

DESIGN VALIDITY ENVELOPE

Start with your Artifact (1) and one related Claim (2). Then define Reference Entity (3) and possible Validation Approach (4). Finally, select the Validity Type (5).
Follow the numbers (not the arrows).

State one clear claim about your Artifact (1).
Check claim type.

© Kai Larsen, Roland M. Mueller, Katja Thoring, Phil Cash, Roman Lukyanenko, 2026

Which Validity Type best fits your Claim (2) and
Validation Approach (4)?

2

Claim

☐ **Criterion Claim** Is it better or preferable?

☐ **Causal Claim** How or why does it work?

☐ **Context Claim** Where and for whom does it work?

.....

.....

.....

5

Validity Type

Criterion

☐ **Criterion efficacy validity**
Do we know the outputs are better?

☐ **Criterion characteristic validity**
Do we know it has better characteristics?

Causality

☐ **Causal efficacy validity**
Do we know which parts shape the outputs?

☐ **Causal characteristic validity**
Do we know which parts shape the characteristics?

Context

☐ **Ecological validity**
Do the claims hold in the intended setting?

☐ **External validity**
Do the claims hold in other settings?

Other

☐

To:
The Design Community

From:
.....
.....

START HERE

↓

1

Artifact

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

4

Validation Approach

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3

Reference Entity

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

is grounded in

is about

evaluates

is an instance of

compares

compares

suggests

What is your Focal Artifact name and type?
Describe it briefly.

How do you compare Artifact (1) and Reference Entity (3)?
What data, observation, or activity produces evidence?

What is the Reference Entity you are comparing your
Artifact (1) with? [e.g. current practice, prior version,
alternative design, user expectation, desired state, theory]