9 Navigating Uncertainty

Developing the Facilitator's Role Through Participatory Service Design Workshops

*Maija Rautiainen, Michelle Van Wyk
and Satu Miettinen*

Introduction

The facilitator role in participatory service design workshops is central to developing trust with workshop participants. The core of facilitating and understanding various impacts of the workshops is in recognising the complexity (Kingsbury, 2017) of and various challenges in developing decolonising practices within a sensitive context (see De Lima Costa, 2013; Maldonado-Torres, 2011; Nakata et al., 2012) that employ arts-based methods (ABMs) and how to utilise them with the underserved youth and communities. This is done through creating a keen awareness of important factors that facilitators might be unaware of but need to keep in mind when preparing and conducting workshops within these communities. Poor access to public services, such as basic education and healthcare, and a lack of opportunities in the job market are the realities the communities face. Sensitising processes of the facilitator include gaining a conscious sensitivity and an informed approach to the realities and complexities that the locals encounter in their lives (Istratii, 2019).

The facilitators' sensitising process, actions and ABMs were reflected in the 'Participatory Development with Youth' (PARTY) project, which sought to advance human development and assist in reducing youth unemployment by increasing the involvement of young people in service development. In working towards these aims, the project researchers used service design methods in the participatory arts-based workshops where ABMs were used such as visual arts, design, video production and theatre. In the workshops, we experienced some positive impacts on youths' self-esteem and empowerment, which have been discussed elsewhere in more detail (see e.g. Miettinen et al., 2017; Sarantou et al., 2018). The PARTY project aimed to utilise and build on the creative potential and tacit skills (such as drawing and craft-making) practised by youth, embracing the tradition of storytelling and tacit knowledge about coping in marginalised circumstances that historically have been present in their communities and the greater society. The ABMs drew on embodied action, such as arts and creative making or performing roles for team building with youth, which, in turn, created a sense of community and learning. These participatory service design workshops were conducted in youth communities based in Grabouw and Platfontein, South Africa, and Windhoek, Namibia.

By responding to the needs of youth to foster self-appreciation through recognition of their skills and talents, ABMs can increase the youths' ability to confront, process and confront the challenges in their complex circumstances (Miettinen &

Sarantou, 2019). One of the main benefits of ABM is that it supports grassroots actions where youth can share their opinions, be heard at some level within and outside of their community, and develop greater confidence when engaging in dialogue with stakeholders in the public space (Miettinen et al., 2016). Furthermore, ABMs stress the ownership of youth in different development processes through participatory action. Arts-based research (ABR) practice is at the core of this kind of development work (Leavy, 2015). Thus, ABM and ABR work hand in hand (see e.g. Chapter 13).

There are many different types of challenges in developing decolonising practices through ABMs. One of the most important lies in ensuring that the facilitation process is respectful and ethical and that the facilitators are culturally sensitive (e.g. Smith, 2013, pp. 9, 178), which requires that they understand the complex structures within the contexts in which the people live. Sensitising is essential in recognising and acknowledging the tensions, inequalities and social injustices in the local context, and it is the requisite first step when working with local communities (van Stam, 2014). This includes acknowledging the inevitable blind spots facilitators may have. Sensitising is a process whereby there is appropriate consideration of the ethical processes and contextual knowledge of the youths' circumstances (Fouka & Mantzorou, 2011; Shivayogi, 2013). For example, San youth face marginalisation and trauma as a result of large San communities having experienced assimilation and relocation from Namibia to South Africa. These traumatic life events have generationally affected the self-appreciation of the youth, as well as caused transitional trauma.

The importance of understanding colonial history and its continuing impact on the everyday lives and experiences of people and communities cannot be overstated. Besides broader historical and structural issues, awareness of local cultural practices is very important, as, for example, when navigating the issue of obtaining participants' consent, it needs to be acknowledged that it often must also be verbally granted by the elders in communities. In the participatory service design workshops, the facilitator's goal is to help navigate the complex tensions between the participants and stakeholders, such as potential future employers, political governing bodies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) that work in the communities. With tools made available through ABMs (see Taylor & Ladkin, 2009; Yassi et al., 2016), inclusive atmospheres can be created, but tensions will inevitably exist despite workshops being designed in collaboration with local partners. The participants may come from different backgrounds and experience different kinds of challenges in their lives.

The facilitator best navigates and addresses these potential differences by respectfully addressing emotions that may surface during the workshop. This is best approached by being aware of several perspectives and knowledge sets with which to inform the atmosphere of the workshop and by acknowledging the value each one brings to it. In the case of the PARTY project, the facilitators were from different cultural backgrounds, and this impacted their understanding of how behaviour, gestures and expressions would be interpreted by the participants and vice versa. In this context, the facilitators were operating within European Marie Curie secondments that totalled 255 secondment months. This meant a high rotation of people and constantly changing faces which, as we noted in hindsight, affected establishing trust within relationships with youth and fostering commitment and motivation to participate in the workshops.

To better prepare the European facilitators for their role, it was essential to sensitise them, making them aware of possible challenges and ensuring that they had a realistic understanding of the actions, workshops and goals before arriving in Namibia and South Africa, as they were not as knowledgeable about the central issues as the local facilitators. As important as understanding the challenges ahead was, it was crucial to understand the expectations that the facilitators themselves held without being aware of the cultural differences between the facilitators and participants, and how these unintentional expectations would potentially impact their experiences, judgements and responses in certain situations. To explain these challenges, this chapter sets out to examine and detail the work done in the workshops conducted in Namibia and South Africa, which highlighted the uncertainty of the facilitator's role and the development of decolonising practices.

Theoretical Framework

ABMs can play a role in enhancing capabilities that enable empowerment and dialogue. Savin-Baden and Howell-Major (2013) have pointed out that ABR draws on ABMs to steer the moral commitment for participating communities. This process includes the participants creating artefacts that foster their personal transformations and serve as means to communicate with their audience and researchers. ABMs can use stories, storytelling and artefact making, which help the participants to process their emotions on a deeper level. By sharing them through processes of artefact making and storytelling, communities can draw on reflexivity to process difficult issues. The activity presents the participants with opportunities to critically reflect on their circumstances and life experiences (Miettinen et al., 2016). Artistic skills are not the focal point of the activities; rather, the outcome is expected to be the initiation of an individual empowerment process, which may involve the inclusion of the entire community and the identification of possible solutions for their everyday challenges.

As Leavy (2015) has noted, community-based participatory research concentrates on finding solutions to problems and finding collaborative and social actions that enhance trust amongst participants, community, researchers and stakeholders. ABR combines multiple research methods. It is experiential and flexible, and applies methods in dialogue with requirements for transforming the development processes of communities. According to Leavy, ABMs can also cultivate empathy and self-reflection through the disruption of dominant narratives by exploiting the powers of performance and storytelling. In the case of the PARTY project, the use of artistic methods, especially storytelling, enabled both the participants and the facilitators to better understand one another and create a dialogue through stories. These methods do not draw on expertise; hence, they encourage participation and collaboration on more equal levels.

Service design is a participatory methodology used for creating new or improving existing services (Bowen et al., 2010). It has a strong collaborative and human-centred focus that fits well in the context of community development (Gill et al., 2011). Service design offers a vast selection of participatory methodologies to include individuals and communities in the process of developing their services. This promotes concrete and more democratic participation in the process of designing service production and delivery. In the context of the PARTY project, it was essential to develop new ways to include the voices of the Indigenous youth in the dialogue about their needs and

wishes concerning their futures and practical circumstances within and outside of their communities.

The Facilitator's Role in the Context of Decolonial Thinking and Doing

Decolonial thinking and doing emerged in the Global South as a counterpoint to the very foundation of modernity/coloniality. Modernity is a consequence of colonial structures and processes. Decolonial concepts and actions involve critical thinking about Eurocentric power systems and limits to their hegemony (Mignolo, 2011). ABMs and research strategies are used to promote participatory, respectful and inclusive collaboration between researchers and communities. In this research case, art and artefact making—for example, the creation of posters, storytelling and performance such as using theatrical methods or storytelling templates—were applied as approaches to process emotions through creative expression. Understanding the importance that these approaches play in Indigenous communities (see e.g. Fouka & Mantzorou, 2011; Flicker et al., 2014; Hammond et al., 2018) can support the potential usefulness of ABMs in the facilitation of decolonial processes. These reflect the impact of the research regarding the community and its stakeholders, as well as various power relations that are attached to the research process (Smith, 2013) and facilitation of arts-based activities. Furthermore, it is important that the research outcomes are discussed and interpreted with the communities (Braun et al., 2014), thus not offering only the researchers' interpretation or viewpoint.

Yet, even with sensitisation and learning about the historical and political context, there are some uncertainties in the facilitator's role that could not be prepared for. The 2015–2016 student movement, known as #FeesMustFall, started at Wits University and soon spread across government-funded universities in South Africa. #FeesMustFall was one of many protests against what South African youth saw as systemic oppression birthed by colonialism and apartheid (Hendricks, 2018). The movement started off as a protest against increasing 2016 university fees but grew to become the unheard voice of many underlying issues pertaining to higher education in South Africa. Due to growing anger at the government's ongoing non-responsiveness to issues that were raised, the #FeesMustFall movement eventually turned violent, resulting in many universities being vandalised and student activists being arrested (Langa, 2017). The #FeesMustFall movement was preceded and underpinned by the #RhodesMustFall movement that had taken place a few months earlier, where students protested against the statue of Cecil John Rhodes situated on the University of Cape Town's main campus. #RhodesMustFall drew attention to the visible presence of colonial structures on campus, in essence echoing the colonial nature of university systems and approaches to education (Langa, 2017; Mavango, 2019). Students protested the unaffordable fees that prohibited access to education and curricula that are Eurocentric, offering little support and relatability in a pan-African context. Hendricks (2018) describes universities as 'rigged spaces' in that the notion of transformation has been communicated in the way that universities position themselves, but noted that no shift in power, orientation or forms of knowledge production had occurred. This is problematic because the fundamental building blocks of universities in South Africa have been formed from what Hendricks has described as 'norms, values, cultures, and epistemologies of the West' (p. 18). Keet et al. (2017) reflect on the 2015–2016 student protests in South Africa in their editorial, pointing out the contradiction between

social justice and social reality as one of the obvious reasons behind the protests. The authors support Hendricks's (2018) point about the lack of decolonial thinking, concluding that it is often only a theoretical concept, and it is not effectively transferred into practice.

These student protests took place during the PARTY project and impacted both the realisation of the project and the facilitators' mindsets. Some of the workshops were cancelled, as some youth found it very important to participate in the protests, fighting for a future that they needed and wanted to be a part of. The facilitators fully understood and supported this, and they were appreciative of the fact that they could see the agency that students had in applying decolonising practices. Due to these student movements (#FeesMustFall, #RhodesMustFall and #PatriarchyMustFall), now often collectively referred to as the Fallism movement, unprecedented changes have taken place in fee structures, access to education and student accommodation, workers' conditions and institutional culture that addresses relevance in taught curriculum content (Booyesen, 2016; Mavango, 2019).

Self-reflection is an essential component of sensitisation when working in any workshop context involving marginalised communities. The facilitator can often represent the colonial power structures of the past and carry out the legacy of the colonial trauma that has been suffered, thus impacting how one relates to the other. This highlighted the need for understanding and processing one's being in this political context for many of the facilitators during the PARTY project. It also created difficulties and uncertainties in adapting to the facilitator's role and raised the question of how to address this uneasy relation with the 'other'. Reflection on power structures impacted the experiences that came about during the workshops, as facilitators were keenly intent on not reinforcing colonial practices. A practical example of this was the effort to renegotiate research protocols to be inclusive of community practices. This included such things as the facilitators understanding the hesitance around signing printed documents (consent forms, which are stipulated research criteria) and treating the process of obtaining consent with careful awareness. Thus, a simple verbal explanation of the terms of consent and facilitating such verbal communications were essential in achieving respectful research.

One of the main goals of the PARTY project was to understand how to support empowerment. The complexity of facilitating empowerment without creating the perception of hierarchy and imposition, which are associated with colonial practices, is an additional challenge that facilitators face. Also, language plays an important role in workshops with marginalised communities, as English is often not a mother tongue but another remnant of foreign colonial systems. This, in turn, can affect self-confidence in communication with facilitators. Facilitation is not forcing people to do something, but rather enabling people to use their energies in a creative way (Jenkins & Jenkins, 2006). Engaging in a common goal in a workshop is a voluntary action and requires the commitment of the participants (McInerney, 2016). When working with communities, it is always very helpful to have a native speaker to assist with the interpretations of communication between participants and researchers. It is also a sign of respect. It is important to fully acknowledge and take into consideration the participants' culture and strive for equality in the communication.

The facilitator is more easily trusted and able to lead a successful workshop when perceived as a neutral actor and not someone in an authoritative position who controls the participants (see Di Russo, 2016, p. 149; Schwarz, 2002; Wilkinson, 2012).

This means that the facilitator cannot be part of the group or have a role as a designer in the workshop, as the group itself works as the core design team (Di Russo, 2016, p. 149; Schwarz, 2002). Facilitators need to put their egos and personal points of view aside (Wilkinson, 2012), as their task is to encourage the creativity of the group by using participatory and collaborative methods (Di Russo, 2016, p. 149). This may often practically take the form of creating room for their lived experiences to take precedence.

Understanding how to behave or how behaviour is interpreted by becoming aware of cultural differences constituted the sensitisation of the facilitators. In the case of the PARTY project, some facilitators were from European countries. It is important to recognise and understand that multiple cultural viewpoints frame personal lived experiences, have an impact on us and influence how we see our realities. These go beyond one individual in the role of facilitator. Yet, we, as facilitators and designers, can play an important role through respectful design (Steen et al., 2011; Tunstall, 2013) by considering the framework (Reitsma et al., 2019) for this, namely: the 1) role of leadership; 2) utilisation of power; 3) ownership of process, outcomes, ideas and material culture; and 4) the role of the Indigenous community and its knowledge. Facilitators need to gain several skills, including developing qualities, methods and roles to balance the work as a facilitator and understand the concept of respectful design. The role of facilitators involves encouraging the participants, keeping focus, energising others, getting things started, closing, recording, building consensus, managing dysfunctions, and preparing and challenging the participants in order to keep the workshop flow going (Schwarz, 2002). The facilitator can have many roles, such as motivator, guide, questioner, timekeeper, organiser, teacher, interpreter, communicator and activator, where the focal point is to reach a result that is created, understood and accepted by all participants (Wilkinson, 2012). All the actions and roles of the facilitator are aimed at enabling the participants to work towards solutions and results (Hjalmarsson et al., 2015). Thus, facilitation is a guided process of moving things forward and acquiring relevant knowledge through activities (Horsfall & Cleary, 2008).

Research Design

The research design described in this chapter was based on long-term participatory action research (PAR) (Kemmis et al., 2015). Teachers and researchers worked as facilitators during their secondments in South Africa and Namibia, forming the focus group for the research. In the European focus group, there were one male and five females whose expertise was in teaching, technical support and research for the project. The focus group included two authors of this chapter, who had extensive knowledge of the PARTY project, one of whom had long-term experience in facilitating workshops with vulnerable communities. All the focus group participants had concluded several fieldwork visits where they facilitated service design workshops in Namibia and South Africa. The use of focus group discussions (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2009) generated more informal discussions and reflections on each other's learning, where participants could respond to comments and ideas, which resulted in rich multivocal data sets. In addition, workshop sessions were reported after each fieldwork period. These reports were also analysed, and they offered us significant insights into the fieldwork experiences and feedback from youth who participated in the workshops.

The selection of the specific PAR was driven by a strong motivation to have an impact on the role of the facilitator in the context of service design as well to address decolonial thinking and doing. PAR seeks to influence service design communities of practice (Kemmis et al., 2013) that work with vulnerable or marginalised communities. Focus group discussions served as reflexive learning tools for collecting data about the facilitators' experiences in the field (Parker & Tritter, 2006). The reflexive discussions supported the purpose of the action research to develop the practice with the community. The research design was constructed around several research cycles where both documentation and analysis of data were conducted. These cycles were divided into fieldwork periods for working with facilitation and reflective focus group discussions. One focus group discussion took place during the project and one after the project. The research process (Figure 9.1) followed these phases: 1) sensitising and ethical and service design training for fieldwork; 2) fieldwork, facilitating the workshops and reporting; 3) focus group discussions and the content analyses; 4) fieldwork, facilitating the workshops and reporting; and 5) pre-task, focus group discussion and content analyses.

The first focus group discussion was formed around research questions about the role of facilitators and their experiences, emotions and activities before and during the workshops, and their experiences after the workshops. The discussion lasted two hours. The second focus group discussion was constructed around a set of preparatory questions as a pre-task. These were focused on one's role as workshop facilitator. Participants were asked to choose a photograph taken during the workshops that would visually illustrate their role in a chosen situation. They were directed to consider the following questions: 1) How do you interact with the youth?; 2) What does the picture tell you?; 3) What kind of role do you have?; 4) How do you accommodate youth's needs and concerns?; and 5) How do the ABMs help facilitate the interaction and decolonise workshop structures? The second focus group discussion had four of the same participants as in the first interview. The second discussion was conducted a year after the PARTY project had ended, which made it possible to reflect on experiences further along in time. This focus group discussion took two hours. One of the authors facilitated the discussion.

The analysis of the data documentation of the focus groups followed (Wilkinson, 2011). The theory-based data analysis (Aneshensel, 2002) focused on the verbal communication of the focus group discussions, transcripts of the focus group discussions

Figure 9.1 Research process in self-reflections of the focus group in the PARTY project.

and written reports. The theoretical framework and data analysis process included the following steps: 1) first focus group discussion on the thematic elements of the PARTY project; 2) thematic analyses of the discussion and defining the theoretical framework; 3) second focus group discussion alongside the theoretical framework; and 4) theory-based data analyses of the second focus group discussion, workshop reports and self-reflection tasks. The workshop reports included feedback from the youth who had participated in the workshops. The focus group visited Namibia and South Africa separately and partly together a total of 25 times over 19 months. The duration of the secondments varied from two weeks to two months, and a total of 20 workshop reports were produced from these activities. The research design enabled the development of the facilitator's role in the service design workshops.

The Sensitising Process for Facilitators

The sensitising process in the PARTY project included: 1) ethical training sessions that were managed by a representative of the South African San Institute; 2) service design and workshop facilitation training sessions that were conducted by the PARTY project manager; 3) documentaries related to San culture; 4) selection of reading materials; and 5) an ethical check on the completed workshop reports. In-depth sensitising was highly dependent on the participants' interest and motivation, as these actions could not be forced. The goal of the sensitising process was to increase the facilitators' awareness of the colonial pasts of Namibia and South Africa, as well as the historical marginalisation of the Indigenous San people (Francis & Francis, 2010). It was important to make facilitators aware of ethical issues related to working with Indigenous communities (Tunón et al., 2016). Ultimately, the most important part of the sensitising process was that the facilitators considered their own attitudes and expectations related to how youth live and what kinds of skills they have. This was essential, as false expectations can produce simplified perspectives and negatively impact the outcomes.

Ethical training sessions were conducted at the University of Lapland for the project researchers and facilitators. They were conducted by representatives of the South African San Institute who had been working with the Indigenous San communities for long periods of time and who had gained a trusting relationship with the communities as well as extensive expertise on ethical issues relevant to the San communities. Their expertise was related to the problems that had occurred in the earlier research projects and provided the opportunity to establish good practices and respectful attitudes required to work with the San youth. They had been involved in publishing the San Code of Research Ethics (Schroeder et al., 2019; South African San Institute, 2018). Ethical training sessions were documented by recordings so absentees could obtain the same information as the participants. The key point of the training was to increase awareness and understanding of the actual circumstances and challenges in the context, as well as to create informed action with the workshop participants with whom the researchers were in contact. In the workshops, awareness and understanding of the context were created through the stories shared about local histories. Moreover, it was important to promote dialogue between the facilitators and the participants to create relationships amongst people coming from different backgrounds and contexts.

The training sessions on service design and workshop facilitation introduced the researchers to some basic principles of service design and practical issues related to workshop organisation, such as the contents, timetable, workshop methods and

different roles during the workshops. The use of embodied action and participatory service design methods were discussed as approaches for joint activities that could be conducted in an inclusive manner. Such a manner was, for example, accomplished by the facilitators considering ways to increase equality and reduce hierarchical workshop structures such as the more traditional teaching set-up that often has the teacher, who is higher in the hierarchy, in front of the classroom giving a lecture, and the students, who are lower in the hierarchy, sitting down. To change this set-up, the facilitator can consider where they locate themselves in the space, and if they are sitting down or standing (Cui, 2019). There are also cultural meanings related to standing up and sitting down. For example, in certain contexts in Namibia, it is considered rude to stand while you are waiting. Through one's own actions, the facilitator can gain multiple benefits by reducing hierarchy and decreasing tension in the workshop. The thoughts about embodied action, such as football playing, of the youths and facilitators were discussed in the training sessions. The aim to act with respect towards the participating youths and their culture was clarified by a set of questions, such as: Do I act like local participants? Do I play football during the break with the local participants? Will I observe and participate in local customs—and, for example, eat—in a traditional way? Embodied action—for example, in playing games together—can facilitate the dismantling of hierarchies and enable decolonial doing (Butterwick & Selman, 2012).

The inclusion of youth in the planning of the workshop content was important. A significant part of the sensitising process was learning and adapting participatory service design methodologies (Yang & Sung, 2016). Participants should know what the workshop is about, what the goals are, what they would gain from it and what outcomes or results will be coming from it. The consent forms should be simple and clear so that the participants understand to what they are giving their consent. Moreover, it has to be considered that the consent form itself can be seen as a colonising 'tool' because the benefit of it is clearly for the researcher and not as much for the participants. This is related to practices that are not usual for them and/or if they do not necessarily recognise it as a form of protection and understand how to use it for this purpose. Recording consent videos in the participants' spoken language during the project was an effective step we took to eliminate this problem and the tensions related to it. Participatory methods provide more opportunities to encourage youths to commit to the workshop. Amongst the methods, it should be noted, is to allow enough time for meaningful discussions and writing in their native language and to create room to unpack any possible challenging experiences. One aspect to consider is that many of the roles to be fulfilled during the workshops can also be given to the youths. This changes their role from that of participant to an organiser, which highlights the importance of their agency within the workshop. Also, 'leave behinds', such as community posters, printed photographs and access to video footage taken during the activities, are an important part of the workshop so that they can partake in, and feel ownership of, the results.

The focus group emphasised that the sensitising process made it easier to be aware of the responsibilities that come with the facilitators' role. The facilitators experienced that they could plan the secondments and workshops as much as they wanted before the secondment, but the reality of what worked in workshops and the circumstances at sites only became validated in action. Sensitisation to the colonial legacy was affirmed by each secondment and during the time spent with the youths and other

partners at the sites. An effective decolonial practice would be to offer opportunities and provide alternatives to the community, and design and plan together with them, and then conduct the workshops based on their specific needs and interests. Often, actions such as introducing pre-planned ideas into a community that had no say in the development or design of the activity can be seen as colonial practices. Decolonial planning practices should include planning with the community in real time and then running the workshop with them.

The Facilitator's Role and ABMs in Participatory Service Design Workshops

The overall theoretical framework followed the themes that had already been investigated and found important during the PARTY project of 2015–2019. In the first focus group, the main themes that were frequently discussed included: 1) The role and the content of service design workshops—*how the service design methodologies and process were used in the project and how the participatory actions were designed and implemented during these workshops*; 2) the role of ABMs—*how the ABMs were experienced as impacting the equality and power relationships, as well as the atmosphere and interpersonal relationships, in preparation of and during the workshops*; 3) the facilitator's role during the workshop; and 4) the role of decolonial thinking and doing in the workshop actions, and activities and their experienced impact—*what different types of power structures and overall problems were encountered during the fieldwork visits and what the impact of the practical doing was during the workshops*. The themes were discussed, and it seemed that, for some of them, the facilitators had more questions than answers. The sensitising process, the fieldwork periods and the focus group discussions provoked self-reflections and enhanced sensitivity in understanding the power structures, past historical context and societal challenges related to the realities of Indigenous youth.

The Role of Service Design and ABMs

The facilitators found that the ABMs contributed towards a more equal and participatory workshop experience. They tried to construct their roles not only as facilitators or tutors, but as collaborators who could be met and engaged in discussion on a more equal level. ABMs were experienced as a way to apply decolonial thinking and doing, rather than relying on outdated or even colonial power structures in education (Kerr, 2014). We also found that the ABMs enabled the facilitators and the workshop participants to familiarise themselves with each other. The ABMs contributed to creating more relaxed feelings, and embodied action, such as roleplaying or craft- and art-making, contributed to more balanced and equal relationships between the facilitators and the workshop participants. After the workshop, the facilitators noted that relaxed and free discussion was easier. This felt empowering for both the facilitators and the participants, and it enabled social interaction amongst individuals who were from different cultural backgrounds. Both the facilitators and workshop participants were able to reposition themselves and self-reflect on their roles through embodied activities during the workshops. Moreover, the arts-based and embodied activities were diverse and numerous during the PARTY project: working with artistic interventions in the communities, team building activities such as playing football, mindfulness

activities and drama and storytelling activities, as well as learning different textile and craft-making techniques.

The focus group discussions highlighted the relevance of encountering youth as well as the interaction and communication for creating trust, empowerment and dialogue. The workshops had the aim of consciously raising the self-esteem of the participants, which was one of the challenges indicated in prior studies (see Chennells, 2009). The action was intended to enhance possibilities for youth self-empowerment. The interpersonal relationships from person to person, without their stepping into more detailed, previously planned roles, were essential in encouraging and fostering the commitment of the participants to participate in the activities, and the facilitators were responsible for reflecting on the attitudes and unconscious communication they brought to the workshop. Mutual respect enabled possibilities for assuming a human-centred focus in the workshops. It encouraged genuine concern about and awareness of multiple life experiences and the significance of individual life encounters. The focal point was to understand the circumstances. Hierarchy and power structures were difficult to overcome, but through the use of ABMs, it was possible to create at least some opportunities for dialogue and more equal encounters to emerge between the facilitators and the workshop participants.

Participatory service design methods and ABMs aided the facilitation of the workshops in constructive ways. The methods fostered the creation of an atmosphere whereby the participants could feel they were welcome and taken, as best as possible, into consideration. Cultural differences were reflected on and carefully considered in the planning of the workshops. Although the facilitators made a detailed plan for the workshop in advance, it was impossible to know how the plan would play out in practice. However, their comprehensive understanding of the service design methods allowed them to quickly adapt their plans at times when flexibility was needed. There were opportunities for youth empowerment by providing them with the chance to teach something to others, including the other participants and the facilitator. The feedback received from the participants showed that reversing the roles gave them a sense of equality and a sense that they were contributing as individuals. This required input from the facilitators' side, in that they had to encourage and support the mutual learning process, and be open to new experiences.

According to the feedback the participants gave after the workshops, the participants and the facilitators believed that stories and storytelling were at the core of ABMs. The influence of using stories was considered powerful in many ways. In their feedback, the youths mentioned that stories enabled them to express themselves and be seen by the group members in a new way. The empathy created through storytelling diminished the perceived hierarchy between the facilitators and the workshop participants, which is also related to stories being often valued and helping with feeling, hearing and understanding the storyteller, facilitator or participant (see Gair, 2012). The facilitators understood, in the very practical process of doing and learning together with the participants, the significance of reflecting on the stories told in an empathetic, respectful and accepting way, as well as appreciating the stories.

The main result of using participatory design and ABMs was engagement with others through diverse means. This transformation affected participants, facilitators and the entire group. Participants had gained new perspectives, which increased their ability to see value in their own actions, regard themselves from another perspective and feel proud of their contributions and roles. This was demonstrated, for instance,

in the 'poster intervention' conducted with San youth, when they were engaged in sharing their concerns with the community by drawing posters and displaying them anonymously in public spaces. According to their feedback, the youths believed that this action provided them an opportunity to voice their ideas and feelings to the community and gauge the community's impact from the message. The facilitator also experienced the transaction as rewarding and informative and as a means to generate the ability to critically evaluate her own actions. The workshops produced bonding between the facilitator and the participants as well as amongst the participants themselves, which in turn strengthened their commitment to each other and improved the facilitator's understanding of the youths and their communities.

The youths' impressions and reflections after the workshops showed that they considered them an opportunity to process their problems, emotions and issues. Amongst the youths, art was seen as a method for healing. Thus, these methods enhanced self-confidence and developed the patience needed for processing complex questions. They discovered that the ABMs could be used to broaden the possibilities for life choices, exploring possibilities and perspectives that relate to their life situations by using their art to communicate their views on the challenges they face in the community in which they live, and to the NGOs that work with them, to address some of the challenges they face. Art practices helped them to again recognise the value and importance of their arts and crafts, traditions and rituals, as well as their own cultural and historical roots. They experienced that art could be used as a method to start the discussion on certain problems within the community. However, there were also some obvious limits to the impact of the use of ABMs. The workshops could not even come close to solving many of the serious challenges in their lives, but they did provide them with some new perspectives and means to learn how to approach these in different ways.

Namibia's painful colonial past of slavery and apartheid can be considered the foundation for many current societal problems, including widespread inequality and lack of access to opportunities. The youth participating in the workshops believed that, while a lot had already been achieved, Namibia had not yet been able to break free from the colonial legacy. They expressed their concern about critical societal challenges such as the lack of free education, high unemployment numbers and poverty. The ABMs helped them to discuss these complex issues in their society. As a result, they felt more confident in challenging their role as a minority. They stated that the arts gave them a voice and that art made it easier to process feelings, emotions and abstract issues as well as provided them the opportunity to say freely what they felt. Freedom was mentioned as an essential part of being able to express themselves through art, as it was a very unique means to express their voice.

The Facilitator's Role in the Context of Decolonial Thinking and Doing

Historical tensions in society, workshops and everyday life caused uncertainty in the facilitators (Chambers & Curti, 1996). The fieldwork sites were based in communities that experienced poverty, unemployment, racism, lack of opportunities for education and even scarcity of food. This made the facilitators aware of the difficult and complex circumstances facing the participating youth. The facilitators felt unsure and critical about their own contributions and understood how insignificant their impact would be on the lives of these young people. This resulted in them self-critically evaluating and questioning the purpose and meaning of the workshop actions. Facilitating

workshops and getting to know these youths had made it necessary for the facilitators to process and reflect on their own attitudes and intentions. The role of the facilitator was ideally seen as that of a neutral actor, but at the fieldwork sites, it became clear that the facilitators needed to understand the complex tensions related to the role of a facilitator, as it was strongly influenced by colonial power structures in education (Kerr, 2014).

One of the key structural challenges of the PARTY project was that the overall funding instrument (MSCA RISE) was Eurocentric, as the main beneficiaries of the project were European institutions. The funding instrument positioned the African partners as 'third country' representatives. This affected the relationships amongst the PARTY consortium partners and resulted in questioning—rightfully and justifiably—the project values as participatory, tolerant and inclusive in respect to the actual collaboration. These issues were openly discussed amongst the collaborators, who as such could not eradicate the existing power imbalance, but it did nevertheless provide the possibility for the partners to present their criticisms and reflect on the situation which was considered unfair by many of them. Despite this and other challenges, some of which were caused by the particularities of the funding instrument, the project was also able to produce positive impacts. For example, the sensitising process and self-reflections of the facilitators succeeded relatively well, which made it possible for the workshops to be organised in a collaborative manner, and also some advancement was made in developing decolonial strategies for the project and fieldwork periods. The most essential means to negotiate the technical constraints of the funding instrument, as well as the broader structural issues in the context of this project, were personal relationships, encounters, collective discussions and reflections amongst those involved.

For the facilitators, their role in the workshop was not limited to technical facilitation. Many steps had to be taken before a workshop could be organised, as the facilitator needed to recognise and understand their own positionality in light of the political and colonial history, societal challenges and even demonstrations during the fieldwork periods, as well as economic and disadvantaged opportunities amongst the partners.

The facilitators discussed and reflected on their roles and actions through the preparatory task that they were assigned before the focus group discussions. The facilitators' role changed as they needed to carry out multiple roles during the workshops. Even though the facilitator was always placed in the role of the guiding authority, the workshops were designed and carried out in such a way that it made it possible to offer a participatory experience for all involved. The ABMs used for advancing equality and implementing the participatory approach included the personal actions and histories of the participants. This helped in developing closer and more personal relationships with youth. On the basis of the youths' feedback, it seems that they especially enjoyed embodied actions such as playing football, role playing, arts-based activities and storytelling. The fact that the facilitators showed interest in their experiences and stories was regarded as an opportunity for them to be heard, and it was also important that they were encountered as individuals, as this created a sense of caring and engagement. The relationships were further developed each time they met, and it was seen that embodied actions created trust between the facilitator and participants. The focus group discussions concentrated on the ways in which the experience had impacted the facilitators' mindset and resulted in more critical processing and self-reflection on understanding the ethical considerations. For the facilitators, the

learning experiences were rewarding, but also challenging. The personal abilities of the facilitators impacted how well they coped with challenges and uncertainties. Continuous assessment of capacities for handling complex situations in different contexts and the added need for flexibility resulted in the facilitator's role being characterised by uncertainty. Often, this means not really knowing how to act and carry out such a role. Unfamiliar power structures create uncertainty about how actions would be interpreted by the participants, especially in a context with which the facilitator is not fully familiar—in this case, a postcolonial context (Matlosa, 1998).

All focus group participants experienced uncertainty in a similar way. There were tensions, power structures and polarisations amongst the different communities and between male and female representatives, and between European and Southern African institutions. For the facilitators, some hierarchies and power structures were challenging to perceive. During the course of the project, it became clear to the facilitators that their contributions were bound to be very minor as they were not involved in aid work and could not through their role have large impacts or effect structural change. Simultaneously, it was very important for them to be able to manage the expectations of the youths to avoid potential disappointments caused by unrealistic expectations. Facilitators sometimes felt there was a lack of trust and oversight in the local context. In fact, they had very little communication outside of the workshops with the participating communities. These tensions were addressed in discussions between facilitators and local actors (partners, communities and NGOs) to enable critical reflections on the facilitator's role. The reflective approach and dialogue contributed to clarifying the role of facilitators and workshops as contributors to local innovation, new perspectives and collaboration. The focus group discussions were an important way for facilitators to critically self-reflect on their roles in the fieldwork and develop their understanding of ethical engagement, local culture, colonial history and power structures.

Discussion and Conclusion

The use of ABMs in the service design workshops had clear benefits for both the workshop participants and facilitators. The facilitators could use the ABMs—especially the embodied action such as craft-making, roleplaying and gaming—in the workshop plan, which created a more relaxed, open and inclusive attitude during the workshops. Critical reflections on these approaches after the workshops were useful to explore their value in decolonial thinking and doing when possible cross-cutting approaches in workshop settings. This was demonstrated, for example, through the activities where workshop participants could take a leadership role and use their creative potential, as well as storytelling abilities, and create positive and empowering outcomes in the workshops.

As in all group work, diverse tensions between the participants or between the facilitator and participants will exist. In postcolonial contexts, the facilitator needs skills and competencies to understand complex issues and face tensions that are historical, social, political and cultural, and those related to contextual hierarchies and power structures. Critical reflections on the attitudes of the facilitators in a postcolonial context can assist them in processing their experiences of uncertainty in such contexts. Embodied actions can be used to release tensions related to interaction between facilitators and participants, and to create a more equal and welcoming environment

to encounter each other in a participatory service design workshop. Sensitivity to and awareness of circumstances play essential roles in the process of creating long-lasting interpersonal and institutional relationships, as well as respectful mutual experiences and learning processes for workshop facilitators and participants. Facilitators can set an example and lead the workshop by their actions to promote open dialogue and reflection, drawing on creative energies within the workshop setting. In openly and honestly acknowledging that oversights can occur unintentionally, facilitators can learn from their experiences in facilitating workshops with vulnerable communities and increase their confidence in conducting future workshops that require careful ethical engagement.

In vulnerable communities, the benefits of using ABMs in facilitation can be realised when facilitation takes place carefully and respectfully. The feeling of succeeding in something or in some activity can create trust and empathy amongst the participants. The ABMs provided possibilities to carefully consider all participants' needs and interests, and to reduce hierarchy and create new ways to understand and encourage interaction amongst individuals. The stories and storytelling were used in several workshops, and they created engagement and empathy in the workshops that presented the participants with more means and methods to process and manage the challenges in their lives and communities. The workshops could not significantly impact any large societal issues, but on the basis of the feedback, we found that, within their actions, some empowering transformations in participants were achieved. Thus, we concluded that ABMs (Leavy, 2015) have the potential to contribute to decolonial thinking and doing (Mignolo, 2009). This chapter has focused specifically on creative and embodied activities that aimed to contribute towards the development of open and reflective dialogue between the facilitators and participants, and at times, also enabled the inversion of their roles.

There are limitations to this study. It focused primarily on a very narrow sample of Finnish facilitators representing their cultural context within the PARTY project. This study was qualitative and descriptive by definition, and it sought to initiate and continue dialogue. While the study and workshops have been able to identify some youth perspectives, there remains much more to be done in this area, both in terms of research and youth involvement. The PARTY project offered some new opportunities for developing facilitation in a multicultural context, but more opportunities need to be developed for conducting longitudinal research and investigation that includes youth perspectives.

Acknowledgements

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 645743.

References

- Aneshensel, C. (2002). *Theory-based data analysis for the social sciences*. SAGE Publishing.
- Booyen, S. (2016). Introduction. In S. Booyen (Ed.), *Fees must fall* (pp. 1–20). WITS University Press.
- Bowen, S., Dearden, A., Wright, P., Wolstenholme, D., & Cobb, M. (2010, November 29–December 3). Participatory healthcare service design and innovation. *Proceedings of the 11th Biennial Participatory Design Conference* (pp. 155–158).

- Braun, K. L., Browne, C. V., Ka'opua, L. S., Kim, B. J., & Mokuau, N. (2014). Research on Indigenous elders: From positivistic to decolonizing methodologies. *The Gerontologist*, 54(1), 117–126.
- Butterwick, S., & Selman, J. (2012). Embodied knowledge and decolonization: Walking with theater's powerful and risky pedagogy. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 2012(134), 61–69.
- Chambers, I., & Curti, L. (1996). *The post-colonial question: Common skies, divided horizons*. Routledge.
- Chennells, R. (2009). Vulnerability and Indigenous communities: Are the San of South Africa a vulnerable people? *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 18(2), 147–154.
- Cui, D. (2019). Decolonising dominant knowledge constructions in the education of immigrant youth in Canada. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 38(1), 67–75.
- De Lima Costa, C. (2013). Equivocation, translation, and performative interseccionalidade: Notes on decolonial feminist practices and ethics in Latin America. *Revista Anglo Saxonica Series*, 3(6), 73–101. University of Lisbon Centre for English Studies. FUNDAÇÃO PARA A CIÊNCIA E A TECNOLOGIA.
- Di Russo, S. (2016). *Understanding the behaviour of design thinking in complex environments* [Doctoral dissertation, Swinburne University of Technology]. <https://researchbank.swinburne.edu.au/items/a312fc81-17d3-44b5-9cc7-7ceb48c7f277/1/>
- Flicker, S., Danforth, J. Y., Wilson, C. L., Oliver, V., & Larkin, J. (2014). Because we have really unique art: Decolonizing research with Indigenous youth using the arts. *International Journal of Indigenous Health*, 10(1), 16–34. <https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/ijih/article/view/29025>
- Fouka, G., & Mantzourou, M. (2011). What are the major ethical issues in conducting research? Is there a conflict between the research ethics and the nature of nursing? *Health Science Journal*, 5(1), 3.
- Francis, M., & Francis, S. (2010). Representation and misrepresentation: San regional advocacy and the global imagery. *Critical Arts: A Journal of South-North Cultural Studies*, 24(2), 210–227.
- Gair, S. (2012). Feeling their stories: Contemplating empathy, insider/outsider positionings, and enriching qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 22(1), 134–143.
- Gill, L., White, L., & Cameron, I. D. (2011). Service co-creation in community-based aged healthcare. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 21(2), 152–177.
- Hammond, C., Gifford, W., Thomas, R., Rabaa, S., Thomas, O., & Domecq, M. (2018). Arts-based research methods with Indigenous peoples: An international scoping review. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 14(3), 260–276. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1177180118796870>
- Hendricks, C. (2018). Decolonising universities in South Africa: Rigged spaces? *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies: Multi-, Inter- and Transdisciplinarity*, 13(1), 16–38.
- Hjalmarsson, A., Recker, J., Rosemann, M., & Lind, M. (2015). Understanding the behavior of workshop facilitators in systems analysis and design projects: Developing theory from process modeling projects. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 36(22), 421–447. <https://eprints.qut.edu.au/82922/>
- Horsfall, J., & Cleary, M. (2008). Planning and facilitating workshops. *Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, 39(11), 511–516. <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.libproxy.cput.ac.za/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=4aca7ecf-76ba-4232-bc1d-0dfa860496f4%40sessionmgr102>
- Istratii, R. (2019, November 19). *Applying a decolonial lens to research structures, practices and norms in higher education: What does it mean and where to next?* LIDC (London International Development Centre). https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/31882/1/Applying%20a%20decolonial%20lens%20to%20research%20structures%20and%20practices%20and%20norms%20in%20higher%20education_%20What%20does%20it%20mean%20and%20where%20to%20next_%20_%20LIDC.pdf

- Jenkins, J. C., & Jenkins, M. C. (2006). *The 9 disciplines of a facilitator: Leading groups by transforming yourself* (Vol. 3). John Wiley & Sons. https://books.google.fi/books?hl=fi&lr=&id=cfgAnOWrDqgC&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&ots=yA_iV0ZdC1&sig=_286xXloHO6orTnmMXZN0IoziHo&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Keet, A., Sattarzadeh, S. D., & Munene, A. (2017). An awkward, uneasy (de) coloniality higher education and knowledge otherwise. *Education as Change*, 21(1), 1–12.
- Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2013). *The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2015). Critical theory and critical participatory action research. *The SAGE handbook of action research* (pp. 453–464). SAGE Publishing.
- Kerr, J. (2014). Western epistemic dominance and colonial structures: Considerations for thought and practice in programs of teacher education. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 3(2).
- Kingsbury, P. (2017). Uneasiness in culture, or negotiating the sublime distances towards the big other. *Geography Compass*, 11(6), e12316.
- Langa, M. (Ed.). (2017). *#Hashtag: An analysis of the #FeesMustFall movement at South African universities*. Johannesburg: Centre for Violence and Reconciliation.
- Leavy, P. (2015). *Method meets art: Arts-based research practice*. Guilford Publications.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2011). Thinking through the decolonial turn: Post-continental interventions in theory, philosophy, and critique: An introduction. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(2).
- Matlosa, K. (1998). Democracy and conflict in post-apartheid southern Africa: Dilemmas of social change in small states. *International Affairs*, 74(2), 319–337.
- Mavango, G. (2019). #FeesMustFall protests in South Africa: A critical realist analysis of selected newspaper articles. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa*, 7(1), 81–99.
- McInerney, G. J. (2016). Ten simple rules for curating and facilitating small workshops. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 12(7), e1004745. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004745>
- Miettinen, S., & Sarantou, M. (Eds.). (2019). Introduction: Managing complexity and creating innovation through design. In *Managing complexity and creating innovation through design* (pp. 1–11). Routledge.
- Miettinen, S., Sarantou, M., & Akimenko, D. (2016). Art and storytelling as an empowering tool for service design: South Australian case study. In P. Ryttilähti & S. Miettinen (Eds.), *For profit, for good: Developing organizations through service design* (pp. 74–80). University of Lapland.
- Miettinen, S., Vezzani, V., Chivuno-Kuria, S., Pierandrei, F., Van Wyk, M., & Vuontisjärvi, H. R. (2017). *Open design for development and youth* (pp. 367–369). Hong Kong Design Institute. Cumulus Hong Kong 2016 Cumulus Working Papers 21–24 November 2016 Hong Kong Design Institute 33/16 entitled Open Design for E-very-thing.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7–8), 159–181.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011). Epistemic disobedience and the decolonial option: A manifesto. *Transmodernity*, 1(2), 3–23.
- Nakata, M., Nakata, V., Keech, S., & Bolt, R. (2012). Decolonial goals and pedagogies for Indigenous studies. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1).
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Dickinson, W. B., Leech, N. L., & Zoran, A. G. (2009). A qualitative framework for collecting and analyzing data in focus group research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(3), 1–21.
- Parker, A., & Tritter, J. (2006). Focus group method and methodology: Current practice and recent debate. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 29(1), 23–37.
- Reitsma, L., Light, A., Zaman, T., & Rodgers, P. (2019). A respectful design framework: Incorporating Indigenous knowledge in the design process. *The Design Journal*, 22(sup. 1), 1555–1570.

- Sarantou, M. A., Kontio, T., & Miettinen, S. A. (2018). The hero's journey: An art-based method in social design. *Symmyt/Origins Journal* (3), Special issue on Catalyses, Interventions, Transformations, 129–149.
- Savin-Baden, M., & Howell-Major, C. H. (2013). Qualitative research: The essential guide to theory and practice. In *Qualitative research: The essential guide to theory and practice* Routledge. Routledge.
- Schroeder, D., Chatfield, K., Singh, M., Chennells, R., & Herissone-Kelly, P. (2019). The San code of research ethics. In *Equitable research partnerships: A global code of conduct to counter ethics dumping* (pp. 73–87). Springer.
- Schwarz, R. (2002). *The skilled facilitator: A comprehensive resource for consultants, facilitators, managers, trainers and coaches*. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Shivayogi, P. (2013). Vulnerable population and methods for their safeguard. *Perspectives in Clinical Research*, 4(19), 53–57.
- Smith, L. T. (2013). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. Zed Books Ltd.
- South African San Institute. (2018, December). *San code of research ethics*. www.globalcodeofconduct.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/SanCodeHistory.pdf
- Steen, M., Manschot, M., & De Koning, N. (2011). Benefits of co-design in service design projects. *International Journal of Design*, 5(2).
- Taylor, S. S., & Ladkin, D. (2009). Understanding arts-based methods in managerial development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(1), 55–69.
- Tunón, H., Kvarnström, M., & Lerner, H. (2016). *Ethical codes of conduct for research related to Indigenous peoples and local communities: Core principles, challenges and opportunities*. Vartoe–Centre for Sami Research Umeå University (CeSam). <https://pub.epsilon.slu.se/14401/>
- Tunstall, E. (2013). Decolonizing design innovation: Design anthropology, critical anthropology, and Indigenous knowledge. *Design Anthropology: Theory and Practice*, 232–250.
- Van Stam, G. (2014). Participatory networks: Observations from Macha works. *Participatory Networks Workshop at PDC*, 6.
- Wilkinson, M. (2012). *The secrets of facilitation: The SMART guide to getting results with success*. Jossey-Bass.
- Wilkinson, S. (2011). Analysing focus group data. *Qualitative Research*, 3, 168–184.
- Yang, C. F., & Sung, T. J. (2016). Service design for social innovation through participatory action research. *International Journal of Design*, 10(1).
- Yassi, A., Spiegel, J. B., Lockhart, K., Fels, L., Boydell, K., & Marcuse, J. (2016). Ethics in community-university-artist partnered research: Tensions, contradictions and gaps identified in an 'Arts for social change' project. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 14(3), 199–220.