

Teacher Guide: Stadskompassen

English – Full Version

Stadskompassen is an educational game designed to make visible how people prioritize values when societal decisions require compromises. There are no right answers – the result is a decision profile that can be discussed, compared, and reflected upon.

- 1 Trains consequence-based thinking through realistic dilemmas
- 2 Makes value priorities visible without party labels
- 3 Creates a foundation for discussions about democracy and citizenship

What Stadskompassen Is (and Is Not)

Stadskompassen is designed to explore how people make decisions in complex societal contexts. It does not measure factual knowledge or civic knowledge in terms of right/wrong answers. Instead, each question presents a dilemma where multiple solutions are reasonable, but where different values are prioritized differently.

Stadskompassen is:

- 1 A reflection tool
- 2 A discussion starter
- 3 A model of value conflicts and compromise

Stadskompassen is not:

- 1 A test
- 2 A party alignment quiz
- 3 A judgment of the individual

Learning Objectives

- 1 Describe why societal problems rarely have simple solutions
- 2 Identify which values are in conflict within a dilemma
- 3 Reason about consequences for different groups in society
- 4 Reflect on how legitimacy, pace, and safety influence decision-making

Method: How the Questions Are Designed

The questions are based on everyday societal scenarios where each option involves both gains and costs. The goal is for participants to feel the consequences in everyday life, not just understand them theoretically.

- 1 **No neutral choices** – Every option has a clear downside.
- 2 **All decisions are combinations** – Each option activates several characters simultaneously.
- 3 **Consequences in daily life** – Feedback is written as lived experience: routines, behaviors, and social atmosphere.

Scoring System and Logic

Each answer option is linked to several characters. Two characters are always dominant, as they carry the core logic of the decision.

- 1 2 points = dominant values (without them, the option's logic collapses)
- 2 1 point = present values (supportive but not driving)
- 3 0 points = not central to the option

The result becomes a profile built across multiple decisions, not a label derived from a single answer.

Why Characters?

The characters are not personality types, but value orientations. They are used to make visible which values and decision logics are activated when people are forced to choose between imperfect alternatives.

Jungian Archetypes

Archetypes describe recurring human ways of orienting oneself in uncertainty and complexity – for example the need for order, relationship, meaning, control, or change.

In Stadskompassen, archetypes are not used to describe who a person is, but to highlight which fundamental drives are activated in decisions.

Civic Roles

- 1 Trust in systems
- 2 Care for others
- 3 Questioning power
- 4 Pragmatic problem-solving
- 5 Participation in processes

Political Practice Without Party Labels

The characters reflect decision logics that frequently recur in municipalities and organizations. Political parties often embody several of these logics simultaneously, in varying strengths and combinations. Stadskompassen deliberately avoids party labeling in order to reveal the underlying values behind decisions, rather than attaching them to ideological identities.

Characters – Overview (Terminology Matches Game Data)

- 1 The Enforcer – clarity, order, rapid action
- 2 The Archivist – evidence, long-term thinking, system logic
- 3 The Caretaker – care, safety, social stability
- 4 The Reflector – wholeness, empathy, multiple perspectives
- 5 The Negotiator – legitimacy, negotiation, process, consensus
- 6 The Trickster – friction, humor, critical questioning
- 7 The Burner – urgency, frustration with passivity, radical change
- 8 The Pragmatist – what works here and now
- 9 The Skeptic – questioning, caution, risk awareness

Suggested Classroom Formats (15–45 minutes)

- 1 **15 minutes:** Play individually. Short reflection: Which option felt hardest to choose?
- 2 **30 minutes:** Play. Small groups compare profiles. Whole-class discussion.
- 3 **45 minutes:** Play. Group discussion per question. Short writing task.

Discussion Questions

- 1 Which value did you prioritize most often?
- 2 Which consequence felt hardest to live with – and why?
- 3 Are there choices that feel good short-term but risky long-term?
- 4 Where did conflicts between individual and collective interests arise?
- 5 How does your answer change if you consider another group?

Assessment / Examination (Optional)

- 1 Short reflection text
- 2 Argumentation task
- 3 Comparison of two profiles

Summary for Educators

Stadskompassen makes it easier to talk about complexity without getting stuck in party politics. Participants encounter dilemmas where each choice has a clear everyday consequence. The character profile reveals which values a person tends to prioritize when compromise is unavoidable.