Why improvise? Why do I want you to improvise?
I do this because I want us to discuss the relationship we have to our surroundings. Do we really own the things we have bought or have been given? Would you, if you owned an Arne Jacobsen chair, change it if your altering benefited you? Would you glue a stick to the back of it, if this made the chair more useful to you and your specific and subjective situation? Would the changes you made increase or decrease the value of this chair?
If you’re thinking «nothing could improve an Arne Jacobsen chair!» you have been so thoroughly fooled by designers that I feel the need to apologize on behalf of us.
I want to work for the possibility of more subjective surroundings. For producing what we need, without glimpsing to designers claims about how things should be done, for reprogramability of what we have and for what Richard Sennet in “the Craftsman” calls «dynamic repair»; the altering of our possessions with the aim of having them changing with us when our needs and situations changes.
To do this, we need to be skilled in the craft of improvisation and to be open minded about how things look. «Pretty» can be found everywhere.
When improvising, I try to let my decisions be led by what I feel is the material’s own will.
This is of course vague and diffuse, but has to do with the shape and surface of my pieces. I try to show and exhibit the beauty of the material I have at hand. I almost never cut or shape, instead I try to find a place within the construction that fits the piece as it is. Sometimes I do shape, though.
I select and collect pieces. Personally, I like surfaces with damages and twig marks and unevenness and surprises, but I also select by a practicality-criteria. And people also give me stuff.
To be able to improvise, one needs some kind of bank.
The bigger the bank, the more alternatives.
When I improvised the first piece, which was the base for the fifth piece, seen in the exhibition and named «sjurereir/skatbo», I was very much led by the idea of function. A shelf here, support for the shelf there, adding a peg another place- but this still had to be balanced with the idea of the material’s own will. I trusted that the outcome of this balance between the language of function and the placing of pieces according to the material logic, would give an aesthetically appealing outcome. If I find beauty in every little piece, this beauty does not disappear when placed in a structure.
I've stated that I seldom cut and change the pieces I work with. Through this approach, I let the visual outcome of what I make be dictated by the pieces I have at hand. Through this, I accept that the look of the thing is good enough. I do choose the pieces, and I do place them according to my own will, and this is enough. What I make, does not have to look like it is factory made to be acceptable. Only things made in a factory has to look factory made. My surroundings are my surroundings.
When improvising like this, I remove part of the economic aspect from the thing. I do not mean it to be mass produced, I mean it to be subjective. When talking about mass production, we are really talking about sales. Improvised products are, in their subjectiveness, not meant to be mass produced or sold. What you need, because of your specific situation, you make. And there it ends.

And what you buy, you buy. But wouldn't it be nice if also what you buy, could be changed, instead of thrown away?
The improvised product speaks of it's user-maker.
Or users-makers.
It also speaks about it's place, where it is placed, why it is placed at the where, and what it is made of.
It is therefore, subjective. And often also intermediate, later to be taken apart or changed according to changing needs and changing situations and changing user-makers.
When I produced the objects for this exhibition, I often had to move them around. This was not something I wanted, but it could not be helped. They are hard to move, because they belong to their place. When moved, they suddenly become too heavy or too fragile. This speaks of their subjectiveness.
You take what you have, and then you try to make it look right when everything comes together.
Only factory made things has to look as if they were factory made.
Ok?
You improvise based on what you know. Maybe your knowledge makes the product look different than somebody else’s solution to the same situation, but neither is wrong.
I often experience this: when sorting my pieces, in order to make it easier to navigate in my “bank”, they put themselves in an appealing pattern/structure, that speaks to my sense of aesthetics.
You use your own knowledge, but also your neighbour’s and your relative’s and your friend’s.
I dislike it when things are *refined*. 
Improvising: this is a very sophisticated, primitive method.
When improvising, you somehow accept the aesthetic of randomness. What you have, and what you have chosen, is good enough. What you make, is based one your situation. These are the parameters. If you want to shape, cut, form, sand, change, because you enjoy the process of making, you do that.
I can't say why things just work when they do, in this process/project/exam work. And I don't think we can agree on what looks good, because what I'm certainly NOT saying is that «deep down inside, everybody likes what I am doing, this is indigenous aesthetics, but everybody has been led astray by interior magazines and so on.» Ok, no, sorry, I certainly DO think we have been confused by interior magazines and with this, created some kind of mental/internal «neighbours» telling us what is acceptable and not, and this is what I want to address. I want more to be allowed. I want to advocate the individuals right to her own solutions.
When that is said, I do not think that fashion is something superficial that must be deconstructed and seen for what it is. I think fashion is very rooted within humans, I think it has been with us as long as we have had cultures. But that does not mean that we uncritically should let others decide our surroundings.
I find that when I follow the logic of sorting, the aesthetic outcome is often appealing. I do not know so much about this, but I think the sense of aesthetic is connected to the sense of order, and that this basically has to do with survival: it is better if you can find what you have without having to search for a long time.
I don't find things ugly, but often boring.
And my work is also about my father’s saying: “Only bad craftsmen blame their tools”, and my awfully clever answer to this: “but you cant make a chest of drawers with a mix master!”
I think that’s such a designer’s answer. Because, no, you cant if you want it to be industrially mass produced and sold in a shop as something else than a joke, but if you’re not a designer, you could probably get something storage-like, in terms of function, even armed only with kitchen ware.
I work with the assumption that there is something in the material that can be shown, without having to be altered or beautified.
I come from a place where people don't depend on designers to solve their problems. People are skilled in improvising and seeking solutions, making object based on what is at hand. I think something could be gained if more of us had this approach to our surroundings.
After all, according to numerous designers and design thinkers: the constructive designer's method starts with peoples needs. If the people are taking care of themselves, what do the designer really do?
This instant solving of a problem is not what a designer does. The designer often makes the product without having experienced the problem. Visited, perhaps, but not really experienced it. There might even not be a problem, other than the fact that the designer needs to earn her money somehow.
Everybody has a sense of aesthetic that is good enough. We don't have to agree what «beautiful» is, but I think we all are able to produce this. You don't need to be a designer to do it.

One disturbing example, when it comes to designers meddling with peoples confidence in themselves, are preselected pieces for DIY kits. Want to make a quilted blanket, but feel unable to make one that meets the aesthetic standards of the society? No worries, we've made the selection for you. Here are preselected patches, because we know you don't possess the abilities to do this selection by yourself. You're not a designer after all.

I disagree with the sole idea of making money by taking away peoples trust in their own abilities.

I'd rather have us both improvise.
When I made the ball-shaped thing, the Nye Droget/Åbäke, and the standing fragile structure, Lagerstruktur, I had the feeling of wasting material. Wood in one case, and cable ties in the other. I was thinking No NO No the whole time while making them. I think this says something about me being on the right track.

Why do I do this? I want to open up for another kind of aesthetic, something subjective, self made, far from factory looking. And I would not have felt that I had to open it up if it was already open, so what is stopping us? Only our norms. And I would not have felt the need to oppose to these norms had they not also been my norms. Feeling that something is a waste of material is quite possibly a sign that I am breaking said norms.
The day before our oral exams, one of my pieces was trashed by another student. While annoying and frustrating, this also taught me something about improvisation. I was unable to restack it (this was the stack figure, «muorraguhpa») into its former shape, as I had little time and little energy and was slightly panicking and also very, very mad. This was far from the state I'd been in when I originally made the stack. Still, I tried to restack it as if it was then, instead of improvising in the now. The stack proved impossible to reproduce. It must be produced instead.

(But then, I am not as skilled in improvising as the people back home. Also, I try to balance this into an art/design context, which enriches and complicates it slightly)