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Summary

This thesis examines the use of a participatory approach to develop a marginalized urban area in the city of Malmö, Sweden. By setting up an innovative, participatory and dialogue oriented meeting place called Garaget, the municipality hopes to strengthen the local community and increase the level of inclusion of the residents into a more sustainable society. Garaget is situated in a place with a history of more than a decade of social projects through the EU URBAN initiative, and has “inherited” the extreme participatory approach of that program. Garaget has also been designed to create a fruitful encounter between the urban social research and the community and as a laboratory for dialogue between community and authorities. Today Garaget functions not only as a community oriented space, but also as a library, café, meeting place and creative workshop, all with the intention to feel as a “second living room”. Although there is no doubt that this living room has been widely used by the local community, especially for holding functions, weddings and other events of social nature, the question whether this participatory approach and dualistic design of public and private space will increase the inclusion of the residents into mainstream society, or if it will just add comfort to the isolation and marginalized position they already inhabit today, is left open and needs further research.
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1. Introduction

All over the world, urban areas increasingly face the effects of phenomena such as climate change, resource reduction, global migration, food insecurity and economic instability. These factors will significantly affect town and cities in the future and all of them should be considered if cities are to be sustainable in all aspects; be environmentally safe, economically productive and socially inclusive (UN-Habitat 2009, p.1).

Building sustainable cities is one of our toughest challenges today. In Swedish policy there is a move towards urban sustainability and the Swedish municipalities are playing an important part in this development, as they have a high degree of autonomy and control on city planning (Save-Öfverholm 2008, p.4). Malmö can be considered a good example of this, as the city of Malmö has tried to address the challenges of economic and environmental sustainability for more than 10 years, but still acknowledges that the socioeconomic aspect needs to be addressed just as much as the environmental, if sustainability is to be achieved, and that the inclusion of citizens in the decision making process is essential for success.

1.1 Problem and Aim

In order to investigate how Malmö has tried to deal with the challenges of creating a sustainable city, I have conducted a case study of Garaget as an example of a different approach to improve a city district. In my previous studies, I have examined how the district of Augustenborg in Malmö has been revitalized through a serious commitment by the municipality on the environmental aspect of sustainability (Memari Poor 2012). This time I wanted to focus on how a project like Garaget has used strategies of community building, participation and a creative meeting place to strengthen a city district and create more inclusion and social sustainability in practice.

1.2 Research question

How has Malmö municipality worked with inclusion, participation and place management in practice to achieve sustainable urban development in the case of Garaget?

1.3 Previous Research

I have found three theses written about Garaget, one in Social Work around the organizational structure of Garaget as a municipality project (Söderström & Wastring 2012), and two concerning the innovative use of the library, by students of library and information science in Borås University College (Asu & Rydberg 2012) and Lund University (Nilsson 2008).

1.4 Disposition

After the introduction in chapter 1, I will discuss the choice of using the case study approach and methodology in chapter 2. Chapter 3 deals with the theoretical concepts of sustainability, community, participation, urban development and space, while the case itself is described in chapter 4. In chapter 5 I analyze the case using the theories presented in chapter 3 and then end the thesis with my conclusions in chapter 6.
2. Method

Qualitative research has been utilized mainly as a research strategy in the social science arena because it:

1. “Mainly emphasizes an inductive approach to the relationship between theory and research, in which the emphasis is placed on the generation of theories;

2. Has rejected the practice and norms of the natural scientific model and of positivism in particular in preference for an emphasis on the ways in which individuals interpret their social world;

3. Embodies a view of social reality as a constantly shifting emergent property of individuals’ creation.” (Bryman 2004, pp.19-21)

Qualitative research is thought to be more flexible than quantitative research, as it is a better method to discover unexpected results (Bryman 2004, p.87).

This thesis adopts a single case study approach to put the spotlight on how a city can try to reach sustainable development through participation. Although sustainability is a popular and well-known concept and the importance of participation and community practice has been explained in the literature, finding a suitable case of how to show the relation between these concepts and reaching sustainable development through participation and community practice, can add useful knowledge regarding to how achieve results in practice. To demonstrate this and make this relation more concrete and understandable, I decided to use Garaget in Malmö as a case.

2.1 Choosing the case study approach

I chose the case study approach because case studies make it possible to have a real-life context for abstract and theoretical concepts like participation, sustainability and urban space, comprehensible and usable for the readers. Yin (2009, p. 26) explains the basics for this research design as “the logical sequence that connects the observed data to a study’s initial research questions and, ultimately, to its conclusions”. A case study explores a current phenomenon in-depth within its real-life context, and involves a complete and serious analysis of a single case, for example a community, an organization, a single person or a single event (Yin 2009).

Case studies have been used by researchers as a research method for many years, and especially social scientists have generally used this qualitative research method to examine contemporary real-life situations, in order to offer a basis for the application of ideas and extension of methods. Yin defines the case study research method as an empirical inquiry that examines a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly marked; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used (Yin 1984, p. 23).

Yin (1984, p. 64) suggests the use of case-study procedure as part of a carefully designed research project that would include the following sections: “Overview of the project (project objectives and case study issues), Field procedures (credentials and access to sites), Questions
(specific questions that the investigator must keep in mind during data collection), Guide for the report (outline, format for the narrative)."

Some researchers, for instance Bryman (2004), believe that case studies are more than just descriptive samples to make theories more clear. They see the case study as a problem that should be solved throughout the paper as it progresses. In presenting a case, the writer should bring enough information for readers to get an understanding of what the problem is, and later, after reading the analysis, the readers should be able to come up with a proposed solution, following the analysis and presentation of the empirical data (Bryman 2004).

Both primary data and secondary data can be used in a case study. First-hand information such as interviews and observations help the author to have better perspective for analyzing the secondary data. Secondary data can typically be collected through literature reviews and project documents in order to investigate the primary research questions.

2.2 Primary data
One of the main strength of the case study method is that the author can choose to use multiple sources and techniques in the data gathering process. The researcher determines in advance what evidence to gather and what analysis techniques to use with the data to respond to the research questions. Data gathered is usually mainly qualitative, but may in some case also be quantitative. Tools of data collection can include surveys, interviews, documentation review, observation, and even the collection of physical artifacts (Yin 1984, p.23). As primary data for this case study I used two interviews and an on sight observation of Garaget.

2.2.1 Interviews
Throughout the social sciences, interviews are widely used as a data collection instruments. Interviews are one of the most important sources of case study information. Several forms of interviews can be used for writing a paper: open-ended, focused, structured, or survey. In an open-ended interview, key respondents are asked to comment about certain events. They may offer answers or provide insight into events. The researcher must avoid becoming dependent on a single informant, and look for the same data from other sources to confirm its validity (Yin 1984).

Bryman (2004), however, believes that the purpose of the research interview is to explore the views, experiences, beliefs and motivations of individuals on specific matters. In qualitative methods, such as interviews, providing a deeper understanding of social phenomena can be obtained more easily comparing with quantitative methods such as purely questionnaires. Interviews are, therefore, most appropriate where little information is already known about the study phenomenon or when detailed insights are required from individual participants.

In order to complement the secondary data used to form a background to the case study, I tried to bring the material alive by interviewing Emelie Wieslander, coordinator of Garaget. I set a series of open-ended questions and thus gave the interviewee a chance to feel confident, and to talk
freely. To arrange the interview, I first contacted the coordinator of Garaget and described to her what I wanted to do in my thesis, and the reasons for using interviews. The second interview was conducted with one of the librarians, Gustav Ekman who is more involved in the everyday interaction with the visitors at Garaget.

The first interview was recorded in audio format and also transcribed to secure an exact version of the conversations and avoid losing data, since not everything can be written down during the interview. I arranged to meet the coordinator and we started our interview by having a cup of ecological coffee at Garaget, on Lönngatan 30 in Malmö, and the interview took about one hour. The questions were focused on the background of the place and purpose of forming of Garaget, in order to understand more about the goals of the project. The transcription of the interview was completed within twenty-four hours of the interview. The second interview had to be conducted through a series of e-mails, as it proved very difficult to find a time where we could meet in person. While this interview turned out to be much more structured than the first one, it had the advantage of being “transcribed” immediately, as the respondent wrote down his answers through e-mail.

2.2.2 Observations

According to Yin (2009) direct observation can occur during a field visit in the case study. All these type are possible: from simple ones as casual data collection activities, or formal protocols to measure and record behaviors. This technique is valuable for providing additional data about the subject being studied.

Part of the process of understanding Garaget can be explained by the observational method (Bryman 2004). The observational method is used to measure human behavior, but also the nature, physical space and surroundings can be argued as having importance for the case. The reasoning behind the observational method is to see your surroundings and rank it under specific characteristics. I did observations at Garaget, trying to get a sense of the place and how visitors used it, and also documented it through taking photos (some of which are presented in this thesis). The first observation was in conjunction with the interview of the project coordinator, and resulted in some notes and the pictures used in this thesis. The second observation was made a few weeks later, with a much better understanding of the place and its activities. I was then able to follow the visitors’ usage of the room, the staff’s preparations before the evening’s workshop, move around and small-talk with visitors and staff. I recorded all in notes and transcribed my notes in the evening. This gave me a wider and deeper understanding of Garaget and the how the room is used by visitors and staff.

2.3 Secondary data

Using multiple sources and techniques in the data gathering process can be seen as the main strength of the case study method. The researcher defines what evidence should be gathered and types of analysis techniques that should be used with the data to answer the research questions in advance. Data that is gathered is normally qualitative, but it may also be quantitative. Tools to
collect data can consist of surveys, interviews, documentation review, observation, and even the collection of physical artifacts (Yin 1984, p.25). A qualitative approach is used in this thesis, and the secondary data have been collected from a number of project documents, reports, articles, books and online resources. According to Bryman (2004), the reviewing of different articles, documents and web pages (secondary data) is the most appropriate way to save time as a researcher.

Thanks to the very ambitious reporting on Garaget, I was able to follow the yearly project reports from the very start of the project in 2008, until today. There was also a 35-question survey published on the local community’s opinion and use of Garaget made in 2011, which was very helpful in understanding the visitors’ wishes, thoughts and opinions on Garaget and its activities (Malmö Stad, Brukarundersökning Garaget, 2011).
3. Theory

3.1 Sustainability

Sustainability is a concept that is heard frequently these days in conferences, speeches by politicians and news. According to Lele “Sustainable development has become the watchword for international aid agencies, the jargon of development planners, the theme of conferences and learned papers, and the slogan of developmental and environmental activists” (Lele in Bell S. and Morse S. 2008, p.3).

The concept of sustainability appeared in the first World Conservation Strategy published by the World Conservation Unit in 1980. The definition of sustainable development that was proposed was as follow:

“Sustainable development is maintenance of essential ecological processes and life support systems, the preservation of genetic diversity and the sustainable utilization of species and ecosystems”.

This definition emphasized the importance of natural capital and biological diversity, but economic and social pillars of sustainability are not considered in this early definition. Seven years later, in 1987 the Brundtland Report described sustainability as:

“Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED 1987).

Social sustainability refers to maintenance and improvement of well-being of current and future generations and how natural resources and assets are distributed within and between generations (Chiu 2004, p.66). Social sustainability occurs when “the formal and informal, processes, systems, structures, and relationships actively support the capacity of current and future generations to create healthy and livable communities. Socially sustainable communities are equitable, diverse, connected and democratic and provide a good quality of life”. (Barron and Gauntlett 2002)

In other word, considering fundamental needs and social rights of existing and future individuals of society, is the main basis of social sustainability. Sustainability is about generating and maintaining quality of life for people in both economic and environmental features, and balancing all three dimensions of sustainability (economic, social and environmental) is necessary in order to reach a really sustainable urban development. We need to consider all aspects of sustainability at the same time and at the same level, as much as possible (COWI, ECA & Wilson 2004).
3.2 Sustainability and sustainability indicators

Although sustainable development now is a very dominant theme (Bell S. and Morse S. 2008, p.3) there is a sense of necessity of clarifying this concept. In 1992, the Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit was held and this helped the term of sustainability and particularly sustainable development to become more popular. The Rio Summit agreed a set of action points for sustainable development, collectively referred to as Agenda 21 (agenda for the 21st century), and governments that signed up to these committed themselves to action. In order to help put these points into practice and monitor the progress of sustainable development, the conference established an instruction for the United Nations to prepare a set of indicators of sustainable development (Bell & Morse 2008, p.3).

The idea of using indicators for evaluating sustainability became very popular and several governments and agencies are devoting considerable resources to indicator development and testing (Bell and Morse, 2008:2-4). By using indicators, we can answer the question that should not be ignored when trying to reach a sustainable development: How might we be able to know objectively whether things are getting better or getting worse? (Bell and Morse 2008, pp.3-5).

Most of these sustainability indicator systems track development individually within the economic, environmental, and social fields. The UN system, which has the main and most widely used indicator system, introduces fifty-eight separate parameters. Social indicators provide information on life span, nutritional status, education, population, and child mortality. The environmental indicators express ambient air and water quality, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and land cover, and species diversity. The economic indicators consist of conventional measures such as GDP per capita and measures of consumption and saving (Hecht 2007, p.3). The important issue is to keep all these indicators in mind when designing sustainable policy.

3.3 Urban sustainability

The rapidly growing population and trends of urbanization in several world regions makes it necessary to consider a more sustainable form of urban development. Once the concept of ‘sustainability’ entered the world of urban development, it led planners to use it as a means to how cities and regions should be redeveloped and reformed: “Sustainability is regarded alternatively as either the proper means or the proper end of urban development” (Basiago 1999, p.148). Therefore, many city planners, politicians, and environmental groups are trying to find long term solutions and creating more sustainable cities. They have come to realize that changing existing community conditions and making cities more sustainable beyond policies and good intentions is not an easy task. Location, buildings, and the infrastructure of cities have a strong impact on the environment, on the economy and the society over time, and this impact is not easy to change considerably after construction and inhabitation. According to Register “there are two ways to go about building eco-cities: changing existing towns or building new ones” (Register in Ekblaw et al. 20091).
Mumford states that the city is the idea of “maximum concentration for the power and culture of a community”. He mentions the city as a symbol and form of an integrated social relationship. (Mumford in Wheeler and Beatley 2004, pp.19-20). Talen (1999) explains the notion of sense of community. She believes that neighborhood gathering places give “heart” to the community and work as symbols of public pride and sense of place which help to promote the notion of community (Talen1999, p.1364).

3.3.1 Principles of social sustainability

Barron and Gauntlett (2002) suggested equity, diversity, interconnectedness, quality of life, democracy and governance, as five principles for social sustainability. By following these principles we can try to create a sustainable urban community today and in the future. Equity means providing a fair economic situation for all individuals in society, particularly for marginalized and vulnerable groups of society. Diversity is another important factor in reaching social sustainability, especially if it is encouraged throughout the community, not only “tolerated”.

Interconnectedness is about providing facilities for easier connection within and outside the community, for anyone, and at all levels of society. Democracy and governance refers to providing a democratic system and appropriate governance structures, with access for the community to influence and participate in the political process. Promoting social sustainability therefore promotes sustainability generally and vice versa. For example, equitable social relations, that combine diversity and interconnectedness, promote social, environmental and economic sustainability more than unfair, competitive and divisive social principles, which allow one group alone to be on top (Barron and Gauntlett 2002).

3.3.2 Communities

According to Baum (1997), communities form a bond between individuals and cities, to the benefits of both. People live in cities through their communities, and the experience that they have of the city is actually that of the community (Baum 1997, pp.3-4). For citizens who live in a city with thousands or even millions of residents, it is the community that helps shape a personal identity at a meaningful scale. A sense of community helps individuals to define themselves and know who they are and give them a specific identity that is more than just being one citizen among a million. And this works, according to Baum, in both ways; local society can maintain its identity by allowing members to be powerful and essential, adding to the strength of community (Baum 1997, p.4).

Community organization and political institutions give members the ability to exercise some degree of control over not only the community, but also part of the city. Communities are able to transform individuals into citizens, who are faithful to the city because they transfer their sense of belonging from their community. Therefore, community organization can make a city governable as long as it is not a counter-culture or the community does not have a say in city matters, i.e. participation (ibid).
3.3.3 Participation as community building

The concept of participation has an array of different meanings. Many scholars and organizations provide their viewpoint on the concept. For instance, the World Bank (1996) defines it as “a process through which the people get the chance to influence and share control over development initiatives and to be involved in the process of decision making. This concept is to say participation is a tool through which the stakeholders get their part to act on their own issue that influences their day to day activity”.

According to Creighton, it is mainly used in the sense of describing a form of communication with the public: “The word participation has many different meanings. Some people use it as if it were synonymous with public information programs—getting the word out to the public. It is frequently used to describe public hearings at which the public comments on what an agency proposes to do. It has also been used to imply that an agreement is reached with the public that will be affected by it.” (Creighton 2005).

Participation is seen as a continuum that includes four key levels of participation in city planning and policies of urban development: inform the public, listen to the public, engage in problem solving, and develop agreements (Creighton 2005, p.8).

Creighton (2005) states the public participation methods are a process in which public concern, needs, and values are considered and incorporated into governmental decision making. It should be a two-way communication and interaction, with the overall goal of achieving better quality decisions, which are also supported by the public when they are to be implemented.

He also tries to narrow down the definition of public participation by going through how it is used in the literature. In most definitions of public participations there are four elements which are common: first, that public participation does not only mean to provide information to the public, but also provides interaction between the participants and administrators. Second: public participation is not happening accidentally or coincidentally; it is an organized process. Third: public participation applies to administrative decisions, and last but not least: participants have some level of impact on the decisions being made. Public participation also helps to create better educated citizens, and allows them to learn how and why the government initiates projects and also make them learn how to affects others and how to compose coalitions.

In this sense, community participation can also be effective means to help people to solve their health, environmental, and economic problems. When people from the community organize, plan, share tasks with professionals, contribute to projects and make decisions about activities that affect their lives participatory community can be comprehended (Burns et al. 2004).

According to Burns et al. (2004, p.2),” Community participation concerns the engagement of individuals and communities in decisions about things that affect their lives. Community participation is not the same as consultation. Many organizations say that they have a community participation strategy when they mean that they have a consultation strategy.
Community participation means that communities are playing an active part and have a significant degree of power and influence.”

Burns et al. (2004, p.2) consider it important to be clear about what level of participation is offered in each decision-making field. It is not necessarily correct to compare them and believe that ‘control’ is better than ‘limited delegation’ but it may be. It is important to recognize, for example, that control and limited delegation have quite different effects on participation (ibid: 3).

According to Oakley public participation is a tool to achieve development goals that are already set by a project owner which can be a government or other development agencies (Oakley, 1991). Participation procedures will let the people cooperate and work jointly to achieve externally decided goals. The problem is that although collaboration may be necessary and desirable, it is rarely easy in real situations (Bryson, Crosby, Middleton, 2006). Moreover, Paul (1987, p.6) states that “community participation is an active process by which beneficiary or client groups influence the direction and execution of a development project with a view to enhancing their well-being in terms of income, personal growth, self-reliance or other values they cherish”.

Academically, Greenwood and Levin (2007) defines participation methodologically through Action Research (AR) theory, as a social research carried out by a team that involves a professional action researcher and the members of an organization, community, or network (“stakeholders”) who are seeking to improve the participants’ situation. AR promotes broad participation in the research process and supports action leading to a more just, sustainable, and satisfying situation for the stakeholders (Greenwood & Levin 2007, p. 3).

With the help of AR, academics can help produce a freer and fairer society through collaborative problem analysis and problem solving in the context of social reality. In AR, a democratic process is crucial where stakeholders define the problems and help develop techniques to solve these problems. AR brings democracy into the decision making process between the project initiators and local participants (Greenwood & Levin 2007).

Greenwood and Levin (2007) additionally mention that the concept of AR is based on the fact that experiences and beliefs of participants are combined together in order to define the problem that they seek to resolve. Therefore, AR as a research strategy promotes the social analysis and democratic social change with broad participation during problem solving process. It also increases the ability of participants to control their own destiny (ibid, p.4).

3.3.4 Communities of practice

According to Etienne Wenger (1998), participation refers to a process of taking part and also to the relation with others that reflects this process. To explain the term of communities of practice Wenger (1998) believes all humans belong to communities of practice. His definition of communities of practice is, “groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly” (Wenger 1998, p.6). This definition implies a cross-communication interaction between members belonging to a
community, which also implies that members belonging to the community have total access to learning, to practice, and to expression even if it involves changing community values. (Wenger, 1998:7) According to him, participation needs to be an active process which involves both the individual and the community in a mutual recognition of the other (Wenger 1998, p.55).

In other words, Wenger (1998) believes that learning can mainly be found when a community gathers together in a participative process, or a related consequence of members’ interactions with the community. According to Wenger all communities are not necessarily communities of practice. A neighborhood for instance, is often called a community, but is usually not a community of practice. Three factors are vital in a community of practice:

1. The domain: In a community of practice a shared domain of interest is vital. Membership therefore implies a commitment to the domain, and therefore a shared competence that distinguishes members from other people. The members of the group value their collective skill and learn from each other, even if outsiders (people out of the group) rarely value or even recognize their expertise (Wenger 1998, p.1).

2. The community: In following their interest in their domain, members get involved in common activities and discussions. They help each other and share information. Relationships are built to give them the possibility to learn from each other. A website by itself is not a community of practice. Having the same position or the same job does not necessary lead to a community of practice, although people interact and learn together or from each other. For members of a community of practice it is not essential to work together on a daily basis. "The Impressionists, for instance, used to meet in cafes and studios to discuss the style of painting they were inventing together. These interactions were essential to making them a community of practice even though they often painted alone." (Wenger 1998, p.1)

3. The practice: A community of practice is not just a community of interest, as members of a community of practice are “practitioners”. They have a common list of resources: experiences, stories, tools, ways of addressing frequent problems—in short a shared practice. To reach this common list of resources takes time and needs interaction. The "windshield wipers" engineers at an auto manufacturer make a concerted effort to collect and document the tricks and lessons they have learned into a knowledge base. By contrast, nurses who meet regularly for lunch in a hospital cafeteria may not realize that their lunch discussions are one of their main sources of knowledge about how to care for patients. Still, in the course of all these conversations, they have developed a set of stories and cases that have become a shared repertoire for their practice (Wenger 1998, p.2).

3.4 Urban spaces
The classical definition of a city by Sennett: “a human settlement in which strangers are likely to meet” is referred by Bauman (1978, p.33) and he completes the definition by highlighting that the meeting of strangers is an event without past and is not the same as meeting families, friends and
colleagues (Bauman, in Czarniawska, Solli 2001, p.26). He divides the public spaces of cities into four different groups: *emic* places, *fagic* places, *empty* places and *non-places*, which all can increase interaction. A good example of an emic place is La Defense in Paris; a huge square on the right bank of the Seine that embodies all the traits of the first category of the public spaces. Places like La Defense give the visitors a feeling of inhospitality, but still fascination, just not a place which is attractive enough for staying there and interact with others. Fantastically shaped buildings which encircle the huge and empty square are meant to be looked at, not dwelled in.

The second group of places, fagic places, covers physical spaces of consumption such as concert or exhibition halls, tourist resorts, sport activity sites, shopping malls and cafeterias. Although such spaces encourage action, they seldom encourage interaction. Empty spaces are mostly empty of meaning, and the reason is not that they are meaningless because of the emptiness, but they transfer no meaning and because they are *seen* as empty. According to Bauman, people try to avoid empty places, as it is easy to a bit feel lost and helpless in them, and surprised or a little frightened by the sight of other individuals in them. Non-places “*is a space devoid of the symbolic expressions of identity, relations and history*” according to Bauman, and he gives examples like airports, motorways, anonymous hotel rooms, public transport, places that are used for daily activities, but not for their own sake or with a meaning more than practicality (Bauman, in Czarniawska and Solli 2001, pp. 21-27).

If physical proximity sharing a space cannot be completely avoided, it can be perhaps exposed of experiments of togetherness, meaningful meetings, dialogue and interaction. According to this point of view, public spaces can be seen as meeting places where people make contact with each other and different activities take place, which together create meaning. (Bauman in Czarniawska and Solli 2001, pp. 21-27)

In a paper by Aabøa, Audunson and Vårheim (2010, p.6), meeting places are categorized into two different groups: high-intensive meeting places and low-intensive meeting places. Aabøa, Audunson, and Vårheim (2010, p.6) state that in high-intensive meeting places people have participation with individuals with the same interests and values, such as sports club members, religious services participants or people who have other common political or hobby interests shared together. The locations of such associations, which are called high -intensive meeting places, are developing spontaneously and voluntarily. High- intensive meeting places are vital in creating people’s identity and providing their lives with meaning and bonding social life through contact with similar people. On the other hand, in the meeting places with low-intensiveness people are exposed to values and interests that are not the same as their own identities and interests. In these kinds of places people make contact with individuals with different cultures and values. low-intensive meeting places are important in creating bridges between people with different values and belonging to different cultures. In other word, the essence of the concept of low-intensive meetings is that at such meetings the participants are exposed to otherness, whereas the essence of the concept of high-intensive meetings is that participants meet with people with whom they already share values and interests (ibid).
Manzo and Perkins (2006, p.335) claim that as we are all inseparably embedded in a physical context, certainly we must understand the nature of our relationships as related to place. They debate that affective bonds to places can help motivate action because people are motivated to seek, stay in, protect, and improve places that are meaningful to them. “Consequently, place attachment, place identity, and sense of community can provide a greater understanding how neighborhood spaces can motivate ordinary residents to act collectively to preserve, protect, or improve their community and participate in local planning processes.” (Manzo and Perkins 2006, p.347)

Manzo and Perkins consider that there is still need for learning more about the pro-processes by which meanings and attachments of place can motivate citizen to participate and influence community development efforts but it can be seen through literature that processes of communal action work better when emotional ties to places and their inhabitants are experienced (Manzo and Perkins 2006, p.347).

3.4.1 Public and private spaces
Though interpretation of these two concepts has changed over time, it can be said that referring to Mitchell “public space since the Greek republic has occupied an important ideological position in democratic societies. It represents the material location where the social interactions and political activities of all members of ‘the public’ occur” (Mitchell, in Drummond 2000, p. 2379). Public space is the space ‘out there’ which belongs to the whole community, although controlled by prevailing social and legal norms (Drummond 2000, p.2379).

On the other hand Baum emphasize the importance of setting boundaries for a community, in order to distinguish members of a community from outsiders. He defines social, psychological and geographic boundaries for communities and believes that social boundaries enable people to know who they should care and rely on. Psychological boundaries are drawn between presumably good and special insiders vis-à-vis bad and ordinary outsiders. These boundaries are essential for controlling a community’s values, and can occur both in private and public spaces: “private space is the domestic space where social reproduction occurs more or less free from outright control by outside forces such as the state.” (Baum 1997, pp.47-51)

The ability to live with differences, enjoying such living and to benefit from it, cannot be achieved easily, and definitely not by its own motivation. Multiculturalism in today’s society lead to fruitful and dynamic exchange between people of different cultures nevertheless it seems essential to have meeting places with the capacity to promote communication and generate a critical mass of communality in norms and values across cultural, ethnic, generational, and social lines. Creating such arenas is not an easy task and needs active involvement from policymakers (Aabøa, Audunson, and Vårheim, 2010, p.3).

3.4.2 Public libraries as meeting places
The public library is one of the places that are considered as a meeting place and as an institution with the potential to build community and citizenship in recent year studies. (Aabøa, Audunson
and Vårheim 2010, p.2). The library is a meeting place, functioning as the old city square, a place where people learn something about those different from themselves, a public sphere, and a place for joint activities and virtual meetings.

The library appears to be a place, where people are exposed to the complexity of multicultural society and learn something about multiculturalism in a safe environment and in an unremarkable way. It is a place where people accidentally run into neighbors and friends, but it is also a place where a considerable amount report being accidentally engaged in conversations with strangers. It can be a place where users are exposed to “the others”, people with a background different from themselves. The library can thus be seen as an arena for both low-intensive and high-intensive meetings (Aabøa, Audunson and Vårheim 2010, p.29).
4. Case Study of Garaget

4.1. Malmö Sustainable Urban Development 2020
Malmö is the third largest city of Sweden, located in the southern part of Sweden in the province of Skåne, with approximately 300,000 inhabitants. The city was during the 19th and 20th century an industrial city, internationally competitive in ship building and textile industries. But with the industrial sector in strong decline after the 1970’s oil crisis, the city faced some severe socio-economic challenges. At the end of the 1980’s a transformation of the city center was launched and after the final industrial shock of the 1990’s, Malmö has undertaken several structural changes to transform from industrial waste land to a sustainable, knowledge based, city.

The structural changes were led by building a bridge to the greater Copenhagen area, establishing a University and new, sea side adjacent, developments (Västra Hamnen or Western Harbor in English) targeting a high income segment on the site of the former ship yard and car manufacturing industrial area. The city of Malmö has during this transformation set some very ambitious environmental goals: Malmö is expected to be totally sustainable by 2020, with pilot projects becoming the norm for the entire city; it is to be climate-neutral by 2020; and to operate on 100% renewable energy by 2030. Several district level programs are also directed towards making Malmö an eco-city (Malmo stad 2012).

4.1.1 Moves toward sustainability

High profile neighborhoods like the Western harbor have already been transformed using innovative design and renewable energy supply and increasing biodiversity go hand in hand with other initiatives to create a strong sustainability concept for the whole area. The project is considered successful in many aspects of sustainability; economically, socially and environmentally (Västra Hamnen 2006).

On the other end of the socioeconomic spectrum is the Ekostaden project in the district of Augustenborg. In the 1980’s Augustenborg in Malmö went through harsh economic, social and environmental challenges and the problems in Augustenborg were mainly socio-economic like unemployment, high turnover of residents and segregation, but also physical with deteriorating infrastructure and recurrent flooding in the area, adding to the negative image (Sustainable cities 2010).

In the late 90’s the municipality decided to start a renovation program called Ekostaden (Eco city). Ekostaden in Augustenborg is a good example of trying to create participation among the residents through environmentally oriented projects. The project made many changes in neighborhood reputation and appearance. Over 15,000 study visits have been carried out to the neighborhood (national and international). It has received visits from city planners, politicians
and scientists from a total of 37 countries over the years and the program serves as an example of how to transform existing neighborhoods into more eco-friendly alternatives. Augustenborg was featured as a case study for good practice in urban climate adaptation at the United Nations COP15 climate change conference in Copenhagen in December 2009. (World habitat awards 2010).

4.1.2 URBAN
In the mid 1990’s, Malmö was the first city in Sweden to launch a socioeconomic revival of part of the city through the EU URBAN program. The URBAN program was an EU initiative which targeted urban districts in need of socioeconomic revival, and 1996-2001, more than 100 million SEK were spent on 61 projects in five city districts in Malmö: Sofielund, Augustenborg, Almhög, Nydala and parts of Möllevången. All projects targeted challenges of sustainability, economic, social and environmental, and the URBAN headquarters were situated in the building that later came to host Garaget.

Although the objectives of the URBAN program were highly measurable things like 5 % higher employment rate in the areas, the creation of 300 new jobs, 25 new enterprises, education of 500 people (of whom 33% are expected to be long term unemployed) and the establishment of information centers and creation of Media and Cultural centers, the URBAN program had participation and engagement as key operative words, trying to establish a sense of community or “homeliness” (NUTEK 2001). This meant that community dialogue and setting up meeting places for exchange of ideas, consultations and finding common ground with the inhabitants were common modus operandi within the 61 projects of the URBAN program. It is on this foundation Garaget rests and to some extent has inherited its principles. The name Garaget is also oddly appropriate as the building had been the manufacturing and repair workshop for the electric road train that was envisaged to revitalize the public transport system in one of the largest URBAN projects in Augustenborg, a project that was abandoned at the end of the URBAN program in 2001 (Söderström & Wåstring 2012).

4.1.3. Malmö district development plan
During autumn 2008, the city of Malmö contracted a new three-year agreement with the national government. This so-called district development plan (områdesplan) promotes methods and solutions to be used in order to fight social exclusion through the interaction between the municipality, the inhabitants, the different kinds of organizations active in the districts, and the national authorities. As it would have been too expensive and too much work to develop the ten districts of Malmö, the municipality decided to give priority to the less advantaged districts, Hyllie, Rosengård, Fosie and Södra Innerstaden. In short, the district plan seeks to promote a strengthened public participation in the implementation and planning process of the four selected districts.

However, despite great efforts, Malmö still remains a divided city, socially, economically and geographically. Too much work need to be done to create partnership and cooperation between
the local businesses, the police, the non-profit organizations and all other actors concerned with the development of the districts (Nilsson 2011). The head of the district program stated that the objectives are to develop the areas according to the wishes of their inhabitants and all the people affected by the changes in the area, as well as to make people feel that their opinion is rather important in discussions relevant to the planning process. The expected result is an increase in public participation on issues referring to the urban development, and therefore a greater integration of the citizens, since they know they can influence the decisions taken (Nilsson 2011).

4.2 Garaget

Garaget is situated in the area of Södra Sofielund, which belongs to the district of Södra Innerstaden. Södra Sofielund started to develop during the second part of the 1800s. The area included small industries and business buildings. The area is characterized by a young population, since half of them are between 19 and 44, and 73% are under 44. Södra Sofielund has a heterogeneous population. More than 60% of the inhabitants have a foreign background, whereas the percentage is only 33% for the whole district of Södra Innerstaden. The five biggest ethnic communities are from Iraq, Bosnia, Yugoslavia, Poland and Denmark. But there are also substantial communities of Romanians and Somalis (Områdesfakta Södra Sofielund 2008).

The level of education is rather low, though it has increased over the last few years. People who were born outside Sweden have a lower educational level than the others. (Malmö municipality, 2009) 8% of the population has unknown educational background at all, 33% have a university
degree and 38% stopped their studies after high school. 6% of the 18-64 is unemployed and 4% of the 18-24 have no job. 23% of the population receive social aid (Områdesfakta Södra Sofielund 2008).

Garaget opened its gates in February 2008 as a partnership between the central administration of the municipality, division of culture, and the two districts of Fosie and Södra Innerstaden. The opening was the result of almost 3 years of deliberations and planning, starting as a request for a research centre on urban integration as a branch of Malmö University in 2005. At the same time there was a committee responsible for revitalizing the library in the area, and once these two ideas merged and formed a project group in 2007, it was decided that the municipality should form some sort of open space for engaging the citizens, create a new type of library and be a contact point for urban research (Davidson 2011).

With the opening of the Ideas Store in London as a model, the project committee decided to hold a series of dialogue meetings with the stakeholders in the district: representatives of the community, NGO’s and school representatives. During 2007 seven large dialogue meetings were held, where the participants could share their vision of what the future meeting place should look like and contain. More than 140 people attended these meetings and the result was to agree on the name Garaget (the Garage – a place where you can find almost anything) and to set up a DialogueLab, where the community could engage in a dialogue with the municipality, authorities, NGO’s and culture. In September 2008, the library part was added and opened to the public (Davidson 2011).

Most activities of Garaget have been based on the needs and wishes of people in the neighborhood as expressed through the ongoing dialogue with the community which is an important resource in the development of the city. Moreover, a great number of local associations and municipal administrations interact there. Study-circles, movie-events and different sports activities are also organized in Garaget (Dureigne 2011).

After almost 5 years, it is still a meeting place for all ages and interests. Garaget is an arena for increased participation and provide opportunities for people to develop new thoughts and ideas. The meeting place Garaget has been revamped during 2012, with a new interactive neighborhood library, a dialogue lab, an organic café, various activities and events and a creative open workshop. The attitudes of Garaget operations are based in part on user participation and the activities shall be open to all, non-commercial, accessible, welcoming and inspiring. These are the main activities there now:

4.2.1. Library
Garaget is a special library in a sense that the activities that take place there are not the same type of activities that we're used to see in the library context. The actual room and how it is arranged not immediately think of how people generally imagine a library, the bookshelves are relatively small and movable, the information desk is also a café counter, there's a stage with a large open area in front, and a creative workshop in the room (Asu and Rydberg 2012, p.8).
Nilsson (2008, p.33) has in her study concluded that “Garaget” is defined as a meeting place, where the library is a part of the project. This according to her can be seen as a part of an overall development in the Swedish libraries today. The term “library” is no longer obvious to describe the activities that are generally known as the library.

Here people can borrow, request books and obtain information. They can also borrow laptops or iPads in place. They have many books and the newspapers in different languages and try to fulfill different kinds of visitors' needs and interests (Malmo stad 2012).

4.2.2. Ecological café
There is an ecological café in the place that they offer visitors fresh bread and ecological coffee and fast food at a cheap price. In Garaget visitors can, while enjoying a hot cup of tea or coffee sit comfortably in one of the seating areas and glance through a magazine or check their emails and use the library atmosphere simultaneously (Malmo stad 2012).
4.2.3. Open stage

There is a possibility to use Garaget as a free space after the library is closed. People can borrow Garaget to arrange art exhibitions, organizing dance workshops, singing evenings or a lecture, watch a movie, hold a mobilization meeting, organize a theme night, offering a workshop or any other similar events inside the building. Garaget has a 580 square-meter room that can be used for much and the building is lent free of charge on evenings and weekends for various events (Malmo stad 2012).

“We hand out the key, the alarm code, and everything to people who come here. So when we close the library, we give the key to somebody else to take over and do their thing here. The last few years we’ve had 360 different activities with a wide range of topics and lots of people, we have around 6000 to 8000 visitors a month” (Interview with Garaget Coordinator 2012).

There are some rules for borrowing the building. First it must be clean and all the furniture must be restored after the events. Also, in order to arrange activities in Garaget, the following is required: The event is free and open to the public and no alcohol or drugs are involved. There is a possibility to use all the facilities inside the building during an event; a small kitchen with microwave, refrigerator, freezer, coffee maker, dishwasher, miscellaneous tableware and kitchenware, small stage with some stage lighting, PA system, 2 microphones and a video
projector, chairs for approx. 100 people. The events should be able to link to one or more of the sustainability dimensions:

• Ecological sustainability
• Social sustainability
• Economic sustainability
• Support and access for groups that rarely come across in society (Malmo stad 2012).

4.2.4. Creative workshop
The creative workshop in Garaget is an open workshop that serves as a motivating place for both adults and children. Here is a wide variety of materials, equipment, courses and literature in various fields related to creative activities like sewing machines and toolboxes. They also have courses in various kinds of handcraft and painting. During my observation two of the library staff were preparing for the coming workshop in the evening, and they explained their job briefly: “My job here is to help out creating a workshop for kids and also take pictures and document it. We have different workshops in different days and the reason is to give the kids opportunities to have something meaningful to do after school.” (Observation, 20120920)

4.2.5. Computer room
To facilitate the visitor’s needs, there are eight computers that can be used for training or just to browse the internet or writing work applications. During my observation the computer room was almost full with younger individuals, and seemed a very popular and engaging place for that group.

4.2.6. Meeting room
Meeting room is a place that can be booked by an organization, private group or any other residents that want to have a place to discuss ideas and have meetings. During my observation there was a Language Coffee (Språkcafè) for people who want to practice and improve their Swedish and also enjoy having a cup of coffee, with a Swedish female as a mentor.

4.2.7. Quiet room
They have decided to dedicate one room to students or other visitors who want to read or do their homework in a quiet room and all these new parts added according to people’s suggestions through dialogue workshops or surveys.

“Before we only have this one big room and we couldn’t have a lot of different activity at the same time. like you can’t sit here and study and at the same time something on the open stage and people can sit and have creative work shop. People wanted a quite study room; meeting room that you can book everybody can book to have private meeting and a computer room for young kids.” (Interview with Garaget Coordinator 2012)
4.3 Goals and objectives of Garaget

The budget for Garaget today is around 5 million SEK per year, and most of that goes to cover the permanent staff. The logical framework of the program was developed through workshop sessions with the staff and the overall objective of Garaget is to decrease the marginalization of the community, increase participation in the area, and create a natural meeting place for information, dialogue and creative activities.

This overall objective is interpreted in yearly plans of operation, budgeted and approved by the municipality and broken down to activities. These can range from very concrete things like: *Using the café to prolong the visitors’ stay and use of Garaget* → *improve and widen the variety of foodstuff offered* → *indicator: 20% increase in revenue from the café*, to more abstract chains of reasoning as: *All activities should be based on participation of visitors in different ways* → *educate all staff in citizen participation and democratic forms of conducting meetings* → *indicator: the staff feels that they have increased their awareness and competence in participatory techniques* (Verksamhetsplan 2012).

In 2011 a large survey was made among the visitors of Garaget to find out more about how the needs and wants of the users. A questionnaire with 39 questions was used to capture what the visitors wanted Garaget to evolve into. As a result of the survey, Garaget has increased its opening hours from 37 hours/week to 42 hours/week, and will be open in the evening one day/week. It will also evaluate the use of the DialogueLab and how to integrate the research done at Garaget into the other activities, as a majority of the users did not see the need of having research done separately from the other activities.

![Picture 4. A meeting place for different activities, Garaget. Photo : Nille Leander (Malmo stad)](image-url)
5. Analysis

5.1 Participation

Garaget emerged as a result of two different projects: plans for a new district library, and the idea of creating a center for urban integration where scientists, public servants and community organizations could meet and share knowledge about integration and inclusion. They worked with Workshops - Dialogue meetings, to which they invited the inhabitants of the area to investigate the expectations and opinions on this new, experimental meeting place. These dialogue meetings became regular, and continued to be an important factor when taking decisions regarding Garaget’s operations.

According to the coordinator the building was empty for several years and civil servants and politicians from Malmo city were discussing what to do with it and another library in the neighborhood was also closed. So the need for having a library in the neighborhood can be seen. "They were discussing maybe we should open the new library here but they thought that there are also a lot of more rooms than just a library. Maybe we should ask people of this area what we should put inside this building. How can this building be used in this neighborhood. So we organized seven dialogue workshops and invited people from the neighborhood, children from school next by, people who live in the area, people from organization and so on. And the question that they work with was how can be this building be in used? We want to have a library but what more? A lot of people came. Around 200 people with wide range, young...Lots of suggestions came out through these workshops people could vote on the website and here. We had these dialogue workshops in this empty room. It was not furnished at all, totally empty. Then people voted and we tried to focus on all this suggestion. What do we really think that is important for the neighborhood and people wanted to have." (Interview with Garaget Coordinator 2012)

The way Garaget uses participation fulfills all four elements required in Creighton’s (2005) definition of public participation: real interaction between participants and administrators through dialogue meetings, and well organized and intentional process, taking decisions and influencing how they are implemented. This seems to be at the heart of the idea of Garaget, and as one of the librarians puts it: “There are always new challenges, and through our assembled experiences, backgrounds and educations we can see challenges from a variety of angles and find a solution for most situations. By using participation through changes made in Garaget we make sure that our visitors can contribute and give their view on our operation.” (Interview with Garaget Librarian 2012)

So Garaget is really designed and developed through a two-way communication and interaction, with the overall goal of achieving better quality decisions, which then are also supported by the public when implemented as summed up in this quote by a participant during my observation: “I
like it here, it’s full of light and they changed the industrial place to a meeting place. It’s a multicultural place and many people attend with different background.” (Observation 20120920)

It could be argued that Garaget has inherited this strong tradition on involving the community in not only planning, but also decision-making around this new meeting-place, from the 61 projects implemented during the URBAN program. There has been a high degree of participation in both the planning and development process of Garaget, and it is very fitting that it not only inherited the institutional culture of the program, but also the space itself, the URBAN program headquarters.

5.2 Community of practice

The activities at Garaget mirror the three factors necessary to construct a community of practice according to Etienne Wenger (1998): through the participatory process, Garaget tries to establish a domain of common interests and knowledge among the visitors. Many activities are focused on learning and sharing knowledge between visitors and with invited groups or individuals. In their common situation as to some degree socioeconomically and culturally marginalized, this outsider position can form a common interest to pursue activities to strengthen the community and their position in the city. To do this they share and organize activities and learning experiences which could be described as satisfying the third factor Wenger mentions: the practice. In doing things together they share knowledge and possibly a way in to society, through the collective strength of the community (Wenger 1998).

“Our goal here at Garaget is to provide a place where you can either do something creative yourself or just come here as a visitors to see something happening to go to some of our arrangements.” (Interview with Garaget Coordinator 2012)

From the start the university has also been involved in trying to establish a bridgehead between research and social change of the community. Garaget can therefore also be seen as having a strong base in learning and action research, a way of interaction between social research and the community in order to promote a more sustainable society. This is not only for the benefit of the community, as the research also gets infused by the real life experiences and defining the problems in a more grounded way through the participation of the community.
5.3 Creating a public private space
Garaget is a place to meet strangers, but also a place where different communities can manifest their togetherness by using the place after opening hours and inviting the public to join them. It can be both a high-intensive and a low-intensive meeting place, depending on who is currently using the space to organize an activity (Aabøa, Audunsona, and Vårheim 2010). By being such an open and common asset, Garaget can develop a common meaning and attachment to motivate the citizens to participate and influence community development efforts (Manzo and Perkins 2006).

“But here people come from different range we have medicine students sitting study all day, people from area come here maybe newly arrived never been to library before they heart that they can borrow computer here ,take copies very cheap or just read newspaper in different languages. Families with young kids come here plays read books in different languages .lot of people from different background they meet here and actually happen and it’s a little unusual.” (Interview with Garaget Coordinator 2012)

As can it can be understood from the interview with the coordinator, the surrounding community were involved in developing the activities of Garaget and were the main influence on changes and development of both the place and project.

They wanted this building to have an open stage that they could borrow for free. Where you could have activities and where they could organize activities. So people come to us. They can be private, persons or organization or whatever. They have an idea like to organize a festival or circus workshop for young people or literature debates or evening events. We who work here never decide what kind of activities we should have.” (Interview with Garaget Coordinator 2012)

Although the initiative of establishing Garaget came from researchers and the local authorities, the community has been deeply involved in shaping the strategies and activities of Garaget. “It was started in an area with very few cultural activities and arenas, and through citizen participation the city of Malmö wanted to create a place where they took in the opinions and needs of the public. This process was the foundation of Garaget, and participation continues to be a big part of Garagets ongoing evolvement.” (Interview with Garaget Librarian 2012)

Throughout the whole process the goal has been to create a common ground, a place of inclusion and shared values. If the traditional library has attempted to emulated the old village square (Aabøa, Audunson, and Vårheim, 2010), and private space can be used to experiment and develop socially without control of outside forces like the state and the market (Baum, 1997), then Garaget is an attempt of capturing the spirit of both the village square and the living room.

“We are an extra living room because in living room you usually have books and library, you also can be creative.”(Interview with Garaget Coordinator 2012)
Picture 5. Your living room (Ditt Vardagsrum), Garaget: Photo taken by author
6. Conclusion

To make our cities sustainable socially, economically and environmentally, we have to address some of the challenges that come with globalization. Garaget is an attempt to revitalize an area of Malmö that has been hard hit by the decline of the manufacturing industry, lack of investment (public and private), migration and social exclusion. But in contrast to the previous period of the URBAN program, Garaget does not focus on employment or entrepreneurship to change the socio-economic status of the area, but instead offers increased participation through culture, learning and interaction with researchers. By establishing a meeting place that combines the advantages of being both public and private, both high-intensive and low-intensive, a village square and a living room, the authorities hope to increase participation in general, create a sense of community, and through that turn the negative trends in the city district around.

It is interesting to see that the researchers at Malmö Högskola together with the local authorities have been such strong driving forces in establishing Garaget, which by design is strongly community oriented and participatory. There seems to be a complex mix of a very top-down project evolving to a bottom-up laboratory of dialogue, participation and sustainability. The building’s prior use as a manufacturing factory, URBAN program office and green train workshop (part of the Malmö 2020 sustainability policy) are all testimonies of the dominant economic forces in the city district at the time. Now it is totally focused on the residents’ participation, inclusion and well-being, but seems isolated from the outside forces that dominate society. It is a sanctuary, in danger of closing the community in a bubble, rather than increasing their connection to the surrounding society.

The activities offered at Garaget has a strong participatory focus and include improving basic skills as internet/IT use, language courses, workshop oriented activities for younger children to promote creativity and an open stage for parties, cultural events and concerts. There is little interaction with the business community, public and private employers, entrepreneurs, or job centered activities, which could be a more direct way of improving the social economic situation for many of the participants. Instead there is a focus on strengthening the community through developing a special public/private encouraging participation and inclusiveness, but only within the local community, not the “surrounding” world.

I am not sure if this is giving up on the idea of trying to include the residents in the labor market or economy, and instead making the marginalized position more comfortable by offering a public living room, or if the strengthened identity and public participation will yield a better outcome in the long run. I hope further research can show whether this model of a second living room also is a way to open up routes into mainstream society, and that places like Garaget also can attracted people from outside the afflicted district to a much higher degree and become a village square again.
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Appendix

Main Questions for Interviews:

1. What were the ideas behind the Garaget? Why did they start it?
2. What do you try to achieve through different activities in Garaget?
3. What do you want to reach through people participation in Garaget activities?
4. How did participation help you to reach your goals within the Garaget?
5. What are your overall goals?
6. Which parts are more successful in attracting visitors according to you?
7. Did you face any challenges within the Garaget and how did you manage these challenges?
8. Do you think Garaget can be a successful model to be use in other part of Malmo or even Sweden? If not, what kind of changes would you suggest to be more successful in reaching the goals?