Age</i> , 3(1), 19-42. <a href="https://doi.org/10.4018/IJPADA.2016010102">https://doi.org/10.4018/IJPADA.2016010102</a>
42	Le Heron, R., Lewis, N., Fisher, K., Thrush, S., Lundquist, C., Hewitt, J., & Ellis, J. (2016). Non-sectarian scenario experiments in socio-ecological knowledge building for multi-use marine environments: Insights from New Zealand's Marine Futures project. <i>Marine Policy</i> , 67, 10-21. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.01.022">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.01.022</a>
43	Sisto, R., van Vliet, M., & Prosperi, M. (2016). Puzzling stakeholder views for long-term planning in the bio-economy: A back-casting application. <i>Futures</i> , 76, 42-54. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2015.04.002">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2015.04.002</a>
44	Ligtvoet, A., Cuppen, E., Di Ruggero, O., Hemmes, K., Pesch, U., Quiet, J., & Mehos, D. (2016). New future perspectives through constructive conflict: Exploring the future of gas in the Netherlands. <i>Futures</i> , 78-79, 19-33. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.03.008">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.03.008</a>
45	Duggan, J. R., Lindley, J., & McNicol, S. (2017). Near Future School: World building beyond a neoliberal present with participatory design fictions. <i>Futures</i> , 94, 15-23. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2017.04.001">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2017.04.001</a>
46	Gudowsky, N., & Sotoudeh, M. (2017). Into blue skies—A transdisciplinary foresight and co-creation method for adding robustness to visioning. <i>Nanoethics: Studies of New and Emerging Technologies</i> , 11(1), 93-106. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s11569-017-0284-7">https://doi.org/10.1007/s11569-017-0284-7</a>
47	Gudowsky, N., Sotoudeh, M., Capari, L., & Wilfing, H. (2017). Transdisciplinary forward-looking agenda setting for age-friendly, human centered cities. <i>Futures</i> , 90, 16-30. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2017.05.005">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2017.05.005</a>
48	Bonsu, N. O., Dhubháin, Á. N., & O'Connor, D. (2017). Evaluating the use of an integrated forest land-use planning approach in addressing forest ecosystem services conflicting demands: Experience within an Irish forest landscape. <i>Futures</i> , 86, 1-17. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.08.004">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.08.004</a>
49	Bourgeois, R., Penunia, E., Bisht, S., & Boruk, D. (2017). Foresight for all: Co-elaborative scenario building and empowerment. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i> , 124, 178-188. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.04.018">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.04.018</a>
50	Ojoyi, M., Mutanga, O., Mwenge Kahinda, J., Odindi, J., & Abdel-Rahman, E. M. (2017). Scenario-based approach in dealing with climate change impacts in Central Tanzania. <i>Futures</i> , 85, 30-41. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.11.007">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.11.007</a>
51	Zulean, M., Andreescu, L., Gheorghiu, R., Roescu, A. M., & Curaj, A. (2017). Romanian public administration reform 2.0: Using innovative foresight methodologies to engage stakeholders and the public. <i>Foresight</i> , 19(3), 261-279. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1108/FS-09-2016-0047">https://doi.org/10.1108/FS-09-2016-0047</a>
52	Kuzmanovic, M., & Gaffney, N. (2017). Enacting futures in postnormal times. <i>Futures</i> , 86, 107-117. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.05.007">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.05.007</a>

(continued on next page)

(continued)

Paper #	Citation in APA 7th format
53	Amanatidou, E. (2017). Foresight process impacts: Beyond any official targets, foresight is bound to serve democracy. <i>Futures</i> , 85, 1-13. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.11.003">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.11.003</a>
54	Wright, D. L., Buys, L., Baker, D., Mayere, S., Susilawati, C., & Cuthill, M. (2017). Co-futuring narratives for Toowoomba - A regional Australian community. <i>Journal of Futures Studies</i> , 22(1), 19-38. <a href="https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.2017.22(1).A19">https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.2017.22(1).A19</a>
55	Bonatti, M., Schlindwein, I., Lana, M., Bundala, N., Sieber, S., & Rybak, C. (2018). Innovative educational tools development for food security: Engaging community voices in Tanzania. <i>Futures</i> , 96, 79-89. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2017.11.008">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2017.11.008</a>
56	Park, S. (2018). A possible metric for assessing self-efficacy toward postulated futures. <i>Foresight</i> , 20(1), 50-67. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1108/FS-08-2017-0044">https://doi.org/10.1108/FS-08-2017-0044</a>
57	Rosa, A., Gudowsky, N., & Warnke, P. (2018). But do they deliver? Participatory agenda setting on the test bed. <i>European Journal of Futures Research</i> , 6(1), 1-12. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-018-0143-y">https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-018-0143-y</a>
58	Soria-Lara, J. A., & Banister, D. (2018). Collaborative backcasting for transport policy scenario building. <i>Futures</i> , 95, 11-21. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2017.09.003">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2017.09.003</a>
59	Bodinet, J. C. (2018). The image today: Field-notes on the interdisciplinary use of the visioning workshop. <i>World Futures Review</i> , 10(3), 213-218. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1177/1946756718781322">https://doi.org/10.1177/1946756718781322</a>
60	Chen, K. H. (2019). Transforming environmental values for a younger generation in Taiwan: A participatory action approach to curriculum design. <i>Journal of Futures Studies</i> , 23(4), 79-96. <a href="https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.201906.23(4).0008">https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.201906.23(4).0008</a>
61	Matschoss, K., Repo, P., & Timonen, P. (2019). Embedding European citizen visions in sustainability transition: Comparative analysis across 30 European countries. <i>Futures</i> , 112, 102437. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2019.102437">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2019.102437</a>
62	Kuzmanovic, M., Gaffney, N., Auer, T., & Boykett, T. (2019). Making things physical. <i>Journal of Futures Studies</i> , 23(4), 105-116. <a href="https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.201906.23(4).0011">https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.201906.23(4).0011</a>
63	Nygrén, N. A. (2019). Scenario workshops as a tool for participatory planning in a case of lake management. <i>Futures</i> , 107, 29-44. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2018.10.004">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2018.10.004</a>
64	Demneh, M. T., & Darani, Z. H. (2020). From remembering to futuring: Preparing children for Anthropocene. <i>Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences</i> , 10(4), 369-379. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s13412-020-00634-5">https://doi.org/10.1007/s13412-020-00634-5</a>
65	Lehoux, P., Miller, F. A., & Williams-Jones, B. (2020). Anticipatory governance and moral imagination: Methodological insights from a scenario-based public deliberation study. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i> , 151, Article 119800. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119800">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119800</a>
66	Angheloiu, C., Sheldrick, L., Tennant, M., & Chaudhuri, G. (2020). Future Tense: Harnessing design futures methods to facilitate young people's exploration of transformative change for sustainability. <i>World Futures Review</i> , 12(1), 104-122. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1177/1946756719844050">https://doi.org/10.1177/1946756719844050</a>
67	Fletcher, A. L. (2020). Smart city visions: Pathways to participatory planning in two American cities. <i>Foresight</i> , 22(5/6), 689-702. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1108/FS-04-2020-0036">https://doi.org/10.1108/FS-04-2020-0036</a>
68	Nikolakis, W. (2020). Participatory backcasting: Building pathways towards reconciliation? <i>Futures</i> , 122, Article 102603. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102603">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102603</a>
69	Simpson, A. (2020). Futures for dialogue in the context of Hong Kong's protests. <i>Journal of Futures Studies</i> , 25(1), 35-44.
70	Schroth, F., Glatte, H., Kaiser, S., & Heidingsfelder, M. (2020). Participatory agenda setting as a process — of people, ambassadors and translation: A case study of participatory agenda setting in rural areas. <i>European Journal of Futures Research</i> , 8, Article 6. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-020-00165-w">https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-020-00165-w</a>
71	Wright, D., Stahl, B., & Hatzakis, T. (2020). Policy scenarios as an instrument for policymakers. <i>Technological Forecasting and Social Change</i> , 154, Article 119972. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.119972">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.119972</a>
72	Belton, O., & Dillon, S. (2021). Futures of autonomous flight: Using a collaborative storytelling game to assess anticipatory assumptions. <i>Futures</i> , 128, Article 102688. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102688">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102688</a>
73	Gordon, H. S. J. (2021). Ethnographic futures research as a method for working with Indigenous communities to develop sustainability indicators. <i>Polar Geography</i> , 44(4), 233-254. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/1088937X.2021.1881647">https://doi.org/10.1080/1088937X.2021.1881647</a>
74	Gudowsky, N., Bechtold, U., Peissl, W., & Sotoudeh, M. (2021). Democratizing utopian thought in participatory agenda setting. <i>European Journal of Futures Research</i> , 9(1), Article 5. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-021-00174-3">https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-021-00174-3</a>
75	Pau, S. S. T., & Hall, A. (2021). New spaces for healthcare futures studies: Connecting existing theory to deeper participatory practice. <i>Futures</i> , 126, Article 102689. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102689">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102689</a>
76	Pollio, A., Magee, L., & Salazar, J. F. (2021). The making of Antarctic futures: Participatory game design at the interface between science and policy. <i>Futures</i> , 125, Article 102662. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102662">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102662</a>
77	Shantiko, B., Liswanti, N., Bourgeois, R., & Laumonier, Y. (2021). Land-use decisions in complex commons: Engaging multiple stakeholders through foresight and scenario building in Indonesia. <i>Environmental Management</i> , 68(5), 642-664. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-021-01470-1">https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-021-01470-1</a>
78	Keseru, I., Coosemans, T., & Macharis, C. (2021). Stakeholders' preferences for the future of transport in Europe: Participatory evaluation of scenarios combining scenario planning and the multi-actor multi-criteria analysis. <i>Futures</i> , 127, Article 102690. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102690">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102690</a>
79	Kuroda, M., Uwasu, M., Bui, X.-T., Nguyen, P.-D., & Hara, K. (2021). Shifting the perception of water environment problems by introducing "imaginary future generations"—Evidence from participatory workshop in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. <i>Futures</i> , 126, Article 102671. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102671">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102671</a>
80	Osborne, C., Mayo, L., & Bussey, M. (2021). New frontiers in local government community engagement: Towards transformative place-based futures. <i>Futures</i> , 131, Article 102768. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102768">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102768</a>
81	Reimann, L., Vollstedt, B., Koerth, J., Tsakiris, M., Beer, M., & Vafeidis, A. T. (2021). Extending the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs) to support local adaptation planning—A climate service for Flensburg, Germany. <i>Futures</i> , 127, Article 102691. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102691">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2020.102691</a>
82	Toivonen, S., Rashidfarokhi, A., & Kyrö, R. (2021). Empowering upcoming city developers with futures literacy. <i>Futures</i> , 129, Article 102734. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102734">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102734</a>
83	Tysczuk, R. (2021). Collective scenarios: Speculative improvisations for the Anthropocene. <i>Futures</i> , 134, Article 102854. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102854">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102854</a>
84	Lázaro, M., Iribarne, P., Adalyza, P., Rumeau, D., & López-Echagüe, C. (2021). Using CLA to participatively explore the urban solid waste problem in Uruguay. <i>Journal of Futures Studies</i> , 25(3), 15-24.
85	Laouris, Y., & Romm, N. R. A. (2022). African youth's visioning for re-inventing democracy in the digital era: A case of use of structured dialogical design. <i>World Futures</i> , 78(1), 18-61. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/02604027.2021.2014112">https://doi.org/10.1080/02604027.2021.2014112</a>

## References

- Ahlqvist, T., & Rhisiart, M. (2015). Emerging pathways for critical futures research: Changing contexts and impacts of social theory. *Futures*, 71, 91–104.
- Andersen, P. D., Hansen, M., & Selin, C. (2021). Stakeholder inclusion in scenario planning: A review of European projects (Article) *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 169, Article 120802. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120802>.
- Andersson, J. (2018). *The Future of the World: futurology, futurists, and the struggle for the post-Cold War imagination*. Oxford University Press.
- Arnstein, S. R. (2019). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 85(1), 24–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2018.1559388> (Original work published 1969).
- Beech, D. (2010). Don't look now! Art after the viewer and beyond participation. In J. Walwin (Ed.), *Searching for Art's new publics* (pp. 15–29). Intellect.
- Bisht, P. (2017). Decolonizing futures: Exploring storytelling as a tool for inclusion in foresight [OCAD University]. (<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/154171898.pdf>).
- Bisht, P. (2020). Decolonizing futures: Finding voice, and making room for non-western ways of knowing, Being and Doing. In R. Slaughter, & A. Hines (Eds.), *The knowledge base of Futures Studies*, 2020 pp. 216–230). Association of Professional Futurists.
- Björgevinnson, E., Ehn, P., & Hillgren, P.-A. (2012). Agonistic participatory design: working with marginalized social movements. In *CoDesign: International Journal of CoCreation in Design and the Arts*, 8 pp. 127–144).
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. In *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 pp. 77–101). <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Broto, V. C. (2021). Queering participatory planning. *Environment and Urbanization*, 33(2), 310–329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09562478211019377>
- Bull, M., & Galimberti, J. (2022). Contemporary art and class: reassessing an analytical category. *Oxford Artel Journal*, 45(2), 167–177. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxartj/kcac013>
- Candy, S. (2017). Dreaming together: experiential futures as a platform for public imagination. In T. Durfee, & M. Zeiger (Eds.), *Made up: Design's fictions* (pp. 44–48). Actar Publishers.
- Cardullo, P., & Kitchin, R. (2019). Being a 'citizen' in the smart city: up and down the scaffold of smart citizen participation in Dublin, Ireland. *GeoJournal*, 84, 1–13.
- Chilvers, J., & Kearnes, M. (2016). Science, democracy and emergent publics. In J. Chilvers, & M. Kearnes (Eds.), *Remaking participation: Science, environment and emergent publics* (pp. 1–27). Taylor & Francis.
- Clark, T. (2008). We're Over-Researched Here!: Exploring Accounts of Research Fatigue within Qualitative Research Engagements. *Sociology*, 42(5), 953–970. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038508094573>
- Cooke, B., & Kothari, U. (2001). *Participation: the new tyranny?* London: Zed Books.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 139–167.
- Dewey, J. (1946). *The public and its problems: an essay in political inquiry*. Gateway Books. (Original work published 1927).
- DiSalvo, C. (2009). Design and the construction of publics. *Design Issues*, 25(1), 48–63.
- Eidlin, B., & McCarthy, M. A. (2020). Introducing rethinking class and social difference: a dynamic asymmetry approach. In B. Eidlin, & M. A. McCarthy (Eds.), *Rethinking class and social difference* (pp. 1–23). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0198-871920200000037002>.
- Ende, M. A. V. D., Wardekker, J. A., Mees, H. L. P., Hegger, D. L. T., & Vervoort, J. M. (2021). *Towards a climate-resilient future together. A toolbox with participatory foresight methods, tools and examples from climate and food governance*. Utrecht University. (<https://www.uu.nl/sites/default/files/Foresight%20methods%20toolbox.pdf>).
- Escobar, A. (2018). *Designs for the pluriverse: radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds*. Duke University Press.
- Farias, P. G., Bendor, R., & Eekelen, B. F. v (2022). Social dreaming together: A critical exploration of participatory speculative design. In *Proceedings of Participatory Design Conference 2022 (PDC'22)* (vol. 2., 147–154. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3537797.3537826>
- Fleener, M. J., & Coble, C. (2022). Queer futuring: an approach to critical futuring strategies for adult learners. *On the Horizon*, 30(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OTH-03-2021-0049>
- Flyvbjerg, B. (1998). *Rationality and power: democracy in practice*. University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977 (C. Gordon, Trans.)*. Pantheon Books.
- Frantzeskaki, N., & Rok, A. (2018). Co-producing urban sustainability transitions knowledge with community, policy and science. *Environmental Innovation Society Transitions*, 29, 47–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2018.08.001>
- Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. Bergman Ramos, Trans.; 30th anniversary ed.). Continuum International. (Original work published 1970).
- Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 66–75.
- Gesturing Towards Decolonial Futures. (n.d.). Gesturing Towards Decolonial Futures (GTDF). (<https://decolonialfutures.net/>).
- Goode, L., & Godhe, M. (2017). Beyond capitalist realism – Why we need Critical Future Studies. *Culture Unbound: Journal of Current Cultural Research*, 9, 1–22.
- Goodwill, M., Bendor, R., & van der Bijl-Brouwer, M. (2021). Beyond good intentions: Towards a power literacy framework for service designers. *International Journal of Design*, 15(3), 45–59.
- Gudowsky, N., & Rosa, A. (2019). Bridging epistemologies-Identifying uniqueness of lay and expert knowledge for agenda setting. *Futures*, 109, 24–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2019.04.003>
- Gunnarsson-Östling, U. (2011). Gender in futures: A study of gender and feminist papers published in Futures, 1969–2009. *Futures*, 43(9), 1029–1039. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2011.07.002>).
- Hacking, I. (1990). *The taming of chance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066>
- Hickey, S., & Mohan, G. (2004). *Participation: From tyranny to transformation?: exploring new approaches to participation in Development*. Zed Books.
- Howell, N., Schulte, B. F., Holroyd, A. T., Arana, R. F., Sharma, S., & Eden, G. (2021). Calling for a plurality of perspectives on design futuring: An un-manifesto. *Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, Yokohama, Japan*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411763.3450364>
- Inayatullah, S. (1990). Deconstructing and reconstructing the future: Predictive, cultural and critical epistemologies. *Futures*, 22(2), 115–141.
- International Association of Public Participation. (2018). IAP2 spectrum of public participation. Retrieved October 12, 2020, from ([https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/pillars/Spectrum\\_8.5x11\\_Print.pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/pillars/Spectrum_8.5x11_Print.pdf)).
- Jackson, S., Porter, L., & Johnson, L. C. (2017). *Planning in indigenous Australia: from imperial foundations to postcolonial futures*. Routledge.
- Jesson, J., Matheson, L., & Lacey, F.M. (2012). *Doing your literature review: Traditional and systematic techniques* (Reprint 2012 ed.). SAGE.
- Jungk, R., & Müllert, N. R. (1987). *Future workshops: how to create desirable futures*. Institute for Social Inventions.
- Keshavarz, M., & Maze, R. (2013). Design and dissensus: Framing and staging participation in design research. *Design Philosophy Papers*, 11(1), 7–29. <https://doi.org/10.2752/089279313x13968799815994>
- Lee, C. (2015). *Do-it-yourself democracy: the rise of the public engagement industry*. Oxford University Press.
- Light, A. (2021). Collaborative speculation: Anticipation, inclusion and designing counterfactual futures for appropriation. *Futures*, 134, Article 102855. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102855> (Article).
- Loveridge, D., & Street, P. (2005). Inclusive foresight. *Foresight*, 7(3), 31–47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14636680510601968>
- Luck, R. (2018). What is it that makes participation in design participatory design? *Design Studies*, 59, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2018.10.00>
- Mahony, N., & Stephansen, H. C. (2016). The frontiers of participatory public engagement. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 19(6), 583–597. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549416632007>
- Mangnus, A. C., Oomen, J., Vervoort, J. M., & Hajer, M. A. (2021). Futures literacy and the diversity of the future. *Futures*, 132, Article 102793. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102793>

- Marres, N. (2012). *Material participation: technology, the environment and everyday publics*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Maze, R. (2019). Politics of designing visions of the future. *Journal of Futures Studies*, 23(3), 23–38.
- Miles, I. (1975). *The poverty of prediction*. Saxon House Lexington Books.
- Miller, R. (2018). *Transforming the future: anticipation in the 21st century*. UNESCO & Routledge. (<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000264644>).
- Mitlin, D. (2013). A class act: Professional support to people's organizations in towns and cities of the global South. *Environment and Urbanization*, 25(2), 483–499. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247813488862>
- Mitlin, D. (2021). Editorial: Citizen participation in planning: From the neighbourhood to the city. *Environment and Urbanization*, 33(2), 295–309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09562478211035608>
- Muiderman, K., Gupta, A., Vervoort, J., & Biermann, F. (2020). Four approaches to anticipatory climate governance: Different conceptions of the future and implications for the present. *WIREs Climate Change*, 11(6). <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.673>
- National Readership Survey. (n.d.). Social Grade - Lifestyle and classification data. National Readership Survey. Retrieved August 15, 2023 from (<https://nrs.co.uk/nrs-print/lifestyle-and-classification-data/social-grade/>).
- Nikolova, B. (2014). The rise and promise of participatory foresight. *European Journal of Futures Research*, 2(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-013-0033-2>
- Perna, H. K. (2017). Deliberative future visioning: Utilizing the deliberative democracy theory and practice in futures research. *European Journal of Futures Research*, 5(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-017-0129-1>
- Pimentel Walker, A. P., & Friendly, A. (2021). The value of participatory urban policy councils: Engaging actors through policy communities. *Environment and Urbanization*, 33(2), 436–455. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09562478211031705>
- Pittway, L. (2008). Systematic literature reviews. In R. Thorpe, & R. Holt (Eds.), *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative management research* (pp. 216–218). SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857020109>.
- Ramos, J., Sweeney, J.A., Peach, K., & Smith, L. (2019). Our futures: By the people, for the people. Nesta.
- Robertson, T., & Simonsen, J. (2013). Participatory design: an introduction. In J. Simonsen, & T. Robertson (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of participatory design* (pp. 1–17). Routledge.
- Rosa, A. B., Gudowsky, N., & Repo, P. (2021). Sensemaking and lens-shaping: Identifying citizen contributions to foresight through comparative topic modelling. *Futures*, 129, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102733>
- Saldana, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.,). SAGE.
- Sardar, Z. (1993). Colonizing the future: The 'other' dimension of futures studies. *Futures*, 25(2), 179–187.
- Silvonen, T. (2021). One step forward, two steps back? Shifting patterns of participation in a former informal settlement in Mexico City. *Environment and Urbanization*, 33(2), 478–495. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09562478211027122>
- Stirling, A. (2006). Analysis, participation and power: Justification and closure in participatory multi-criteria analysis. *Land Use Policy*, 23, 95–107.
- Stirling, A. (2008). Opening up" and "Closing down": Power, participation, and pluralism in the social appraisal of technology. *Science Technology & Human Values*, 33(2), 262–294. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243907311265>
- Toffler, A. (1970). *Future shock*. Random House.
- Tshishonga, N. S. (2020). Forging civic and democratic governance from below through virtual state and communities: case studies of communities of practice. In S. Chhabra, & M. Kumar (Eds.), *Civic engagement frameworks and strategic leadership practices for organization development* (pp. 67–95). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-2372-8.ch004>.
- Turnhout, E., Metzke, T., Wyborn, C., Klenk, N., & Louder, E. (2020). The politics of co-production: Participation, power, and transformation. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 42, 15–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.11.009>
- Varwell, S. (2022). A Literature Review of Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation: Lessons for contemporary student engagement. *Exchanges: The Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(1), 108–144.
- Vuksanović-Macura, Z., & Mišević, I. (2021). Excluded communities and participatory land-use planning: Experience from informal Roma settlements in Serbia. *Environment and Urbanization*, 33(2), 456–477. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09562478211024095>
- Warner, M. (2002). Publics and Counterpublics. *Public Culture*, 14(1), 49–90. (<https://www.muse.jhu.edu/article/26277>).
- Wynne, B. (1992). Misunderstood misunderstanding: Social identities and public uptake of science. *Public Understanding of Science*, 1(3), 281–304.
- Xiao, Y., & Watson, M. (2019). Guidance on Conducting a Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 39(1), 93–112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456x17723971>