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?

A tool to promote collaborative communication and attitudes relating to the solidarity paradigm for people working together in arts and culture (and other relevant sectors). Its purpose is to give participants a chance to express what values are important to them in their collaboration, to understand how others think and what is important and necessary for them to work and communicate together. The workshop also provides inspiration and an opportunity to reflect on how the team wants to deal with possible conflict.

This game is made up of four steps and can be played with or without a moderator. The duration of each step and for the whole game is deliberately not set. Team members can decide how much time they can devote to it and then proceed with the game accordingly. As a guideline, it is possible to play a good game within two to three hours. To play the game, you will need the Value Cards, the Conflict Cards and (optionally) the Cheat Sheet.

Step 1. Personal Values Selection
All Value Cards are placed so they are visible to all players. The Conflict Cards are placed face down in the middle. Without touching the cards, each player must select two values in their mind that they relate to, want to refer to, are important to them.

Step 2. Getting to know each other – each player takes a turn
1. Pick up the two cards that you have selected in your mind and show them to the others.
2. Tell a personal story/ poem/ thought/ reflection /idea/ joke, etc., that is connected with the value(s) you chose.
3. Place back the card from where you picked it up.

Step 3. Conflict Scenarios
The Conflict Cards show examples of situations that may occur in collaborations, targeted at instances in which at least one value has been compromised
1. One player draws one Conflict Card from the pile and reads it aloud to the team.
2. Once the conflict scenario is clear to everyone, the players think about which value has been compromised and why.
3. The player holding the Conflict Card makes suggestions about which values have been compromised.
4. Open the discussion about the values, with the group reaching an agreement
(Note: Several values can be identified. Also: If you like, check out the Cheat Sheet for our suggestions).
5. Steps 1–4 are repeated according to the number of participants.
(Optional step: After determining the Values, make suggestions for a possible resolution to the conflict.)

Step 4. The Agreement
1. Each player picks a Value Card. They will be a Guardian of this value for the rest of the project. This value may differ from the originally chosen one, inspired by the previous discussions.
2. When all have chosen a card, each player presents it to the other players and talks about it (examples: why they have chosen that card, what that value means to them, how they will guard

that value in the course of the project). If one value is chosen by more than one player, come to an agreement among yourselves while respecting solidarity.

(Optional: discuss how the guardianship is practiced, realized, what the scope of it is, how the guardianship will be reviewed, modified, and so on.)

In which way is this method alternative?
How does it try to bring change or represent an alternative to existing or dominant knowledge sharing settings and methods?

Because they will jointly face fictional but possible conflict scenarios during the workshop, participants have the chance to recognise and identify mechanisms that, although often invisible and opaque, cause tensions and difficulties, especially when participants come from different contexts.
The workshop is based on simple exercises. It encourages discussion of the values that seem to make up the concept of solidarity and aims to harmonise the different approaches, experiences, and thoughts represented by the participants. The main goal is to help the team formulate their own mutual framework of values to support the development and sustainability of solidarity within the team. We believe that it can help teams establish shared, mutually beneficial values and principles of cooperation and should be promoted on a systematic, institutional level.

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?

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 Gamified Workshop Toolkit is designed to be played in a group setting of four to eight people. If there are more than eight people, it is best to split into two groups. You will then need two sets of cards. The game can best be played sitting around a table or in a circle, as you would in a regular card game. You do not necessarily need a table to play the game.

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?

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?

Additional references
If possible, please provide additional links, materials, instructions and other relevant content.
https://reshape.network/prototype/the-gamified-workshop-toolkit-values-of-solidarity