Shakin' the classroom
Spreading alternative knowledge sharing methods

Please briefly explain the knowledge sharing method/approach/tool.
What are the main processes? What are the expected outcomes? In what ways does that method bring change or represent an alternative to existing or dominant knowledge sharing settings and methods?

Dugnad (meaning, in Norwegian language, an unpaid, voluntary, orchestrated community work) as a method belongs to a different form of instruments developed within so called design thinking process. It was created by Kaos Pilots from Denmark in order to give space for creative thinking and collaboration of each member of a team. This method gives opportunity to include neighbourhood inhabitants in elaboration processes of site-specific installations and services. The project has several phases.

First phase – **exploration**, is happening on the real spot (street, square, park, etc.): tasks
- Explore the space by using it: how does this space effect you, what does it inspire you to do, how does it feel? (individual)
- Explore the space by observing it: which interaction patterns can you observe or deduct from traces in this space, what does the space have to do with the nature of these patterns? (individual / team)
- Focus: What does this space need? What is missing here? What is its hidden potential? Which issue wants to be addressed here? (team)

Second phase is **conceptualisation**.
Conceptualise a site-specific intervention for this place that addresses the needs, lacks or potentials you identified. Start with a brainstorming of ideas.
Synthezise / select / assemble ideas to come to a project design.

Third phase is **creation** of a prototype, of a service, or performative presentation (Create a prototype, minimalistic small-scale model, of the intervention(s) and install/perform it at the site. Document the prototype).

Forth phase is **presentation** in a plenary (within the site or in a classroom) if there are more groups in the same or different sites. (Due to involvement of community – preferably is to present on the spot.

Fifth phase comprises **re-cap - group process analysis** with several sub-phases (here presented as in an original tool but for our purposes each time method applied this recap process should be reinvented according to the needs of the group).

- Quick Individual Evaluation: How happy are you with the outcome of your group project? How happy were you with the process? (both indicated by thumbs up/down-scaling)
- Process Recap: Create a timeline of the 90 minutes and anchor milestones and phases of the group process (observer). Mark your personal fever curves on this timeline: When were you enthusiastic in the process, when were you down? Evaluate how synchronised or counterbalanced the curves are. What is behind this?
- Role Analysis: How did you experience the roles of the team members? Was there leadership and how did it come about? Was someone dominant? Someone silent? Did it feel right? How does the self-perception fit with the observer data? Optional: Give four-colour feedback to your team members: each person has 2 blue (expert), 2 red (manager), 2 yellow (ambassador) and 2 green (facilitator) cards. Distribute as many as

> you like – keep the ones you receive separate from your own leftover cards. Take the hand you are given as feedback. Analyse the gap (which cards were not given out in the group?).
> - Conception Process Review: How was the concept born? Is it additive, selective, multiplicative in regards to the initial individual contributions/ideas? What were critical moments in this process? When did you experience turns, breakthroughs? How were clashes handled? What does the intercultural situation have to do with these issues?
> - Consequences: What does this mean for your future collaboration?
>   **I have added:**
> - For this space, site, problem, issue – how this newly created knowledge will be integrated in a community… (community of practitioners, or among inhabitants…)

If possible, please briefly explain the context in which the method has been developed.

Who were the main actors? What were the main reasons/motivations/inspirations behind the creation? Which previous developments have influenced it? If relevant, in what ways did the method/tool develop or change over time or in different locations/contexts?

> This method is changed in every use by different persons and groups as it is easily adapted to different spaces/cultures/contexts and to teams that might be international, intergenerational, interracial, etc. comprising all sorts of differences but wanting to take advantages exactly in them.

In your opinion, what kind of settings and participants is the method best suited for?

E.g. age, educational level, cultural and professional background, etc.

> This method might be used by participants of different educational level as everyone might offer their expertise to be functional and instrumental for the site-specific installation or service solution in an urban context.

Are there any limitations?

Are there any requirements or limits in terms of location, number/profile of participants, tools and devices, time constraints and other? Are there certain skills, sensitivities or relations that need to be developed or assumed for the method to be successfully applied? Are there any contexts for which this method is not best suited?

> There are no specific limitations if you do not want to use it as a competitive "game" among different teams in the training programme. But from our perspective to stimulate subaltern knowledge to be shared, time limits should not be severe. It might be realised within two to six hours or even a whole day if we really want to achieve participation of subaltern group and individuals, exploration and team reflection and debate. Time limits usually serve to identify the most capable, efficient and intelligent group with effective leadership that produced product or service that can be easily accepted (fitting the usual standards and norms). Thus, in the work with subaltern communities, competitivity among groups and any kind of constraints should be avoided.

What are your experiences with the method?

In case you have tested or experienced the method beyond its primary environment, what are your experiences? Would you change anything or suggest further development?

I have applied this method in many different environments, during capacity building and training programmes. Each time I would adapt it according to the seminar aims and values, but also according to the needs of the training group. Changes comprised time and number of teams as well as different ways of presenting the results of the process. Sometimes process was more research oriented, sometimes more oriented toward negotiating the concept of possible future project, and sometimes was very concrete, demanding project to be done at least as a model.

Could you provide any relevant testimonies?

If possible, please provide testimonies, reflections and statements about the method from its authors and/or users.

I might ask some of the former participants to testify about it, but in this moment, I do not have their testimonies.

Additional references

If possible, please provide additional links, materials, instructions and other relevant content.

https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20180521-how-dugnad-shaped-a-nations-work-ethic
https://nationalism-studies.sps.ed.ac.uk/2020/11/18/let-them-do-dugnad-the-fallacies-of-the-norwegian-governments-nationalist-rhetoric-during-covid-19/
Marte Lange Vik: Dugnad as a democratic landscape practice:
http://www.pecsrl.org/PECSRL_2014_Conference_Book.pdf