

AVT Comparison Workshop

Type : Open Source Method
Family : Perception

This workshop is designed to follow a use of the AVT (Archetype Creation) method where two different groups have gone through the process of AVT emergence in parallel. The aim is to allow the two groups to compare their two perspectives and then move to a diverse synthesis of conclusions and a set of recommended actions.

Preparation

Ideally all of those involved in the original two groups should be present at the workshop. The maximum permitted degree of asymmetry in group attendance should be 2:1. The minimal size for the workshop is around a dozen, although neither of these should be taken as prescriptive. You can expand the participation by asking people who were part of the original process to “bring a buddy”.

Groups should not have access to the AVT material of either group in advance of the workshop to prevent any contamination of the comparison.

You will require at least four different colours of hexi pads, ribbon (with spot stickies or pins depending on the work area), pens, strip paper for the walls and action sheets.

AVTs for each group should be prepared in duplicate as follows:

- Each archetype should be printed on a sheet of A3 paper in the standard presentation mode (name, attribute list, cartoon & pie chart showing origin of attributes by character cluster)
- Values should be listed on a single sheet of A3 paper with pie charts showing the origin of attributes by subject cluster
- Themes should be listed on a single sheet of A3 paper with pie charts showing the origin of attributes by belief cluster

Each set (remember you have duplicated these) should be taped together (tip: tape the back of the sheets not the front) in a concertina - vertical if 7 sheets or less, horizontal if more.

Two work areas should be prepared with no line of sight between the two. Each group’s AVT concertina of sheets should be set out to the left of the work area with space for the other group’s AVTs to be laid out in parallel at a later stage in the workshop. A work area should be prepared for hexi posting next to this.

The room should be arranged in cabaret style with plenty of standing room around the work areas.

Flow of events

Step	Comments
The two groups are moved to their work areas and asked to assimilate the original material and (if they have brought a buddy) brief the group as a whole.	Depending on the abilities of the group time may have to be assigned to explaining the presentation of the AVTs
The group are then asked to identify, in respect of their AVTs what conclusions they think the other group will draw (colour 1) and what questions the other group will ask (colour 2)	
Each group is then given the other groups AVTs and are asked what conclusions they draw about this (colour 3) and what questions they want to ask (colour 4)	If Colour 3 is a match with Colour 2 when, however with a different marker colour (and Colour 4 a match with Colour 1) then the outputs of the two perspectives can be combined for subsequent wall exercises (i.e. the colours will match regarding the AVTs being reviewed however the marker colour will reveal two perspectives.
Using ribbon, ask each group to mark connections between AVTs that are the same. Positioning contrasting AVTs in parallel columns in close proximity to each other on the wall facilitates cross-column matching.	
The groups are now mixed up (Preditor-Prey is a good way of doing this) and then merged into small groups of 5 or less. For example if there are 20 people from the first group and 10 people from the second group then we now have 10 groups with one person from the second group and two people from the first group.	
Each small group is then asked to walk around the two work areas and create a list of (i) the things they see in common and (ii) the things that surprised them	

Step	Comments
If necessary, the small groups are then combined to create 4-6 groups (with the above numbers groups are paired from 10 groups of 3 to 5 groups of 6.	If there is more time an additional step can be introduced to review and answer the questions asked by each side
The new groups are then asked to combine their surprises and commonalties into two columns on a single sheet of paper and to identify the three most important conclusions from the material and write them on the reverse of the sheet (this means you do not loose track of the groups output)	You may want to advise the group that the three most important conclusions should be framed for senior management or board consideration. This provides a necessary degree of attention to the conclusions and discloses that the outcomes may be reviewed by senior management within the organisation.
Finally the groups are given action sheets (these can be by Cynefin domain if the group are familiar with the model) and asked to create actions - at least one of which must be for the group.	Depending on the context, you may want to make the condition clear that if any action requires someone else to do something that the group defining the action would be ok if they were on the receiving end of such action. For example, if an action requires a change in organisational structure, then the group recommending the change would approve of the change if they were being affected by it.
The actions are posted on the walls (ritual dissent or support can be used for review prior to this) and the groups are allowed to comment and possibly to vote on the outcome.	

Good & Bad Practice

None noted todate

Other Methods

This requires feed from Social Construction of Meaning