D2.3 Co-design methodology template

Date: 15th December 2021

Document identifier: D2.3_MONTE_Co-DesignMethodologyTemplate_v5
Version: 5.0
Author: MONTE
Dissemination status: Public

CO-DESIGN METHODOLOGY TEMPLATE

Grant Agreement nº:	870939
Project acronym:	SO CLOSE
Project title:	Enhancing Social Cohesion through Sharing the Cultural Heritage of Forced Migrations
Funding Scheme:	H2020-SC6-TRANSFORMATIONS-2019 (DT-TRANSFORMATIONS-11-2019, Collaborative approaches to cultural heritage for social cohesion)
Project Duration:	2020/01/01 – 2022/12/31 (36 months)
Coordinator:	UNIVERSITAT AUTÒNOMA DE BARCELONA (UAB)
Associated Beneficiaries:	- LUNDS UNIVERSITET (ULUND) - STOWARZYSZENIE WILLA DECJUSZA (VDA) - FONDAZIONE SCUOLA DI PACE DI MONTE SOLE (MONTE) - CONSORCI DEL MUSEU MEMORIAL DE L'EXILI (MUME) - ETHNIKO KENTRO EREVNAS KAI TECHNOLOGIKIS ANAPTYXIS (CERTH) - ENGINEERING – INGEGNERIA INFORMATICA SPA (ENG) - TEMPESTA MEDIA SL (TEMP) - ELLINIKO FOROUM PROSFIGON (GFR)

Project no. 870939
SO-CLOSE

Enhancing Social Cohesion through Sharing the Cultural Heritage of Forced Migrations
DT-TRANSFORMATIONS-11-2019: Collaborative approaches to cultural heritage for social cohesion
Start date of project: 01/01/2020 - Duration: 36 months

History Chart				
Issue	**Date**	**Changed page(s)**	**Cause of change**	**Implemented by**
0.10		-	Draft	UAB
1.0	15/02/2021	ALL	Version 1.0	MONTE
1.0	22/02/2021	ALL	Review	UAB
2.0	26/02/2021	ALL	Version 2.0	MONTE
3.0	07/06/2021	ALL	Version 3.0	MONTE
4.0	26/07/2021	ALL	Version 4.0	MONTE
5.0	15/12/2021	ALL	Version 5.0	MONTE
Validation				
No.	**Action**	**Beneficiary**		**Date**
1	Prepared	MONTE		15/12/2021
2	Approved	UAB		22/12/2021
3	Released	UAB		30/12/2021

Table of Content

1. Executive Summary

The goal of this deliverable is to illustrate the co-creation methodology as a natural consequence determined by the context and the premises of the SO-CLOSE project design and Consortium.

The text develops firstly an introduction as a short analytical report of the project framework, both in terms of scientific competences and interactional practices present in the Consortium and it turns then to a critic review of literature and experiences about co-creation. Finally, it presents the co-design methodology template, elaborated as a result of the work carried out throughout WP2, which has included training workshops, Focus Groups and a validation survey.

2. List of Abbreviations

A / As	Academic / Academics
CI / CIs	Cultural Institution / Institutions
FG / FGs	Focus Group / Focus Groups
GA	Grant Agreement
GFR	Elliniko Foroum Prosfigon
MONTE	Fondazione Scuola di Pace di Monte Sole
MUME	Consorci Del Museu Memorial De L'exili
NGO / NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisation / Organisations
PM / PMs	Policy Maker / Makers
R / Rs	Refugee (and Asylum Seeker) / Refugees (and Asylum Seekers)
S / Ss	Student / Students
VDA	Stowarzyszenie Willa Decjusza
WP / WPs	Work Package / Packages

3. Introduction

3.1 Why co-creation

SO-CLOSE is dealing with cultural heritage, cultural memory, cultural history, history of collective identities and memories, collective memories, personal memories and identities, lieux de mémoire, oral history, social structure, inequalities, social mobility, interethnic relations as well as with conflicts, social cohesion, storytelling, mediation and social integration, innovation, digital technologies.

Intersectionality and interdisciplinarity are core concepts in this research, based on different academic disciplines and multiple approaches. In order to foster mutual understanding between refugees and the receiving European societies, the Consortium was carefully built in order to gather many competences and points of view, working as multi-layered context to maximize management expertise on participatory and collaborative design. Thus, the Consortium is composed by University Departments and Centres from the fields of History (Autonomous University of Barcelona and University of Girona), Sociology (Autonomous University of Barcelona) and Languages (Lund University and Autonomous University of Barcelona); hi-tech companies, including Engineering and La Tempesta together with the Centre for Research and Technology- Hellas and renowned cultural institutions such as The Exile Memorial Museum, the Greek Forum of Refugees, the Peace School Foundation of Monte Sole and the Villa Decius Association.

This multi-layered context, gathering several different competences and expertise, is the natural environment for a participative, cooperative and collaborative methodology, both within the Consortium work and - above all - towards the society the members of the Consortium are inserted in.

The Consortium was not created just to "study" the surrounding social phenomenon of migration / refugee / asylum, but to interact with these complex social dynamics in an innovative way, considering refugees and the target audiences from the local societies the experts in their own experiences. The Consortium was asked both to bring the long sight of theoretical research and, through it, to identify, catch and possibly help to satisfy needs, requests for change and rights.

First of all, the basic attitude of the Consortium had to be of an accurate and careful listening of the context it is meant to interact with. This means that the attitude shouldn't be characterized by the presumption of knowledge, but it should be based on the awareness that knowledge and expertise have multiple springs and levels. In consequence, also what comes from knowledge and expertise, that is to say the possibility to create, belongs necessarily to different sources and it can be found in and expressed by a multiplicity of subjects.

That is basically the reason why the project started with a long phase of field work of research. In WP1, 196 interviews were conducted in order to collect information, memories, visions of the

world and of the society people were living in, to identify claims for the present and for the future and to harvest possible lines of action in order to model the context. The interesting thing is that also this phase was multiperspective: structured and driven by the academic expertise, the interviewees were chosen by the Cultural Institutions and the interviews were conducted by Cultural Institutions members. This way of working gave the project not only a set of data to analyse and combine, but also an opportunity for cultural exchange and collective creativity, to foster a sense of community and cultural change. The fact that the research was not an internal and centralized survey, but a tailored and spread contact with real individuals, already defined these encounters as the first phase of the co-creation methodology.

Nevertheless, since SO-CLOSE is society oriented, the relationship with individuals could only be considered as a first step: the collective dimension had to be explored and exploited as well, and this is the point when the co-creative methodology was in a way defined and codified. In order to help refugees and the representatives of the local target audiences engage with each other, to provide effective ways to communicate, to cultivate creativity, to share insights and to test out new ideas with the other participants, many factors have to be taken in consideration, and before exploring each of them it is necessary to remember that a key concept is equilibrium. This concept is often related to a static situation while, when it comes to social interaction, it relates more to the idea of respect, balance and mitigation of power, multiplicity of outcomes. It is, actually, a very flexible concept that varies in connection with the infinite possible different combinations of resources, expertise, experiences, boundaries and limits that a group of people can express. If this is properly taken into consideration, creation will not be a bulb that lightens over a single genius head but an energy potential that, once clear for every member of the group, can pile up on the existing material in order to generate something new and different.

When it became clear that the Covid-19 world pandemic would have extremely limited the possibility of interaction, the mitigation strategy adopted for WP2 action was to exploit the Focus Group technique to its limit. Even conscious that FGs are not workshops, therapy, decision making, education, organizing, art creation activities or behaviour change activities, although FGs may have some of these outcomes as well, CIs were called to the effort of data collection together with inputs feeding for creation (see D2.1).

Even if the best condition would have been to have plenty of time and possibility to travel, Covid-19 impacted in multiple ways. Advanced planning was not always possible since the situation was changing every week. During partial or total lockdowns people were of course prevented to meet. Besides, some participants got ill and there were chances that the sites of CIs were not available. This situation forced the FGs into a mixed modality.

3.2 Contents of the research and of the co-creation

If what is illustrated above gives the idea of the kind of preliminary choices made and the consequences they had in terms of methodological approach, going through content themes and issues can clarify better what can be drawn as a methodological template.

The ambition of SO-CLOSE is to foster social cohesion and fight refugee marginalization or exclusion by facilitating the encounters between similar life stories, through the mediation of innovative digital and artistic tools.

Considering the elements of such a definition, it emerges clearly that the Consortium is dealing with personal, individual life stories, both on the host community side and on the refugees / asylum seekers side. On both sides everyone is to be considered an "expert" about his/her life story. The goal of a common work starting from these single stories is to elaborate narratives that are not anymore personal but in which everyone can still recognize him/herself. It is clear then that the result cannot be simply a juxtaposition, instead it has to encompass elements coming from different sources and on different levels in order to compose something original. In the dictionary, under the word "cohesion" there is an interesting definition that relates to physics: "the force that holds together the atoms or molecules in a solid or liquid, as distinguished from adhesion". Moving to the social context, the definition becomes quite useful because it indicates that we have a context in which these pieces of stories come together that is mostly relevant for the final outcome and, above all, it underlines the difference with the concept of adhesion, that is to say a mechanism of flattening differences but possibly maintaining lines of fractures. The same applies to the concept of innovation, above all if referred to art and digital tools: maybe there are a limited set of arts and tools, but the ways in which they can be performed, built and expressed is almost endless. Therefore, also in this respect, the only chance to reflect the concepts of inclusivity and plurality is to use elements for an original combination.

Finally, it is to be acknowledged that SO-CLOSE development is implemented in four different pilot locations (Greece, Italy, Poland and Spain), selected due to their connection with the present social dynamics and for the actual existence of memory and cultural heritage.

Considering the present social dynamics, it is to be said that the CIs' countries are all bordering countries. This means that their population are dealing with the issue of first reception and management: it can be more difficult to perceive the necessity for social integration when there is often the perception of a continuous turnover of human beings.

When it comes to memory and cultural heritage, the attention goes to the word "actual": Consortium CIs are located and / or related to specific places and specific historical moments, events and contexts. How all this is presented and conveyed to project participants can lead to very different outcomes, and in this respect, it seems to be extremely relevant to identify how each CIs faced the issue, balancing between pandemic constraints and project needs and scope.

Connections between past and present were presented in different ways:

➢ Slide presentation for Trikeri Island project with GFR[1]: a ppt presentation was shown with different pictures and participants were asked about their feelings and opinions about what they were seeing (visual tools, dialogue);

➢ FG on the memorial site (open air) for MONTE[2] and reading a part of a testimony: refugees were on the open-air memorial site of Monte Sole and the facilitator read a part of a testimony of a survivor. The connections with some words of the testimony came spontaneously (experiential, reading, dialogue);

➢ Video, slides and presentation for MUME[3]: participants were presented some slides with stimulus pictures, and a video with pictures both of the Spanish Civil War and the exiled camp of Argelès, a tent camp on the beach (visual, dialogue);

➢ Presentation and dialogue for VDA[4]: participants were asked about connections between past and present, and especially in the case of Ukrainian refugees, a part of the past is literally in common with Poland (dialogue).

3.3 What this frame of reference can tell researchers and social activists

What was described can be seen as a possible list of premises, useful to try to draw a general conclusion. Summarizing, lessons learnt from the work developed in SO-CLOSE lead to identify some of the elements that were key in the co-creation process:

➢ the choice of the core subject of the SO-CLOSE project, that focuses on social dynamics and human interactions;

➢ the need for intersectionality and multidisciplinarity that this subject requires;

➢ the composition of the project Consortium, that gathers different academic departments, different types of cultural institutions and different highly specialized companies;

➢ the variety of resources, both professional and linked to different cultural and historical heritages;

➢ the variety of possible project participants, in terms of expertise, social status and social

---

[1] For GFR, the historical connection to the European traumatic past was to be developed through the connection with and the analysis of the Trikeri Island Concentration Camp, on political persecution and women internment during the Greek Civil War.

[2] Starting from a historiographical reflection around the Nazi massacre of civilians that took place in Monte Sole in 1944, MONTE historical heritages are used to explore the mechanisms of violence that made that violence possible, through the memory of those who were there and of the place itself as a silent guardian of its past.

[3] MUME was meant to explore the link with other historical and current issues such as migrations, exoduses, other forced displacements of people and persecutions due to their ideas in defense of freedom, democracy and social progress.

[4] The historical background related to VDA was meant to explore was outcomes and displacements after the end of a war since, after being a Nazi Police headquarter during the Second World War, the Villa housed a school for auditors of co-operatives, a dormitory and a tuberculosis ward of the Dr. Anka Hospital.

power;

All these elements suggest the need for a participative, cooperative and open methodology. Moreover, a crucial scientific review of useful conceptualizations about heritage/migration/diversity nexus was carried out during WP1 (Deliverable 1.2). This review stresses once again the existence of a variety of points of view and sources, spread in different individuals as well as in different communities; they naturally combine in something new and, as a consequence, it is important to thoroughly listen to all of them in order to shape a cohesive society.

4. Elements of co-creation methodology

This gathering of experience, observation and research leads the WP2 partners to a general template representing the frame and at the same time the steps to be followed to use a co-creation methodology.

Undoubtedly, co-creation exists in a variety of contexts and it is a general term used across the many disciplines[5].Keeping this in mind, it is possible to say that co-creation-oriented methodologies respond to the need to apply a dialogical perspective in which academic research, educational practices, and stakeholders' knowledge and experiences could enhance each other to achieve scientific, policy and social impact through a continuous, egalitarian and intersubjective dialogue (Garcia-Carrión & Gomez Gonzalez, 2018).

Co-creation describes a creative approach involving partners who cooperate in order to achieve a desired goal. It can be understood as an "interlinked collaborative approach aimed to increase dialogue, trust, understanding of needs" (Topp, Mair, Smillie, & Cairney, 2020). Although the term was originally used in the business area to define a process in which consumers are involved in the creation of a product (Ind & Coates, 2013; Vargo & Lusch, 2004) it has since been applied with a broader meaning whenever different social actors engage with academic, cultural or artistic tools in a dialogical and egalitarian process to promote scientific knowledge and social change.

Research on the co-creation of digital tools has emphasized the need to involve end-users in the design process (Abou-Khalil, Helou, Flanagan, Pinkwart, & Ogata, 2019; Fisher, Yefimova, & Yafi, 2016; Šuklje Erjavec & Ruchinskaya, 2019). In the concrete case of refugees and asylum seekers, previous experiences co-creating digital tools have stressed the need to guide the process based on their interests and needs [Citation error]. Other experiences have also started by conducting interviews to identify their needs, designing solutions based on them and then asking for the feedback of refugees who use the created technological tools (Lee, Schwartz, Long, & Naseem, 2018).

In co-creation, the relationship among all actors is reciprocally beneficial and everyone's

---

[5] Please, see the bibliography to have a look to the variety of fields applying some sort of co-creational methodology.

knowledge, expertise and experiences are equally valued. Every actor takes part in the process and each one should be equally proud about its achievements (64 Million Artists, 2018). Even if the goal to be achieved has its relevance, the co-creation process put in place to achieve it is equally, if not more, important: it is the process itself that strengthens resilience to socio-economic marginalization and it gives rise to a shared and co-constructed understanding, which can be developed and translated into recommendations that lead to practical and potentially transformative changes (Brownill & Natividad Puig, 2020).

When WP2 started in M6, WP leader MONTE started a scientific conversation with the research components of the consortium – UAB and LUND – in order to further explore the literature and the practices connected to co-creation. What immediately emerged was the need to deepen that one tradition prevailing among the many: industry/business related definitions and actual implementations. This field of work generally defines Co-creation as a product or service design process in which input from consumers plays a central role from beginning to end. Less specifically, the term is also used for any way in which a business allows consumers to submit ideas, designs or content. Such a definition lies on a hidden premise that is the profit-oriented goal of the process. If this is the case, it means that the process itself cannot be fully horizontal because there is an actor of the process that – having strong interest in the outcome – will tend to lead and strongly structure the interaction.

It was from this analysis that emerged the need for a shared moment for the Consortium, particularly speaking for the Cultural Institutions, to support another vision and the particular cooperative, interactional and intersectional perspective of the SO-CLOSE project.

A 2 –days workshop was organized involving all the resources present in the Consortium. UAB and LUND were asked to share some theoretical inputs while CIs were asked to share some examples of best practices they applied in their everyday work with people. The theoretical framework was set by UAB starting from a very meaningful study by Erik Olin Wright titled "Envisioning Real Utopias" (Wright, 2010). His contribution to the sociology field is based on the move from the concept of "Classes" analysing the social structure to "The Real Utopias Project", developing a theoretical framework for social change. One meaningful quote that was presented says: "The best we can do, then, is to treat the struggle to move forward on the pathways of social empowerment as an experimental process in which we continually test and retest the limits of possibility and try, as best as we can, to create new institutions which will expand those limits themselves. In doing so we not only envision real utopias but contribute to making utopias real" (Wright, 2010, p. 373).

In business studies, as described by Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2004), co-creation involves the union between firms' needs and customers' needs in terms of product development. The coincidence between needs of multiple actors involved in a process would be described in other

fields of science as establishing a win-win situation[6] or adopting a collaborative style as defined by Thomas and Kilmann (2002).

The definition of co-creation is not one, its boundaries are rather vague, both in terms of practical application and decisions about whether it is a process, a method or a research. As Jensen and Pieters (2017) pointed out, it is quite used as a buzzword, implying ambiguity on how it is implemented. Sometimes co-creation is nothing but a "working together" where differentials of power are implicated, where the weak actors are only perceived as a source of information, but decision making is still in the hands of strong actors.

Jensen and Pieters developed then the term "complete co-creation", to underline that end users should be involved in every stage of the process. "A transparent process of value creation in ongoing, productive collaboration with, and supported by all relevant parties, with end-users playing a central role" (Jensen & Pieters, 2017, p. 15).

On its turn, Jurgen Habermas (1984) states that A quote from Jurgen Habermas provided for a defining idea: "[...] as soon as we equip the actors with this capability, we lose our privileged position as an observer in relation to the object domain. (…) We find ourselves forced to participate, in a performative attitude, in the process of reaching understanding. We thereby expose our interpretation in principle to the same critique to which communicative agents must mutually expose their interpretations" (Habermas, 1984, p. 119). So to say that the base line for the co-creation process must be an egalitarian relationship that does not imply the same knowledge, but the sharing of each agents' expertise and experience in a process based on the best arguments rather than on power claims.

Once defined the conceptual perimeter, LUND defined more specifically the analysis of the sociological tool of Focus Group. The reason for this choice was linked to the fact that, as per GA, this tool was indicated as the most effective to be applied both in terms of data collection and of generative encounters among different stakeholders.

However, even when critically considering the concept of co-creation, most of the literature is still vague about detailed implementation, offering general statements, such as "create a safe space for sharing opinions" without detailing how to do it. In the field of education, methods have to be consistent with contents and goals, that is why, in this domain, lots of information on how to implement true participatory activities were found and already applied. CIs were then invited to provide examples and rationales from their practices in order to integrate the sociological theory.

If these are the premises, which are the implications for SO-CLOSE? How do we build the needed knowledge with our multiple constituencies? How does it work out in the performance of a co-creation session?

Since co-creation is a transdisciplinary concept, since collaboration is a concept largely employed in

---

[6] https://www.negotiations.com/articles/win-win-settlements/ (retrieved on Dec. 15th, 2021)

education, since the 4 CIs, far from being only heritage protection oriented, are all engaged in educational programs and have competencies in this field, we felt that in order to reach a true co-creation, the way workgroups had to be implemented was a key issue.

Deriving from findings in WP1 and WP2, the idea that refugees do have common aspects but still claim their complexity and uniqueness as human beings, we decided to apply methods commonly used in workgroups, education, social inclusion, and mutual help. The sensitivity of SO-CLOSE content requires special care for details, as it is about past and recent personal memories, biographies and identities.

Several social and historical elements have to be taken into consideration: majority/minority relationships, differential of powers or the fact that the host country may be ex-colonizer or have a conflictual narrative about controversies with the country of origin. Besides, we also find all the aspects connected with people asked to share their stories, their possible trauma, the way it is perceived by them, the fulfilment of expectations, nostalgia.

That is why, in order to implement a true collaboration, smoothing as far as possible the differentials of power, and applying a bottom-up approach, we had to select methods from the educational work on field and studies of the four CIs.

The outcome of this workshop and of its follow up exchanges is then the following template. Benefiting from many disciplinary traditions, SO-CLOSE project multiperspective structure allows to elaborate a set of elements that are transferable and useful also in contexts not including academic research goals or for-profit testing groups aimed to (im)prove the quality of a product. Museums, cultural institutions and root-based organizations were able to include a different perspective linked to the vast field of education, cultural sharing and promotion, sense of community, collective creativity, and cultural and social change.

This is the reason why what follows has not the rigid shape of a sequence of rules but develops some bullet points that are to be taken carefully into consideration when planning a co-creation session. What differentiates this template about co-creation methodology from the many others designed and applied in diverse fields of research and business is that creation is the goal in itself, not only a participatory way of collecting data or improve products for richer profits. Being the social change the goal of the SO-CLOSE project, and considering that new technologies and innovative tools are only instruments and not the objective, the space for invention, free expression and collaboration is at its largest scope. The bullet points cover from the organizational aspects, to content, roles and responsibilities. They were intended to inform the SO-CLOSE CIs work during the WP2 activities and they are, at the same time, intended for helping in maintaining the path of a not directive and truly generative process in any possible context of work.

The template hereby presented is the result of the work carried out in WP2 during which the four

Cultural Institutions of the Consortium[7] conducted 15 Focus Groups with 4-8 participants each (8 in person, 7 online due to Covid restrictions). The participants included refugees, policymakers, academics, cultural institutions and NGOs. Each FG comprised two sessions with an approximate duration of 1,5h each: one for the content part (Cultural Heritage and Social Cohesion) and another for the tools part.

At a second stage, the technological partners, in collaboration with the CIs, developed the validation process, which included a survey that was administered to 62 end users including refugees (47%), CIs (11%), NGOs (23%), academics (11%) and policymakers (8%).

The analysis of the FGs and the survey, together with the close monitoring of the whole co-creation process, is the basis for the elaboration of this template, which summarizes the lessons learnt from the experiences of the four CIs and the diverse stakeholders that participated in the process of conception of the tools.

4.1 Building content and questions

In order to promote participation, the content of the co-creation workshop, namely the desired outcomes, can be built exploring the future participants' idea through a set of individual interviews to determine, within the general scope of the project, which are the more meaningful aspects. The following step to be taken, after the analysis of the interviews, is organizing collective moments: in this way, it will be possible to add the group intelligence to the individual experience.

In both these possible phases, questions could be open or close, or a combination of the two.

4.2 Setting

In order to promote participation, the setting is quite informal, welcoming and non-judgmental.
The position of participants should be thoughtfully considered as well.

4.2.1 Circle

It gives at a first glance the idea that no one is more important than the other (even the facilitator) or has a dominant role. Roles are different for tasks and not upon hierarchy. Participants can see each other, and this enables awareness on the speaking flow, to encourage everybody to leave space for others. This is particularly important in terms of marking the difference of co-creation methodology derived from SO-CLOSE concept and other possible use of this methodology. When the attention is to a goal profit or data collecting oriented, there is usually no particular attention to the interaction flow and to the reciprocal awareness while the attention is devoted mainly to the object of the analysis.

4.2.2 Presence of tables / desks

---

[7] Greek Forum of Refugees (Greece), Scuola di Pace di Monte Sole (Italy), Villa Decius Association (Poland) and Museu Memorial de l'Exili (Spain).

Tables and desks sometimes prevent people from seeing each other and give an impression of a barrier between people. Of course, if asked by participants because they feel more comfortable for completing the phase they are in, tables should be added.

4.3 Participants

4.3.1 Enrolment
Participants are more likely to be active if they are fully informed about the scope of the meeting and its structure. It is fair to let potential participants evaluate if the content of the session is of their interest and if they are willing to put time and energy in it. This is another particularly important aspect that differentiates this original co-creation methodology from that applied in other fields. Often participants are selected and not simply enrolled: they are chosen because of some particular skill or attitude or role or competence that are thought to be useful for the purpose of the group meeting. When the goals are the process and the creation in terms of social change, it is important to remember that everyone could be considered and expert and the will to commit should be the (only) main characteristic.

4.3.2 Number
Beyond 8 people it is difficult to prevent double or side conversations from happening, which would lead to possibly losing some meaningful parts of conversation.

4.3.3 Power differentials
Participants should not feel intimidated by other participants, and when there are power differentials (e.g.: the mayor and an asylum seeker), this can cause problems. A power differential is not only about the social status, but there can be multiple factors, for instance when a participant is not a native speaker in a group of native speakers.

4.3.3.1 Gender related power differential
A specific situation where participants may not feel comfortable is related to gender and possible manterrupting or mansplaining. The facilitator must pay special attention to this aspect and try to compensate gender biases when taking turns, by asking women directly or reconducting discussions.

4.3.4 Language mediation
If circumstances allow for it, participants should speak the same language. When mediation is necessary, it has to be very accurate. Either a professional translator or a cultural mediator should be given precise instructions.

Translating after only a couple of sentences at a time helps other participants to keep the focus which could be lost if translation comes after a 5-minute speech.

In the case of refugees, in the choice of mediator, organizers should carefully consider any possible controversy with the participant who needs linguistic assistance in terms of belonging to a different

and conflictual political or identity group.

4.3.5 Learning names

Facilitators and participants should know each other's names and use them during the conversation.

4.3.6 Vulnerable participants

When possible vulnerable participants are part of the group, the facilitator will be considering the specific situation, creating conditions for them to feel comfortable and avoiding stigmatization.

4.3.7 Attendees

The session may require the attendance of persons other than the facilitator(s) and the participants (technical assistance, translation, mediation, etc.). It is fair to introduce all of them, clarifying their role and limiting their interaction to the task they have to perform.

4.4 Moderation

4.4.1 Facilitation

The facilitator, with the aims of the session clear in mind, thinks about which information should be provided to participants. If more facilitators are present, they agree on the aims and, if different roles are needed, divide the roles beforehand. The facilitator enables others to dialogue, without directing, willingly or not, the conversation in a direction. Interventions are anyway needed if there is something preventing participants, or a part of them, to take part in the dialogue. Interventions are also needed when the dialogue flow starts revolving around.

The facilitator, in order to help participants to communicate between themselves, helps them not to constantly address him/her also with eye contact or using non-verbal language.

Underlining interventions with a one-word feedback help the process of empowerment, since the sense of efficiency and awareness of action are acknowledged.

4.4.2 Summarizing

Writing a keyword on a board after a participant speaks is meant to underline the importance of his/her words and to create memory in the group. This way of keeping track of what is going on in the group is strongly preferable than taking notes because it allows the facilitator to maintain a careful listening attitude and to pay attention not only to words but also to the group dynamics and individual proxemics.

4.4.3 Recording

If there is the need to keep a track of the session(s) as accurate as possible, it is possible to share this need with participants and ask them the permission to record the meeting. It is important to keep in mind that video recording, even if more accurate and richer in information, could strongly influence spontaneity in participating and reacting while audio recording is less invasive but sometimes more difficult to manage afterwards.

4.5 Rules

Some of the rules are stated before the group meets, like s p e c i f i c a t i o n s a b o u t time and place of the meeting or participants.
Facilitator also suggests some guidelines for the conversation:
  ➢ Interrupting is to avoid
  ➢ Speaking in I-sentences helps empowerment
  ➢ Leave space for everybody and share the responsibility to let everybody speak
The process of deciding rules can also be participatory. Particularly, individual breaks can be problematic as participants may leave/join the group when others are speaking, stating, willingly or not, their interest or disinterest for what is being said. Agreeing to group breaks can solve this issue.
The facilitator may remind rules in case he/she feels this is needed.

4.6 Content management

The following points concern one of the key concepts of SO-CLOSE project, that is the connection between past and present experiences of forced displacement as a tool for fostering social cohesion. However, this connection should not be considered a simple juxtaposing operation. It challenges narratives, autobiographies, it deals with trauma and it should be properly addressed. While sharing their painful experiences, both past and recent refugees may feel uncomfortable when asked to find similarities or differences, since those experiences are now strong identity elements. What follows are some extra points for co-creation workshops dealing with these sensitive topics.
  ➢ The facilitator must select the way to approach the connection between past and present and be aware of the possible fallouts. Using visual or other sensorial tools can trigger emotional reactions that should be taken into account.
  ➢ Refugees need to be given enough time and space if required to express their feelings.
  ➢ The facilitator should make clear that this connection is not a comparison and, above all, it is not a comparison of pain.
  ➢ The facilitator should be prepared to deal with possible negative reactions by any of the participants who still need their stories to be recognized and, therefore, refuse anything sounding to them like a comparison.
  ➢ Negative reactions mentioned above should be accepted, concerns about the acknowledgment of a victim status should be reassured.

4.7 On-line FGs

Given the fact that the above said refers to the face-to-face mode, some specific guidelines are to be considered for online meetings, since online moderation is different and probably more difficult in terms of involvement and respect for the dialogue flow and allowing everybody to express themselves. Moreover, people lose their focus more rapidly online, also due to the body restraint caused by staying in the same position. Difficulties such as connection problems, which might often force participants to switch off their cameras or interruptions from family members have to be considered.

Some precautions have to be taken by the facilitator in order to mitigate such obstacles:

➢ set a specific time and date that fit all participants, asking them in advance to choose the quietest moment possible;

➢ clarify the length of the commitment and make sure to respect it;

➢ ask for technical capacities of the participants: devices available and familiarity with communication software;

➢ if there's no common software among participants, make sure to choose the simplest possible for a new user;

➢ make sure to be able to assist every participant in relation to the device s/he uses and the chosen software;

➢ make sure your equipment and connection work perfectly in order to be a reference point in case of problems;

➢ in relation to the length of the interaction, set and make clear for everybody that there will be breaks;

➢ make sure to use software that allow sound control. If disruptions occur for one participant, do not stigmatize her/him while trying to protect the interaction for the others muting that particular source;

➢ when the interrupted participants come back from the interruption, try to provide a short recap;

➢ do not skip the "getting to know each other" part of the interaction: because it is online, knowing who you are interacting with is essential to smooth the atmosphere and create a trusted atmosphere;

➢ when recording, declare it before the event and at the beginning of it. Audio recording is preferred, in order to limit the camera switching off when one doesn't feel comfortable about video recording;

➢ it is possible to give a time limit to participants for their interventions when there is no balance;

➢ help in keeping the focus, maybe using some interactive tools, such as padlets or word clouds, in order to support the process of retrieval of information. Graphic reporting is an

efficient tool to keep records of the conversation.

4.8 Validation

Imagining the co-creation process as a circle, the closing moment is represented by the validation of the outcomes. Facilitator(s) may collect and elaborate the results of the process, presenting them to the participants group and asking for a positive feedback or punctual request for changes. This follow-up process can be done through another session of workshop, through semi-structured collective questionnaire or through structured individual questionnaire.

5. Summary Chart

1. *Building content*	✓ Include the voices of participants through individual or collective interviews. ✓ Use open and/or closed questions.
2. *Setting*	✓ Informal, welcoming and not judgemental. ✓ Plan participants' allocation. ✓ Dispose participants in circle. ✓ Avoid barriers such as tables/desks.
3. *Participants*	✓ Enrolment: Inform about the scope and structure of the meeting. ✓ Number: 4-8 participants. ✓ Consider power differentials -including gender power differentials- and plan mitigation strategies. ✓ Plan language mediation (if necessary). ✓ Learn the participants' names. ✓ Create conditions for vulnerable participants to feel comfortable and avoid stigmatization.

4. *Mediation*	✓ Facilitation:
	  - Plan initial information to be given to participants.
	  - Divide the roles beforehand.
	  - Enable participants to dialogue without directing the conversation.
	  - Promote interventions from all participants.
	  - Reconduct when necessary;
	✓ Summarizing: write in a board keywords after each participants' intervention to give value to the interventions and create memory.
	✓ Recording:
	  - Ask for permission.
	  - Choose between audio or video recording: in doing so, consider the balance between richness of information and spontaneity of participation.

5. *Rules*	✓ State the guidelines clearly at the beginning. ✓ Consider participatory processes to agree upon the basic rules. ✓ Remind the rules whenever necessary.
6. *Content Management*	✓ Select the way to approach the connection between past and present and be aware of the possible fallouts.

	✓ Use visual or other sensorial tools. ✓ Give refugees enough time and space to express their feelings. ✓ Make clear that this connection is not a comparison of pain. ✓ Be prepared to deal with potential negative reactions. ✓ Accept negative reactions and reassure acknowledgement of victim status.
7. *On-line FGs*	✓ Set a specific time and date that fit all participants. ✓ Clarify the length of the commitment and make sure to respect it. ✓ Ask for technical capacities of the participants. ✓ Choose a software all participants know or the simplest possible for a new user. ✓ Make sure to be able to assist every participant in relation to the device s/he uses and the chosen software. ✓ In relation to the length of the interaction, set and make clear for everybody that there will be breaks. ✓ Make sure to use software that allow sound control. If disruptions occur for one participant, do not stigmatize her/him while trying to protect the interaction for the others muting that particular source. ✓ When the interrupted participants come back, try to provide a short recap. ✓ Do not skip the "getting to know each other" part of the interaction. ✓ When recording, declare it before the event and at the beginning of it. Audio recording is preferred. ✓ Consider giving a time limit to participants for their interventions when there is no balance. ✓ Help in keeping the focus: padlets, word clouds or graphic reporting can be useful tools.
8. *Validation*	✓ Collect and elaborate the results of the process. ✓ Present them to the participants to get their feedback. ✓ This follow-up process can be done through another session of workshop, a semi-structured collective questionnaire or a structured individual questionnaire.

6. Bibliography

Abou-Khalil, V., Helou, S., Flanagan, B., Pinkwart, N., & Ogata, H. (2019). Language Learning Tool for Refugees: Identifying the Language Learning Needs of Syrian Refugees Through Participatory Design. *Languages*, *4*(3), 71. doi:10.3390/languages4030071

Baraldi, C. (2009). *Dialogue in Intercultural Communities. From an educational point of view* (C. Baraldi, Ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bateson, G. (2000). *Steps to an ecology of mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bešić, E. (2020). Intersectionality: A pathway towards inclusive education? *Prospects*, *49*(3), 111–122. doi:10.1007/s11125-020-09461-6

Betts, A., & Bloom, L. (2013). The two worlds of humanitarian innovation. *RSC Working Paper Series*, *94*. Retrieved from https://www.rsc.ox.ac.uk/publications/the-two-worlds-of-humanitarian-innovation

Bohm, D. (2014). *On dialogue*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (2003). L'objectivation participante. *Actes de La Recherche En Sciences Sociales*, *150*(5), 43–58.

Brownill, S., & Natividad Puig, O. (2020). Introduction: Conceptualizing co-creation as a methodology. In C. Horvath & J. Carpenter (Eds.), *Co-creation in theory and practice: Exploring creativity in the global north and south* (pp. 1–23). Bristol: Bristol University Press.

Coleman, P. T., Deutsch, M., & Marcus, E. C. (Eds.). (2000). *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*(6), 1241–1299. doi:10.2307/1229039

Fisher, K. E., Yefimova, K., & Yafi, E. (2016, June 21). Future's Butterflies: Co-Designing ICT Wayfaring Technology with Refugee Syrian Youth. *Proceedings of the The 15th International Conference on Interaction Design and Children*, 25–36. Presented at the Manchester, United Kingdom. doi:10.1145/2930674.2930701

Folger, J. P., & Bush, R. A. B. (1996). Transformative mediation and third-party intervention: Ten hallmarks of a transformative approach to practice. *Mediation Quarterly*, *13*(4), 263–278.

doi:10.1002/crq.3900130403

Garcia-Carrión, R., & Gomez Gonzalez, A. (2018). Communicative methodology: doing research for social impact. Retrieved December 19, 2021, from NCRMNational Centre for Research Methods website: https://www.ncrm.ac.uk/news/show.php?article=5547

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of Communicative Action*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
Ind, N., & Coates, N. (2013). The meanings of co-creation. *European Business Review*, *25*(1), 86–95. doi:10.1108/09555341311287754

Jenkins, H., Peters-Lazaro, G., & Shresthova, S. (2020). *Popular Culture and the Civic Imagination: Case Studies of Creative Social Change*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Jensen, S., & Pieters, M. (2017). *The 7 principles of complete cocreation*. Amsterdam: BIS Publishers.

Lee, J., Schwartz, L., Long, E., & Naseem, M. (2018, May 30). Using Experiential-Learning and Iterative Design to Benefit Colorado's Refugees. *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference Companion Publication on Designing Interactive Systems*, 259–263. Presented at the Hong Kong, China. doi:10.1145/3197391.3205446

Lutz, H. (2015). Intersectionality as a method. *DiGeST. Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies*, *2*(1–2), 39–44. doi:10.11116/jdivegendstud.2.1-2.0039

Mezirow, J. (2003). *Apprendimento e trasformazione. Il significato dell'esperienza e il valore della riflessione nell'apprendimento degli adulti*. Milan: Raffaello Cortina Editore.

Morineau, J. (2016). *La méditation humaniste: Un autre regard sur l'avenir*. Toulouse: ERES.

Panksepp, J. (2004). *Affective Neuroscience: The Foundations of Human and Animal Emotions*. Kettering, Northamptonshire: Oxford University Press.

Patfoort, P. (1995). *Uprooting Violence: Building Nonviolence*. Cobblesmith.

Patfoort, P. (2001). *I want, you don't want. Nonviolence education*. Cobblesmith.

Pearce Barnett, W. (1989). *Communication and human conditions*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Prahalad, K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). *Future of Competition: Co-Creating Unique Value With Customers*. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press.

Rogers, C. (1951). *Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications and Theory*. London: Constable.

Romano, I. (2012). *Cosa Fare, Come Fare. Decidere insieme per praticare davvero la democrazia*. Milan: Chiarelettere.

Rosenberg Marshall, B. (2015). *Nonviolent Communication: A Language of Life: Life-Changing Tools for Healthy Relationships*. Chicago, IL: Independent Publishers Group.

Schön Donald, A. (Ed.). (1991). *The Reflective Turn*. New York CIty, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sclavi, M. (2003). *Arte di ascoltare e mondi possibili: come si esce dalle cornici di cui siamo parte*. Milan: Bruno Mondadori Editore.

Sclavi, M. (2008). Working with passion, anger and creativity. In D. De Leo & J. Forester (Eds.), *Reimagining planning: how Italian urban planners are changing planning practices* (pp. 180–200). Rome: INU Press.

Sclavi, M., & Susskind Lawrence, E. (2011). *Confronto creativo, dal diritto di parola al diritto di essere ascoltati*. Milan: Et al./ Edizioni.

Šuklje Erjavec, I., & Ruchinskaya, T. (2019). A Spotlight of Co-creation and Inclusiveness of Public Open Spaces. In C. Smaniotto Costa, I. Šuklje Erjavec, T. Kenna, M. de Lange, K. Ioannidis, G. Maksymiuk, & M. de Waal (Eds.), *CyberParks – The Interface Between People, Places and Technology: New Approaches and Perspectives* (pp. 209–223). doi:10.1007/978-3-030-13417-4_17

Thomas, K. W., & Kilmann, R. (2002). *Thomas-Kilmann conflict mode instrument*. Sunnyvale, CA: CPP Inc.

Topp, L., Mair, D., Smillie, L., & Cairney, P. (2020). Skills for co-creation. In V. Šucha & Sienkievickz, M (European Commission, Joint Research Centre) (Eds.), *Science for Policy Handbook*. Elsevier Limited.

Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, *68*(1), 1–17. doi:10.1509/jmkg.68.1.1.24036

Watzlawick, P. (1974). *Change: Principles of Problem Formation and Problem Resolution*. New York City, NY: Norton.

Webster, B. (2017, October 3). How can refugee communities be engaged in the co-design of education opportunities? And why does this matter? Retrieved December 19, 2021, from Medium website: https://medium.com/@benwebster20/how-can-refugee-communities-be-engaged-in-the-co-design-of-education-opportunities-fb9e5c2a1581

Winslade, J., Monk, G., & Cotter, A. (1998). A Narrative Approach to the Practice of Mediation. *Negotiation Journal*, *14*(1), 21–41. doi:10.1023/A:1024606303501

Wright, E. O. (2010). *Envisioning Real Utopias*. New York City, NY: Verso Books.