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ABSTRACT

This thesis project explores the research question of “How can vulnerable groups be encouraged to contribute with genuine personal content to a shared entity (the archive) in a scalable way?”. The project applies co-design practices in order to identify qualities that a system for collaborative self-archiving should incorporate in order to engage vulnerable groups to contribute to the archive, more specifically exploring what would motivate the refugees in Sweden to contribute to the Swedish archive. Several workshops have been run together with the target group, preceded by sensitizing exercises and interviews and supported by additional field research of the other stakeholders for the subject explored - the professional archivists and the Swedish citizens.
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1. INTRODUCTION & RESEARCH QUESTION

Storytelling has always been part of human culture, from the micro level of individual’s intimate experiences to family memorials and to the macro level of national cultural heritage. The intertwining of variety of stories on all those levels, supported by tangible historical artifacts, documents, photos and other media is what shapes our history, what gives it a narrative quality through which it is capable to reach not only the professional historians but also the ordinary public. History as a subject of study has been taught to children in our schools since early age and certain knowledge about our predecessors is expected to be part of the adult majority’s common knowledge. Such awareness of what has been in the past is required of all of us for a reason. Understanding what, how and why has been shaping our realities in the past is a vital knowledge for maintaining progress and improvement of the current ways our societies are functioning and shaping our daily lives. Consequently, it is the duty of the present to document as profoundly as possible the reality of today for the future to be able to learn from it and build upon it. This mission is with even greater importance when it comes to phenomenons in our societies that haven’t been witnessed before in their specific configurations and the following them ramifications.

Such an extra-ordinary instance of historical concatenation of circumstances is the emerged “refugee crisis” in Sweden. In 2015 an unprecedented number of 162 877 refugees have entered Sweden in a search of asylum (The Migration Agency, 2015) which is a 1.2 influx of the nation’s population. Standing on solid ground with its own political situation, flourishing economically and having an excellently functioning society system for its own citizens, Sweden has decided to attempt helping the immense number of refugees who’ve entered the country. That, though, has turned out to be quite a challenge even for a power country like Sweden to handle efficiently as the number of asylum seekers entering the state has overpassed the capacity of the current system structure to handle all those individual cases in a timely manner. From that status quo has emerged an unprecedented situation of thousands of individuals being in a limbo state of waiting for a decision from the state. A decision that defines if they can stay in the country and start building a life for themselves here or not, a decision the lack of which paralyses those people in their capabilities to be part of and contribute to the community. This places that vast amount of people in a particularly vulnerable situation.

To be able to profoundly capture this reality for the archive and the future generations, it needs to be documented from different angles and through the different relevant perspectives of the stakeholders involved in the situation. The power imbalance between those stakeholders though plays a significant role in what ends up in the archive and what is left outside of it. “How to give voice to the marginal? How can we involve the underrepresented in contributing to our archives, and in sharing the story of our times from their point of view? How to create conditions for accessing intangible heritage resources beyond traditional methods?” (Nilsson, 2016) are questions that the research project Living Archives (2013) is arising and exploring. “The purpose of the Living Archives project is to research, analyze and prototype how archives for public cultural heritage can become a significant social resource, creating social change, cultural awareness and collective collaboration pointing towards a shared future of a society.” (Living Archives, 2013).
As part of the Living Archives research and as a pre-study to this thesis, a student project for a “Collaborative media” class has been developed to explore different approaches to collaborative self-archiving (Living Archives’ IxD Master Student Project: Co-archiving Practices for Flight Documentation, 2017). To gain insights for designing co-archiving concepts, me and a team of four other students, ran several workshops with refugee participants. What was one of the strongly sensed discoveries of those workshops was that the personal contact and trust we’ve established with the participants, along with the created social environment was key for engaging them in our activities and encouraging a genuine personal input from them. The storytelling and personal materials we’ve gathered through our explorations with the participants can be deemed intriguing and genuine enough to be worth being part of an archive collection. It is important to bear in mind though that the collection of that valuable quality material was influenced by two key factors:

1. The refugees we’ve managed to recruit as our participants were young, educated and proactive people.

2. The setting of our workshops was one based on personal contact, social interactions and sensible feel of equality, friendship and mutual interest in one another.

The problems that these factors bring with themselves though need to be considered as the current thesis study is being approached with the goal to design a co-archiving practice that has the potential to successfully work in the real world with all its ramifications. To address the issues implicated by those factors the following questions emerge:

1. How to design conditions for engaging a broad range of refugees to contribute with personal input to the Swedish archive?

2. How can vulnerable groups be encouraged to share genuine input for the shared archive, to self-archive themselves as a community in a credible way if the role of archivists being personally engaged with them is removed?

To tackle these sub-questions and relate them to broader contexts, this thesis aims to explore the research question of how can vulnerable groups be encouraged to contribute with genuine personal content to a shared entity (the archive) in a scalable way?

Additionally this thesis also aims to explore the subquestion of:

3. What factors influence the capability of co-design methods applied for vulnerable groups to generate viable design solutions?

2. THEORY

2.1. Archiving overview
Such individual and collective personal stories have started to become valuable for our archives along with the development of the archiving profession over time. “Archival paradigms over the past 150 years have gone through four phases: from juridical legacy to cultural memory to societal engagement to community archiving. The archivist has been transformed, accordingly, from passive curator to active appraiser to societal mediator to community facilitator.” (Cook, 2012). To get to that state, the archival discourse has started already in the 70s to express critique regarding the archive practice capabilities to “provide the future with a representative record of human experience in our time” (Johnston, 2001). Without having a more inclusive process, it is arguable how “representative” the archival depictions of our reality can be, given that there are always certain power imbalances in our societies. As Derrida (1995) also depicts in his philosophical take on the archive “there is no political power without control of the archive, if not memory. Effective democratization can always be measured by this essential criterion: the participation in and access to the archive, its constitution, and its interpretation”. What is more, as argued by Ketelaar (2009) such participation in the archival process, in the memory building and meaning making that is part of it, “may constitute a healing ritual. Archives as a space of shared custody and trust” (Ketelaar, 2009). “It is this process of memory-making and identity formation that has attracted the attention of many scholars in the past decade” (Cook, 2012) and that this project will be looking in for ways to document the current reality through means of community self-archiving. The role of the archivist will still be needed for shaping the final archiving entry but given the vast number of asylum seekers along with the ambition to reflect their different perspectives in a representable way, I identify a need for technology to aid the process of generating personal archival material without requiring 1:1 connections between archivists and refugee contributors to the archive. The technological society we are nowadays living in also gives a new set of tools for approaching the way we archive as Cook (2012) also points out: “archives as concept, as practice, as institution, and as profession may be transformed to flourish in our digital era, especially one where citizens have a new agency and a new voice, and where they leave through digital social media all kinds of new and potentially exciting, and potentially archival, traces of human life, of what it means to be human”. Lastly, since “some of the most innovative and original work occurs in hybrid fields where scholars draw on the work of more than one discipline.” (Manoff, 2004) combining the archiving practice with the field of interaction design and through participatory design methods has the potential to take us to interesting results.

2.2. Participatory design

Participatory design aims at including the people for whom we’re designing in the process of creation and thanks to their expertise together to come up with more innovative solutions that better serve the end users’ needs and that better represent the end users’ interests and drivers (Sanders, 2002). Through participatory design can be achieved a “process of investigation, understanding, reflecting upon, establishing, developing and supporting mutual learning between multiple participants in collective ‘reflection-in-action’” (Simonsen & Robertson, 2013). In the context of this project, designing together with the refugees could help to come up with a solution that is better equipped to involve this vulnerable group in contributing to the archive.
2.3. Canonical examples and state of the art

2.3.1. Black Women in the Archival Science Professions
The call for inclusiveness in the process of archiving the lives of underrepresented voices is also made by a study focusing on representations of black women in archives (Warren, 2016). The study explores the misrepresentation of black women in society and points out that one of the reasons for it were recruitment problems in the archiving profession. The marginal has been overlooked in the past and nowadays even though we pay more attention and try to be more inclusive we still have a predominantly homogenous archiving professionals. That by itself holds a risk of them not being able to representatively reflect on the genuine reality of the marginalised population due to the natural human bias of every individual being multiplied by the homogenous nature of a given group.

2.3.2. Refugee stories told by journalists
Many organisations nowadays, around the hot topic of the refugee crisis in Europe, tend to try to tell the refugee story via having journalists who interview and then publicly share the refugee stories they’ve got a hand on. Some examples are the UN refugee Agency (2017) and The Guardian (2017). While those stories are impactful for the reader, they are still a second hand product as they are presented from the perspective of a mediator, the journalist and are defined by the specific selection of questions he/she’s been asking the refugees being interviewed.

2.3.3. Call for refugee stories by Kulturen i Lund
Kulturen i Lund (2017) has also recently started a campaign for gathering refugee related stories. The key difference though being that they are seeking to get a collection of unmediated stories from the refugees and their volunteers by giving them the freedom to share whatever content they feel like in whatever language they feel comfortable with. This very open format of first hand story sharing, driven by the person’s own values and motivation to share, creates a possibility to explore what it is exactly that these people in a vulnerable situation would deem worthy to share if there isn’t a moderator to guide the process. This being very close to what I’d like to explore with this thesis, I conducted an interview with them, the details and discoveries of which can be read in section “4.6. Interview with an archivist from Kulturen i Lund”.

2.3.4. Life needs internet
Life needs internet (2014) is a project that aims at documenting digital culture through the traditional analog medium of handwritten letters. Seeking to explore people’s true feelings about the internet and their diverse subjective take on how it affects their lives, the researcher has spent 7 months travelling in countries all over the world and gathering 70 letters in people’s own native languages. He later translated and uploaded those letters on the internet to use as “an archaeological insight into digital culture” (Life needs internet, 2014). While this project gathered interesting results it is yet again another storytelling projects that requires a moderator, a researcher who goes and drives the process of creation and acquiring of people’s letters. What is more, his open call for others to join and keep sending him their own handwritten letters seem to have not inspired many more entries besides the ones he established personal contact with. This again arises the question of what would motivate people to share their experiences if there isn’t a personal nudge from the researcher for each individual to contribute.
2.3.5. Casual sex project
This project is run by a researcher sexologist and “is a collaborative effort to share our true stories of casual sex experiences or hookups of all kinds” (Casual sex project, 2017). The reason for this project is a misrepresentation of the topic explored as the statics about casual sex have mostly been based on undergraduates while in reality they are not the only ones “hooking up”. This is an example of a project working on a sensitive topic that has been mis- or underrepresented and that has managed to very successfully engage people to share honest personal stories with the public. The anonymity ensured in it makes it safe for people to share incredibly intimate experiences. Driven by genuine interest in the topic and the very human, down to earth relevance of it, the project has so many followers and contributors that it has even started with educational purposes. This work shows how self-archiving and intimate experience sharing with the public is very achievable given the right framework is provided on a topic that the vast majority of people is genuinely interested in.

3. METHODS

3.1. Design research
For this thesis will be conducted design research as formulated by Harvard Maare (2015): “Design research can be defined by the following five characteristics
- Design research is oriented towards change
- Prototyping and design are part of the research activities
- Research involves real-world settings and people
- The research process is iterative
- Design research produces design knowledge intended for designers and practitioners”

3.2. Generative design (co-design)
As this project is pursuing a collective self-archiving system, a key aspect of it is doing so via exploring collaborative “designing for self” methods. This is the so called co-design where the users are not simply reactive informers for the designer but are active contributors and co-creators of the design solution. Falling under the umbrella of participatory design, this way of designing with the users rather than just for them is seen as most fit for this project relating to its goal to find ways for collaborative co-creations of a shared story, shared legacy for the future and even shared identity.

This project will be using methods from the Generative design field (Sanders & Stappers, 2012) and will be exploring all the levels via which the future users of the system can feed its development. Namely I will be researching what people SAY, what people DO and the most central for co-design level of what people MAKE (fig. 1). Covering all three categories will give the opportunity to explore not only the explicit and the observable knowledge and experiences of the users but also their tacit and latent knowledge. What is more, as the design process develops over time, asking the participants to think about the subject and share thoughts (Say level) and keeping track of their own activities (Do level) prepares them for later trying to design a system for themselves (Make level). This kind of comprehensive stimulation prior to the final generative session empowers the participants
to use all the levels of their knowledge in a more efficient and conscious way when it comes to applying it in the MAKE session.

Figure 1 - What people Say, Do and Make in relation to the user’s knowledge behind it and the methods that reveal it. Taken from the book Convivial Toolbox (Sanders & Stappers, 2012)

3.3. Qualitative semi-structured interviews
As Myers & Newman (2007) point out “The qualitative interview is the most common and one of the most important data gathering tools in qualitative research” but it is at the same time also “fraught with difficulties” (Myers & Newman 2007). To tackle some of those difficulties I will be conducting semi-structured interviews for this project. This format is appropriate for the context of the field explored as the interviews for this project imply the sharing of personal stories and potentially sensitive information. For such interviews to be successful an atmosphere of trust and comfort should be established to invite the interviewee to honest and genuine sharing. This can be achieved by having more of a conversation, meaning it’s rather a talk - the researcher also shares personal experiences and the interest is mutual. This makes the participants feel more relaxed and less formal while the researcher can still “sneak in” the questions he/she has planned to get answers of as the conversation is flowing. The open part of the format is of importance to the project as it also allows for the participant to share things not being prior anticipated by the researcher and thus not prepared in specified for it questions.

3.4. Survey exploration of mass opinion
A survey is a tool for gathering quantitative data with certain statistical value. The survey used for this project though will be more focused on the qualitative input of the participants and will seek it through the use of very open-ended questions. This allows gaining an overview of the question explored without applying the researcher’s already existent assumptions on the matter.
3.5. Sensitizing workbook
The preparation of participants for a coming co-design workshop via activities conducted prior to the workshop itself is defined as “sensitizing” by Sanders & Stappers (2012). It is a research method that aims at building awakened sensitivity and expressive ability of the participants so that they are better equipped to co-create relevant solutions in the generative session. “Insight into the deeper layers of understanding requires that the participant has been thoroughly involved in the problem or situation for some time” (Sanders & Stappers, 2012). For the purposes of this project a workbook for personal self-reflection over the period of a week has been chosen.

3.6. Workshops
Generative sessions require an appropriate setting and toolkits to inspire co-creation. For this project a workshop format has been used where few participants that know each other from before take part in a designers’ setting. The established prior to the session friends relation with and between the participants helps them to feel relaxed and free to express themselves. Providing the participants with tools and appropriate preparation activities is vital for awakening their creative skills and supporting them in the co-design creative process. Ideally the workshop environment should be inviting for collaborative work and giving the participants the opportunity to apply their tacit knowledge already stimulated from the sensitizing activity.

3.7. Ethical considerations
The work with participants for this project has been done according to the ethical standards in research formulated by the Swedish Research Council (2002). The participants have been informed that their participation is voluntary, that they can stop at any time and do not need to answer a question if they don’t like it. They have been acquainted with the purposes of the project and have been informed that their inputs will not be used in any other contexts without their permission. Prior to the use of any recording devices (camera, audio recorder, phone) the participants have been asked if they agree with this kind of documentation and the recording has taken place only if all present participants have agreed to it. The identities of the participants have been anonymised in this study for privacy reasons. Participants who appear on pictures have approved the usage of these photographs.

3.8. Project plan
The stages of the design process that took place during this project were:
1. Evaluation of pre-study discoveries in real life settings
   a. Friends - write a letter to Sweden and audio record it > What people DO
   b. Practitioners as part of Workshop 1 - how you feel about the idea > What people SAY
   c. Refugees in a camp as part of Workshop 2 - how you feel about the idea + please write a letter to Sweden (continuum of a.) > What people SAY & DO
   d. Analysis and identifying qualities for the system, iteration 1
2. Research phase
   Understanding the stakeholders’ perspectives
   a. Interview with an archivists’ project close to mine > What people DO
b. Survey with Swedish people > What people SAY

c. Interviewing refugees > What people SAY

d. Analysis and identifying qualities for the system, iteration 2

3. Co-design phase
   a. Sensitizing via filling workbooks > What people DO
   b. Preparing and running Workshops 3 & 4 - co-design a system reflecting on being a refugee in Sweden > What people MAKE
      i. Pilot run of workshop with international students
      ii. Official run of workshop with refugees

4. Analysis and concept design phase
   a. Analysing all data collected and identifying qualities for the system, iteration 3
   b. Final concept exploration

5. Discussion
   a. Evaluation of research and design process
   b. Evaluation of final concept and possible future developments

4. DESIGN PROCESS

The design process followed the double diamond model (Design Council, 2015) (fig. 2)

Figure 2: The activities of my design process in the double diamond model
4.1. Living Archives workshops - exploration of 2 concepts

At the beginning of this design process I was offered the opportunity to take part in a workshop ran by the Living Archives (2013) research project. The workshop was going to take place with 4 practitioners of the archiving profession and 4 refugees living in a refugee camp in Sweden. It was planned as a participatory design workshop where the participants are presented with rough ideas that they discuss and build upon. The ideas presented to them had to be on a very low fidelity level so that the participants would feel comfortable with changing them, criticizing them, combining them, falling them apart, etc.

![Image](image.jpg)

**Figure 3: My two concepts for the Living Archives workshop in their low fidelity format**

I contributed with two concepts (fig. 3) for the workshop’s bulk of ideas to be presented to the participants.

The formation of the first concept “Letters to Sweden” was based on my so far gathered knowledge of the target group, shaped by the discoveries of the pre-study (as mentioned in the Introduction). I chose the format of a letter for an input to the collaborative archiving system here as it had proved to give good results in the activity of writing letters to abstract receivers that we ran in one of the pre-study workshops. The concept’s core is in writing a letter to Sweden as if it was a person. It was aiming at exploring in this way what are people’s actual feelings towards this country and their lives in
The concept also suggested that the author of the letter should make an audio recording of himself/herself reading the letter to Sweden. The recording would be paired with the written letter of that person and the two will enter the archive as one entry. This audio aspect of it was added due to an inspiration from the feedback of a refugee from the last workshop of the pre-study. The participant had expressed the opinion that the media of voice recording is more engaging than just text since through the voice of the actual person telling his/her own story one can more easily feel the other person’s feelings and personally relate to them.

The other concept “My Sweden Today” was created to explore the context of a refugee camp that hasn’t been done in the pre-study. It was based on the little knowledge I had of the reality of a refugee camp and more specifically the vast amount of waiting time and frustrations that this “life on pause” generates. I had gained this knowledge from analysing the well documented results of the previous workshop that the Living Archives (2013) had ran with the same participants. The concept was based on the assumption that with a lot of free time and a lot of feelings on the matter people would be motivated to share their thoughts and experiences in Sweden if a safe space for it is provided in the camp.

4.2. A letter to Sweden probe and results

While preparing for the Living Archives workshop there was time when the plan was to let the participants in some way experience the ideas being presented for them. To pursue this goal I decided to gather some real entries of the “Letters to Sweden” concept. Due to time limitations I used the people in my immediate surrounding, friends and classmates, as participants for this probe. Four people took part in it - two of them were international students having been in Sweden for less than an year and the other two of them were Swedish citizens with foreign parents. I wanted to have examples of different target groups as part of the concept was to have a wide variety of entries for the “Letters to Sweden” archive, it being inclusive for everyone and depicting a broader picture of the people’s perception of the country.

The entries I’ve received (fig. 4) proved several points:

- The audio recording of the author reading their own letter did prove to be more impactful than just reading the text. Hearing the voice of the person sharing their genuine thoughts makes it more personal and makes the letter more “alive”. On the other hand though, not everyone is comfortable with audio recording of themselves and one of my four participants refused to record reading it.

- While for half of the participants this abstract receiver (Sweden as a person) did inspire the wanted personal and emotional sharing of their Swedish perspectives, it turned out to be a too abstract of a task for the other two participants who either took the task guidelines too literally (just shortly finishing every sample sentence beginning I gave them) or lacked the personal touch of the letter by only stating facts about the Swedish ways. That has made their entries less personal and somewhat “drier”.


- The people for whom Sweden is a homeland have harder time shaping what to say to it as it is too big part of them and thus hard to fit in words as a short letter. As one of the Swedish participants noted she had too many thoughts about Sweden and thus she ended up writing a “short poem”. On the other hand this proved to be an easier task for international people who’ve come from the outside and have gathered a lot of new impressions over their limited time in the country.

Figure 4: Letters to Sweden (handwritten & digital) and their audio recordings (See Appendix for all entries)

4.3. Workshop 1 - with practitioners via the Living Archives

When the date of the planned workshop in collaboration with the Living Archives (2013) came, we were informed half an hour before the start of the workshop that the camp refugees will not make it to town today for the workshop. Since that happened on a too short notice and the practitioner participants were already on their way, we ran the initially planned as mixed-participants workshop only with the practitioners.

Being used to abstract thinking and working with conceptualisations, the practitioners were skillful at combining the ideas presented to them and coming up with new ideas inspired by the discussion process. One such idea was including the use of mobile devices for self-archiving via a kind of mobile kit.
Out of the ideas presented to them, they all showed dislike to the concept of “Two Futures” where the users enter 2 alternatives of their futures - one where they get the asylum and get to stay in Sweden for the next 10 years and one where they don’t get it and are somewhere else in 10 years. The practitioners thought that this idea shouldn’t be developed due to making such a comparison and thinking of the worst case scenario would arise too many negative emotions of the refugee users.

![Figure 5: Practitioners evaluating and developing the presented ideas (pink sticker = approval)](image)

The evaluation and elaboration by the practitioners (fig. 5) of my 2 concepts was:

- The “Letters to Sweden” idea should change “Sweden” which implies the state (and for some cultures that has negative meaning associated with danger) and replace it with “the Swedish people” because the refugees will feel better with writing to the ordinary individuals, including people with diverse backgrounds receiving the letter as well. 3 out of 4 practitioners marked this idea favorably.

- The “My Sweden” idea got combined with another idea that enhances the concept by letting the users also express frustration in nonverbal bodily ways - by kicking, jumping, spanking, etc.

4.4. Workshop 2 - with camp refugees via the Living Archives

Due to the camp refugees not being able to attend the planned workshop with the practitioners, another implementation of the workshop took place to gather their input as well. This one was held at their camp and allowed for them to feel more comfortable and for us to get a better feeling of their current reality.

Those camp refugee participants and their surroundings struck me as very different from the semi-integrated refugees that I had worked with up to this point (in the pre-study). The camp conditions were worse than what I anticipated and it was very sensible how those people are craving...
for human interactions. The strong social side of the refugees’ spirit shone once again. After the workshop they passionately insisted on us staying for lunch with them. Lunch they are not even allowed to cook themselves (and most often tastes bad) but they wanted none the less to “treat us” and spend more time socialising with us. The camp reality is filled with a lot of empty time with nothing to do (no tv, no newspapers, no books, no Swedish class, no computer, barely some internet occasionally) and nowhere to go (too limited resources to go to town often). Us being there as a diversity of the mundane boring everyday was welcomed very warm-heartedly and with aroused joy. The unpleasant and in a way extreme camp conditions left a strong impression on me together with how those people are managing to cope with this reality. Must require a strong spirit to stay balanced within oneself in such a disadvantaged and unpleasant reality. “The life at the camp is a life on hold, full of feelings of hope, chaos, and frustration of not knowing what is to come – an unknown future.”, “Why they don’t see us?”, “We exist!” are the camp refugees’ own words to reflect on this tough reality that is their life “on hold” right now.

The discussion that arose during the workshop around the presentation and evaluation of our concept ideas spanned over a variety of topics. The strongest one sensed though was the Problems theme. It almost felt like the only theme - everybody at the camp talk about their problems all the time. Problems have become equal to life for them. The participants commented how this is so intense that sometimes they need to try to talk about something positive among themselves, often going back to childhood memories for that reason. What was most significant for my project from this strong Problems theme amongst the refugees was the statement the participants made that:

*If it wouldn’t help them with their problems, refugees wouldn’t bother with input for the archive.*

This was quite a significant assumption to work with as during the pre-study the topic of Help hasn’t emerged. Seeking to identify qualities for the co-archiving system that will give it a chance to function in the real world and with the actual refugees in Sweden, gaining such deeper understanding of what drives the refugees is needed for the success of the project.

Talking exhaustingly much about their personal problems to us combined with their sensible pleasure of having us over at the camp implied that this is perhaps having a therapeutic value for them. Letting out some of the numerous things that bother you to someone who is interested in listening is known to help people deal with misfortune emotions better. The setting of this workshop confirmed that.

Another strong impression that the workshop with the camp refugees left in me was how they dealt with abstractions. In contrast to the practitioner archivists who are working with abstractions on a daily basis and freely play with them, the camp refugees had troubles with that as they were taking things too literally. This lead to them perceiving the presented concepts in a more limited light. Them being absorbed by the problems in their lives that are at hand and very pragmatic, they treated the concepts we brought to them with the same pragmatic down-to-earth approach by putting them in one exemplary scenario and working with that only.
When it comes to their evaluation and thoughts about specific concepts it was interesting to see how just as unanimously as the practitioners collectively disliked the “Two Futures” idea, the camp refugees all liked it. This shows that no matter how expert the practitioner archivists are, they can not always anticipate the reactions and perceptions of the people being archived, the refugees in Sweden in this instance. This confirms the opening for a system for collaborative self-archiving as such system will allow the being archived to share things and aspects that archivists perhaps haven’t deemed worth exploring before.

![Image](image.jpg)

*Figure 6: Camp refugees evaluating and discussing the presented ideas * (pink sticker = approval)

The discussion regarding my own 2 concepts presented (fig. 6) touched upon the following:

- The “My Sweden” idea provoked a reaction only from one of the three participants. It was a negative take on Sweden - “Sometimes what Sweden does is bad” the participant shared along with her other strong disappointments of the way the state has treated her and her sick daughter. This proved that such concept of letting people express feelings about Sweden while in a camp context is likely to generate only reflections of that frustration people have been building against the state which is keeping them in this situation without them understanding why and what is happening.

- The “Letters to Sweden” idea though got positive affirmation of all three participants. In contrast to the heavier discussion right before it, this concept started a lighter conversation with an animated feel about the Swedish weather. “Dear Sweden, I love you, but you are cold!” is how one participant started a sample letter while laughing. The others also started sharing impressions about how Swedish weather affects them. When I asked them if they would also share negative things about Sweden in such a letter they replied affirmative.

At the end of the workshop though, I had prepared envelopes with stamps and my address (fig. 7) as a “Letter to Sweden” probe to do with the actual camp refugees. Though they expressed positivity
towards the idea during the discussion when handed with an actual letter to write “to Sweden” some of them looked weary of it and others just accepted it with a kind smile after the initial startle. None of them did write and send a letter though. This confirms how “What people SAY” often can differ from “What people DO”.

![Image of envelopes with handwritten address: Raya Dimitrova, Test, 123456, Sweden]

*Figure 7: Envelopes for sending a “Letter to Sweden” to my address*

There are two main factors though that could have influenced this lack of participation:

- Mistrust to the unknown receiver.
  Camp refugees are very weary of their fragile situation in Sweden. They don’t want to risk their chances in any way and writing physical letters “to Sweden” but actually to an unknown receiver was most likely something suspiciously looking to them.

- It being a detached/impersonal activity, hence no social benefit
  The refugees have proved to be strongly driven by social interactions. Thus such a lonely activity as writing a letter and sending it in a postbox is not something that satisfies in any way their social needs. Hence their motivation for doing it is gone since now they don’t “get” anything from it.
4.5. Analysis and identifying qualities for the system, iteration 1

At the end of this first explorative and evaluative stage of the project I summarised my new findings along with the old ones (fig. 8) to identify key aspects that should be considered in the design of a collaborative self-archiving system and in the further explorations of the project.

![Figure 8: Summarising the so far discoveries](image)

So far what have been discovered brings the need to consider the following topics that relate to the qualities for the co-archiving system:

- **Social aspect**
  Refugees have proven to need social stimuli benefits to be motivated to participate in the “co-archiving” activities. The social interactions are of such great importance to them that once you remove it, their participation motivation drastically decreases.

- **Addressing Problems**
  Problems are the main theme that the refugees lives in a camp rotate around. Being in a limbo state seems to swallow everything else and make people think only of how to get out of this state and move on with their lives.
  In relation to that, the assumption goes as: People will not have motivation to participate if it doesn’t help their problems.
Practical & Concrete (vs Abstractions)
While the work done with young semi-integrated refugees during the pre-study showed that they are capable of dealing with abstractions on a fairly good level, the explorations during the first stage of this project showed that not everyone can do that. This project, though, aims to target the wider set of refugees in Sweden - both young and older, both integrated to a certain level and not integrated at all, both those having asylum and those not having it, both those with higher education and those without it. Given this, it is important that the collaborative self-archiving system should present its users with very clear and down-to-earth concepts, something practical that will be easy to grasp and work with for most of the refugees in Sweden.

Trust
 Refugees, especially those in a more vulnerable situation, are generally suspicious and not trusting outsiders of their community. A co-archiving system should manage to build a trustworthy look and feel to convince its users that it is a safe environment for sharing personal input.

4.6. Interview with an archivist from Kulturen i Lund

Starting the next opening up phase of the project I wanted to research the perspectives of the different stakeholders. I started with appointing an interview with an archivist from the museum Kulturen i Lund (2017) who works with an initiative they’ve had that is very close to where my interests for this project lie. As already mentioned in section “2.3. Canonical examples and state of the art” Kulturen has ran a campaign that is a call for sharing with the museum stories from both refugees and volunteers who’ve worked with refugees (Kulturen i Lund, 2017). The call gives the participants the absolute freedom of what they’d like to share and in what language. It was of uppermost interest of mine to find out how many refugees participated in this very open format for sharing, perhaps what drove them to do it and especially what they ended up sharing.

The archivist who works on this initiative and agreed to meet me was Karin Hindfelt. She was very helpful in sharing with me their results and insights based on their vast experience in the field (See Appendix for a recording of the interview). At the time we talked, the initiative has been going on for 2-3 months and has managed to collect 15 to 20 stories from refugees that are roughly from half a page to a couple of pages and some of them being “really really short”. Karin shared that the stories, however, are very impersonal and feel distant - most of them are just stating the facts (like the reasons why they had to flee their country) without talking about any feelings. According to her, this could have been due to the language barrier, them trying to write in English/Swedish, though it is quite questionable since even the one written in Arabic was just as unemotional and only stating facts. She expressed the opinion that it could have been because this is writing to an institution and thus inspires a more distant and impersonal tone. Karin shared that in their experience “the best, the most personal and reflective material has been in long conversations. If you sit with a cup of coffee the conversation floats between everything like ‘oo what a good cake' to very deep, very personal, sometimes traumatizing experiences.” (personal communication, Karin Hindfelt, 24.05.2017).
once again confirms the social significance assumption and the value in the therapeutic effect of sharing with a trusted companion. Karin also pointed out though that this requires an eye-to-eye conversation which in itself is a format that takes a lot of time (to build personal relationship) and could be exclusive for some people as it depends on the personal connection between the ethnographer conducting the interview/conversation and the refugee taking part in it. “Sometimes you just don’t connect. For whatever reason. And then I wonder if those stories will be uncollected. It’s a theory I have.” (personal communication, Karin Hindfelt, 24.05.2017). What is more, such relying on personal relationship conversations is dependent on who the archivist could get in contact with in the first place and thus further confirming the certain level of exclusion Karin was talking about. This yet again arises the need for a system that is more inclusive and can gather the voices even of those who don’t have the right connections and hence don’t go talk to ethnographers.

Another important point that Karin made was that the low number of participants could have also been due to the outdated format of writing a letter. “Of course it takes time for people to sit down and write and I think today people are so used to just sending text messages or communicating through social media that actually sitting down and writing down a long story seems dated. Especially young people, below middle aged at least.” (personal communication, Karin Hindfelt, 24.05.2017). This also relates to the new idea the practitioners came up with in the first workshop with the Living Archives that was focused on using more modern technologies for co-archiving practices such as mobile devices and social media.

4.7. Survey with Swedes

Since this is concerning the Swedish archive and the reality of refugees in Sweden specifically, I wanted to also get a sense of the feeling and thoughts of the Swedes who are also stakeholders in this context. In order to get an idea of what they genuinely think and feel I created a survey (See Appendix) with only three questions, two of which were very open-ended. I managed to get 30 responses from Swedes to the survey, almost equally distributed between men and women and most of the participants being in either the 24-34 or the 35-45 age groups.

After analysing the entries of the open ended questions (fig. 9) there were two strong topics that could be sensed throughout most of the answers:

- **Integration**
  Most of the Swedish participants expressed interest in the refugees themselves only when it comes to integration. This is the local’s greatest concern of the refugee situation in Sweden. And is a concern shared by mostly everyone regardless of whether it is accompanied by negative feel of disapproval or the attitude of “we, the Swedes, are not doing good enough job” (which is being positive towards refugee & negative towards the local authority).

  The question “What would you like to ask the refugees in Sweden if you had the chance to?” was aiming at finding out what kind of interest do Swedes have in these refugee human
beings that live amongst them. 17 out of the 30 participants have expressed Sweden-related integration interest only, while 7 have shown no interest in the refugees themselves and 6 has expressed more genuine human interest in them.

- **Help**
The majority of participants (20 out of 30) have explicitly expressed that they think Sweden should help the refugees here and should try to do a better job in it. Most of the shared opinions though consider this a responsibility of the authorities and only a few of my Swedish survey participants would personally engage in helping the refugees here to integrate (or have already tried to).
4.8. Interviews with refugees

I have used the survey results and what the Swedish participants have identified as interests they have about the refugees and the refugees' perspectives as guiding point for preparing the questions for the semi-structured interviews I was scheduling to have with refugees.

I ended up conducting interviews with seven refugee participants (fig. 10). They were semi-integrated in the local society and have all taken part in the workshops of our pre-study. I chose this target group not only for the time-saving practical reason of already having their contacts but also because these specific participants have already been in a way prepared for this topic, their sensitivity to the matter has already been awakened in the pre-study. Having already established some relation with them prior to their engagement in the current project, have made the process of getting closer to them and gaining deeper understanding of their real drivers a lot smoother. In the process of organising the interviews for this project and the social events that surrounded this scheduling process a sense of friendship with most of my refugee participants has been naturally built. This feel of equality, mutual sympathy and trust has helped to have genuine conversations with those people and for both sides to be more open and comfortable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Participant B</td>
<td>Participant M</td>
<td>Participant D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What drives this person?</td>
<td>Very calm &amp; introverted, likes stories</td>
<td>- Friends, the collective, being together, - likes to do new things</td>
<td>- Studying, build her future here and stay, - Various activities via various organisations, - Very proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Why did you come to our workshops?</td>
<td>- Friend told him, - likes stories - to share his own and listen to others</td>
<td>- to do new things with friends</td>
<td>- to meet new people, - see what malmo uni people do, - do something interesting, different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What did you like the most of them?</td>
<td>- the app for leaving stories in the city, - everybody putting pins on the big map</td>
<td>- being together! Telling the shared story of him and his friends here, - The media side - cool picture taken of him, vanity</td>
<td>activity, - map app, - discover stories in the city, - draw &amp; tell our stories for 5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sweden for you is?</td>
<td>Good far</td>
<td>Came to forget (his lost friend, old girlfriend)</td>
<td>Building my future for the third time. I don't want to move any more. I want to stay here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Choose Sweden because</td>
<td>Brother lives here</td>
<td>Brother lives here, father offended him</td>
<td>Her family is here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Swedish people don't &quot;give a shit&quot; for the other people and culture in their city.</td>
<td>- very kind, - very helpful. trying to help when asked</td>
<td>- Swedish people have always been nice to him, - They think they are the best in the world, - They have opportunities to do something here</td>
<td>- Things are not as perfect as she thought before she came here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>When he came he thought they are very friendly (because they treat all the time), they talk a lot, and are very social like middleeast culture.</td>
<td>- very kind, - very helpful. trying to help when asked</td>
<td>- Things are not as perfect as she thought before she came here</td>
<td>- Things are not as perfect as she thought before she came here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Thinks of Sweden that:</td>
<td>It's calm here, Swedish people have always been nice to him, Likes that they keep things simple</td>
<td>- They think they are the best in the world, - They have opportunities to do something here</td>
<td>- Things are not as perfect as she thought before she came here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The future here is:</td>
<td>Continuing his studies as engineer. he doesn't know if he will get 1.1 months.</td>
<td>Studying to be a translator and work here.</td>
<td>Studying EN &amp; SW to continue her studies in biomedical engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Analysing and comparing interview results (See Appendix for more documentation)

For all interviewees the biggest and most sensitive topic during those conversations/interviews was the Future. Building their future here is what life in Sweden is all about for them. And contrary to the assumption that all of them will want to go back to their country when the war is over, many would actually like to stay in Sweden. They all think there are many opportunities in this country and generally like it even though their perception of Sweden before coming here has been quite exaggerated while in reality they’ve discovered that things here are not that perfect. Studying has been the other all encompassing topic of their lives here as it is the way to build their future in the country. They are all focused now on studying languages (both Swedish and English) so that later the
younger ones can study for their dream job in a Swedish university and the older ones can find jobs locally.

When it comes to Integration, some of them, the more social ones, feel quite integrated within the Swedish community due to:

- being proactive about it and seeking ways to be part of their surroundings, e.g. going to community open events or registering for programs such as “i Malmö möts vi” where one gets a Swedish friend and tickets for doing activities together.
- Having received asylum and hence being able to enroll for language courses. Studying makes them feel like “any other Swedish person here” as it places them in a student status for the community.

Others on the other hand feel like integration is a problem and they suffer from not having Swedish contacts and friends. They blame the lack of interest or the prejudice of the local people, as well as the system itself that reinforces the segregation e.g. via the refugee children’s distribution in the Swedish school system not being mixed enough.

When I’ve been talking with them about why they themselves or other refugees would share their personal stories for the archive the answers rotated around:

- Helping others
  They would share their experiences here because it might help other refugees to know how things really are like (and decide if they want to come to Sweden) and give tips about how people can make it better for themselves here. On the other hand, hoping to get help is another reason why a refugee would share (confirming the assumption from workshop 2 with the camp refugees).

- Therapeutic value
  Would share to not keep it inside, to focus on the new life here and move on instead of fixating on the past - to “continue their story”. Several participants have even mentioned writing a book about their experiences (both the participants themselves and other refugees that they know who have expressed such desire).

- To be known
  They would share their challenges and problems just so that people know of them. Part of it is also about showing to people from other countries that they are “smart and can do a lot of things if given the time” as a kind of response to the prejudice they’ve been facing.

- Because it happened here
  Stating the facts. Would share the more significant facts of their lives - started school, started work, etc. This relates to the results of the Kulturen initiative - refugees consider as things worth sharing even just the bare facts of what has happened to them.
Out of the seven refugees interviewed only one haven’t got the asylum yet and is in that waiting limbo situation like the camp refugees. This inherently colors the experience of this individual as waiting for more than 2 years for a decision that can even be ‘no’ is a quite vulnerable and challenging life situation. Ironically this was also the participant with the most positive and integrated feeling of the Swedish community. “I see here true humanity” is what he says when it comes to Swedish society but at the same time he is very sad and doesn’t understand why the system makes him wait so long. The Waiting being another strong topic - for those who haven’t got the asylum most of all. But even those that have it, still carry a sense of uncertainty as it is given for 13 months only and is not promised to be continued after it.

4.9. Analysis and identifying qualities for the system, iteration 2

After the research activities in this second stage of the design process, I sat down to look over the results of it and find patterns (fig. 11).

Figure 11: Summarising the discoveries from stage 2
The following qualities for the system have been identified from the analyses:

- **Social aspect**
  Refugees have proven yet again the need of social stimuli for sharing personal stories and talk about feelings. Archivists have discovered that it is through a personal relation that one gets the best and most honest stories. Writing to an institution with no social benefit has proven to only result in distant impersonal entries. Additionally, refugees themselves express that they would share their experiences to help others in similar situation, would share for the social significance of it.

- **Aiding the Future building** (and integration)
  Building their future here is the main goal of the refugees in Sweden. How the integration is handled in this process is a concern of both refugees and locals. Help is also an important topic as part of this - signified by both refugee interviews and the Swedish survey.

- **Practical & Concrete**
  Refugees tend to consider stories that just “state the facts” worth sharing. That has been manifested both by the letters Kulturen i Lund (2017) got from refugees and by some of my participants during their interviews. Confirming with this the tendency to refrain from abstractions and stick to the practical side of things that was sensed by the camp refugees.

- **Therapeutic value**
  Both the interviews with the refugees and the talk with the archivist confirmed the therapeutic value for the refugees in sharing their stories with others. The participants have mentioned sharing “to let it out”, “so that i don’t keep it inside”, sharing for writing a book and etc.

- **Modern technologies**
  Using outdated media like letters writing or expecting participation in time-consuming lonely analog exercises is not a winning strategy as the initiative of Kulturen i Lund (2017) has proven. What is more, all the refugees confirmed during the interviews that they work on a daily basis with social media and use their phones more than any other device.
4.10. Sensitizing via a workbook

At the end of each interview with the refugees I gave the participants a small workbook to fill in the span of one week. It was called “My life in Malmö” and included 3 small tasks in it that aimed at creating awareness in the participants in what comprises their lives here, what is most important for them and what is the essence of their reality here.

![My life in Malmö workbook](image)

Figure 12: First exercise in the booklet filled by a participant (See appendix for more)

The first task was “A day of my life” (fig. 12) where the participant was asked to fill the activities that he/she has done during a specific day on 3 levels:
1. What is it that happened?
2. How did it make you feel?
3. Why?
This exercise prepares them to work with more tacit knowledge - going from the superficial level of facts to reflecting on the deeper motivational level of what does actually drive me.

**Figure 13: Second exercise in the booklet filled by a participant**

The second task (fig. 13) was about tracking what one is sharing with others, regardless of whether it is by texting them, calling them, sending photos online, publishing posts, etc. The participants were asked to note down shortly all those at the end of each day. It aimed at making them think of what they usually share and with whom. It showed what is it that they actually deem worth sharing.
The third task (fig. 14) was most reflective as it asked them to fill at the end of the week what were their top happiest and top unhappy moments. It aimed at making them reflect on a bit bigger scale of what are the things that were most significant for them this week.

At the end of the workbook I had also placed real life examples of the booklet being filled with my own entries (fig. 14). When the format of an exercise is as open as that, it is a good practice to give the participants an example that guides them what the expected results of the exercise are and that helps them to stand on some solid ground as a starting point.

As a whole, though, not all participants were motivated to fill the workbook. Out of the seven booklets I handed out to refugees, I only managed to gather back four of them. Two of those four were even filled in one evening during a social event we had together. They only filled them for me and it required the engagement of my actual physical presence for them to have a motivation to write in the workbooks. This altogether confirmed the social benefit being a big part of their motivation to take part in activities like these. Once some of them have to do something alone at home, it suddenly becomes unattractive while the same thing done in a workshop setting would inspire a generous and devoted input from those same people.
4.11. Co-design workshops

Part of the sub-goals of this project was exploring the practice of doing co-design sessions. I have been very curious about how much could ordinary people actually design and wanted to experience first hand how it works and what could come out of it.

The structure of the workshop was as follows:

The sensitizing workbook was mostly meant to prepare the participants for the co-design workshop by making them reflect on what their lives here in Sweden are about in reality.

Activity 1:
The warm up at the beginning of the workshop was a continuum of that exercise and consisted of making a collage/drawing representation of one’s life here in Malmö. It aimed at making the participants reflect on the big picture of their life here now after they’ve already paid attention to the small bits of it in the sensitizing workbook which focused on their everyday here. The collages/drawings would also be a good representation of what it is like to be a refugee in Sweden by depicting the aspects of it that the refugees themselves identify as key. To guide it, though, the activity required them to cover:
- Why you chose to come to Sweden?
- Your life here (main part)
- Future in Sweden?
These aspects were chosen as worth talking about based on the so far discoveries from the field.

Activity 2:
The second activity was an even higher level picture of the same thing but encompassing now the whole society, not just the individual. In a short brainstorming session the participants were asked to collectively identify “What are the important aspects of being a refugee in Sweden that should go in the archive?”. This exercise aimed at also gradually developing the participants’ abstract thinking and summarising all we’ve got so far on the whiteboard so that it is easier for them to later apply it in the systems they’ll be co-designing.

Activity 3:
After a break for refreshments and chitchating, the workshop continues with a paper prototyping activity as a preparation for the co-design. To set the mood for a designing activity and acquire a designer’s mindset for the time being, the participants were asked to “reverse engineer”, i.e. wireframe on paper an app they use often and already know well. This concept of “reverse wireframing” of a familiar software as a way of fast introduction of people from various backgrounds to the design practice of mock-ups and fast sketching of solutions on paper was inspired by Jody Barton’s IxD thesis project on “Designing for well-being” (2017) where it has been successfully applied. The goal was to show the participants how with as simple materials as post-it papers, pens and phone mockup any app or web service can be recreated and its behaviour simulated by simply moving papers around. The activity aimed at making the participants comfortable with making mock-ups. To develop their design thinking further, the participants were then asked to come up with
an improvement of the app they mocked up, change something in it after they’ve paper prototyped it the way it is now. This aimed at aiding them to think as designers and acquire a critical point of view over the design at hand.

Activity 4:
Once the participants have created and played with their own paper prototypes followed the co-design activity challenge of designing a system that reflects what being a refugee in Sweden is about. A system that could be used to leave something behind as part of the archive. With my help if needed participants were to come up with a system concept that best serves as a representation of their reality.

After having planned the workshop concept and its comprising activities I started preparing for each of them. To validate my time estimates and see how well all the activities work together in reality, how are the group dynamics in each of them and in combination, I decided to first run a pilot test of the workshop and only then do it with the refugees. The pilot test also aimed at checking how the documentation of the workshop will work and how appropriate each activity actually is for being run by one researcher and four or more participants.

4.11.1 Workshop 3 - international students co-design pilot test

I ran the pilot test of the workshop in our design studio at the university with four international students that I recruited from within my non-designers friends circles. I chose this target group not only because of the easier resource saving recruitment but also because international students is a group that can somehow be related to the refugees. Both of those groups are outsiders from Sweden that have to fit in in their own way after coming to this foreign country and both face their own challenges when experiencing the different culture and lifestyle here. There is though the big difference between the two groups consisting of the reason why one came to Sweden in the first place and the possibility (or the lack of it) to go back home. Though this is a significant difference, it was actually an acceptable compromise as this was, after all, just a pilot test of the workshop.

Sensitizing:
Prior to the pilot workshop I gave the participants sensitizing workbooks to fill in as well. Unlike the refugees, the international students followed the instructions and examples in the workbook and didn’t confuse what was expected from them in the exercises. Some of them also shared that they enjoyed filling it as it made them reflect on what they are actually doing. There were though some limitations to the workbooks distribution to the international students. A limitation such as the fact that some of them received the booklet only a few days (the weekend) before the pilot test workshop. Or such as that one of the four participants filled it for Norway instead of Sweden and by memory of her time there one year ago versus it actually happening now. Those drawbacks were acceptable though as the purpose of the workbook was mostly to initiate reflection on the explored topic of what our lives as international students are about. And a certain level of that could be achieved even by one time filling in part of the booklet.
Activity 1 (international students):
The first activity of making a collage/drawing of my life in Malmö (fig. 15) was a good starting point as while everybody took turns presenting their Malmö/ Sweden/ Norway drawings, the participants got to know each other a bit more and the sharing tone was set for the workshop. Organisation-wise, I had invested time and efforts in selecting and preparing images that relate to the context of being international students (fig. 16) and that the participants could cut out and use in their collages/drawings. During the pilot workshop, though, it turned out that none of the participants used any of those images and all of them preferred to express themselves only via drawings. Thus making it redundant for me to prepare such images for the actual workshop later.
Activity 2 (international students):
Next was the brainstorming session (fig. 17) on what is important to be reflected in an archiving system about what being an international student in Sweden is like.

Figure 17: Notes from the brainstorming session that I kept together with the participants

All of the participants took active part in the brainstorm and together they identified the following core aspects of their student lives here:

1. **Everyday common life**
   Swedish culture and customs - discovering them every day and adjusting to the Swedish lifestyle, e.g. fika, bicycling, equality, etc (positive references only)

2. **Exploring & traveling**
   That is the “extraordinary”, the “adventurous” side of being an international student that is a big part of their lives here that goes hand in hand with the everyday student life side.

3. **Education in Sweden specifics**
   - Freedom for students and teachers
     The way the education system works here is different from most of the other places in Europe and includes a great level of freedom in the student schedule, relation with teachers, hand-ins and homeworks, etc
   - Positive reinforcement
     In Sweden teachers mostly provide positive feedback and in general an almost exclusively positive attitude towards the students.
4. **The international vibe**

   International students get to experience making new friends from all over the world in their international student contexts. Most consider this very valuable and enriching experience as it makes one much more open-minded and lets one learn new things all the time.

Activity 3 (international students):

The activity of paper prototyping an app they know took place after the break. The participants were split in groups by 2 and asked to work together. One group chose to prototype Spotify and the other - Facebook Messenger. Everybody had fun with the task and enjoyed being in the role of a designer. When it comes to coming up with improvements for the apps, the team working with Spotify (fig. 18) so much liked their own idea of a new feature for Spotify that an animated discussion on actually suggesting it to Spotify occurred. It was the feature of having the possibility to search music in Spotify by nationality of the artist and in this way getting to hear local music. In the instance of the participants’ context their stimuli was looking for Swedish music. I consider this also being influenced by all the sensitizing they got so far on the topic of our Swedish lives here.

![Figure 18](image74x176_487x486.png)

*Figure 18: Participants paper prototyping Spotify (See more photos in appendix)*

Activity 4 (international students):

In the next and main activity of co-designing together a system that reflects the lives of international students here in Sweden, the participants worked together, all four of them (fig. 19) and came up with a system that is a Guide for exchange students.
The first quality of the system that they came up with was making it global (fig. 20). For exchange students all over the world and then narrowed down based on selected city/country.

They designed the system to have two main tracks - “Community” and “Explore” (fig. 21) that reflected the earlier identified in the brainstorming segregation of those two being the main pillars of the international student’s life. In the “Community” section the users of the system would have access
to variety of checklists with practical information in them for the newly arrived students, e.g. packing list (what you need to bring when coming here), sightseeing list, university tasks list, etc. There will also be a forum in the “Community” section where students can read about the experiences of others and exchange knowledge and tips about living at the given location.

The “Explore” section of the system will offer its users to see a map of the region around the location selected that is covered with pins left by students with photos and stories from their trips to those places. The goal is to let students discover new destinations based on other students posts and how many likes those posts got. The “Explore” section will also offer tips and ideas for one day trips around the area, as well as a calendar with all the student related events that are happening around town.

Figure 21: The two main tracks of the co-designed solution

Analysis of the co-designed solution:
- The system is all about help - helping others with giving them ideas how to spend best their time and what they can do here. It’s about exchanging knowledge & experiences to learn from each other and help the newly coming after us.
- The system is a super system that has too many functionalities.

Analysis of the activity’s design:
The participants ended up being very satisfied with their solution. It felt like they did enjoy creating a system for themselves and felt very comfortable during the creation process. They liked their own
system so much that we started discussing if similar systems exist and some started dreaming of having the system they just designed for real.

One of the improvements that I noticed the activity needed was working in smaller groups. Being split in two groups would be better as not everyone can take a quality role in the current setting of all four people co-designing together. As it happened in this instance, one of the four participants, who was perhaps more introverted, didn’t take a very active part in the co-design. What is more, if there are two teams they will not only come up with two very different ideas but there will also be the possibility to present their ideas to each other and give additional feedback.

Another aspect that could use some improvement was the way I was managing their co-creation process. I realised after the session that people tend to go for super systems and part of my facilitating job should be that when they present such a feature-creeped solution I should ask them what of all this would be the minimum of their system.

**Analysis of the whole pilot workshop:**

The pilot test of the workshop turned out to be very useful in many aspects. Most of all it helped me to get confident with the activities and improve them.

It helped with a lot of the small details that I haven’t thought of before but that were none the less part of the workshop experience. Examples of such are:

- playing some appropriate music while the participants are creating the visualisations of their lives in Sweden
- the dynamics during the break and how much they change depending on where I place the snacks (on the workshop table at hand-reach or on a table as “foot-reach”)
- making bigger phone mock-ups to fit the double sized rectangular post-its, etc.

The pilot test also helped me to validate the time span of the activities - I was hoping to fit them in 2 hours and a half. The pilot did fit in that time frame and was even shorter with 15 minutes. I also used it to test my documentation techniques. I used an audio recording, taking photos and taking a video recording of the session after I’ve got the permission of all the participants. I had troubles with the video camera and its charging but I made technical conclusions to be better prepared for the next actual workshop with the refugee participants.

(See appendix for more photos and documentation of the workshop)

**Additional step:**

Inspired by the nice final solution that the international student participants came up with, I decided to design my own solution for the refugees prior to the co-design session with them in order to see how it will differ from what they come up with themselves and how would the co-design session affect my final design.
Based on the insights so far and the given limitations, I sketched a system as how I would design it with all I’ve learned so far and to match a possible technical solution that is not too complex. The system is about sharing stories in several main categories such as Life in Sweden stories, Future in Sweden, Getting here stories, Home stories (fig. 22). I chose those categories based on the interviews with the refugees and the Swedish survey results. The system would have an important social side of liking stories so that it shows top stories in each category and stimulates the users to write quality material. The system offers to translate entries to desired languages so that it allows its users to write in whatever language they feel comfortable with.

![Sketching a solution based on so far insights - 2 main screens: Home on the left and selected category of stories on the right](image)

Writing a new post (fig. 23, left) can be also done without logging in the system. Then the user fills a bit of data about themselves and chooses how anonymous they’d like to be. Some fields like country of origin are mandatory and there is a test for validity of the user, e.g. the task of something un-copy-able to be translated in the language of the selected country. This would aim at limiting fake refugee posts.

The posting format also encourages the user to write about their feelings by having a small section at the end of each post: “it made me feel” with emoji choice and words to write.

At the profile of each registered user (fig. 23, right) there will be a timeline of all their shared stories which will be in a way forming their personal story for the archive. At the same time all the stories in a given category are the shared co-created archive.
4.11.2 Workshop 4 - refugees co-design

The actual co-design workshop with refugees I ran a few days after the pilot test and in the same setting of our design studio at Malmö university. I had invited all of my 7 interviewed and sensitised refugee participants, 6 out of which confirmed they are coming to the workshop. On the actual day 4 participants came, one of which with half an hour delay. I was worried that I would not be able to handle well as many as 6 participants but I invited them all none the less due to anticipating this case of some of them not showing up.

I documented the workshop via an audio recording and taking of photographs after I have got the permission and agreement of the participants. Some of them didn’t want to be videotaped so I didn’t use the video camera for this workshop.

Activity 1 (refugees):
This time I didn’t prepare images for the first activity as it is a time consuming effort and the pilot test workshop proved that those pre-chosen images are actually unnecessary. We started the activity with the three participants present and the fourth one came right before they were about to present each one’s visualisations of “My life in Sweden”. The presentations (fig. 24) and the discussions that
emerged around them created a relaxed and friendly atmosphere, thus served as a good warm up to the workshop. The participants were also joking with each other and sharing personal matters. As mentioned before, this kind of easy connection was favored by all the work done previously with those people and the combination of them.

![Participants presenting their visualisation of “My life in Sweden”](image)

**Figure 24: Participants presenting their visualisation of “My life in Sweden”**

Activity 2 (refugees):
The brainstorming session went very well with the refugees too. Only one of the four participants wasn’t so very active but that was due to language limitations. The discussion was profound and everybody managed to contribute more or less. They even asked me what I think in the end - if something is missing from everything I have learned from them about them by now.

The main aspects of the reality of being a refugee in Sweden as identified by the participants during the brainstorming session (fig. 25) were:

- **The Future**
  The hope to study and work here, build a new happy life

- **The waiting and the residence permit**
  Everything starts from here - the permission to stay in Sweden and for how long, will it be prolonged after the year expires? This is their biggest problem, the uncertainty of what comes next, may I stay or should I go?
- **Studying**  
  Especially languages as according to the participants speaking Swedish is the key to getting a job and to much more.

- **Working**  
  Putting the efforts in ensuring getting a good job by getting different kind of certifications and further education

- **Swedish society & integration**  
  Building the knowledge of Swedish culture, lifestyle and social codes

- **Social life**  
  The family and friends relationships; making new friends here

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 25: Notes from the brainstorming session that I kept together with the refugees**

Activity 3 (refugees):  
The paper prototyping exercise (fig. 26) went smoothly with the refugees as well. Some of them really enjoyed it and had fun with re-creating and changing their favorite apps. One of the groups had a problem with changing the snapchat app because as they saw it “it is perfect”. That was the same kind of initial reaction as the one of the pilot test group which chose Spotify. It is a common impulse when one is dealing with their favorite app to find it flawless as it is. After awhile of thinking, though, they do end up with coming up with improvement suggestions, even if they are just to remove something. For this workshop I also asked the participants to “play” their prototypes and show them to the other team in order to get the feel of “interacting” with the paper.
Activity 4 (refugees):
For the co-design activity this time I split the participants in two groups, two people in each. That was a significant improvement as now everybody did take an active role in the co-creation and no one was excluded. What was even more beneficial about it was that in the end I got two suggested solutions and feedback for each of them from the opposing team.

Team 1 solution - A guide for refugees in Sweden
The first team came up with a super system (as anticipated from the pilot workshop result) that supports a variety of services and offers a rich functionality, all targeted at helping the refugees cope with their lives here in Sweden (fig. 27)
Their suggested system (fig. 28, left) consists of various sections, such as:

- Advices for refugees in Sweden
  General advices on how one can adapt to the new environment

- Information about Sweden - health, geography, politics, society, culture

- Place for sharing stories from the “members” of the platform (those being other refugees)
  They saw this system as a rather closed community where one should contact the organisers if one wants to become a member.

- Education
  The system is also containing practical information about language courses, schools and universities in Sweden.

- Activities and events information / Integration program
  The system will provide the users with a list of the variety of events that refugees can take part in, as well as the places they can go to meet others. There would be even special activities organised for the members.

  This is about providing ideas on what refugees could do with the vast amount of free time they have in this country while the notorious waiting processes takes place. It is also to some extent about the integration as the participants discussed opportunities for activities specifically involving Swedish people.

  The idea of having some kind of a program that helps newcomers to integrate in the society was also mentioned

- Personal consulting for a future plan

  Here the refugee would register to get personal consulting about their specific situation and problems by a specialist or someone (typically another refugee) who has already done this before and knows a lot about Sweden. The participants envisioned what they called “free advisers” - people who volunteer to share their hardly earned knowledge and who can say “as per our experience we have this and this solution, this and this stage”. They called this “future plan” meeting, confirming the earlier identified big topic of building a future here in Sweden. The discussion even covered how they themselves would register for advising other people after they’ve been here for a couple of years and have gotten the big picture of it all.
Figure 28: The two co-designed solutions (team 1 on the left, team 2 on the right)

When it comes to languages, their system would support all the refugee languages - Arabic, Persian, English, etc. It was interesting that they initially excluded Swedish due to considering “a guide for refugees” not something that the Swedish people would read. This could be seen as an affirmation of the discovered earlier refugee trust mostly within their own community. Later, though, they considered some materials, like videos, worth being translated to Swedish too: “it is important that Swedes read this part also”. So they saw the system as selectively translated, making it clear who certain materials are targeted at - what is for the general Swedish public and what for within the refugee members community only.

Expecting to get a super system as a suggested solution, this time I was prepared for it and asked the co-designers what is the most important part of their system, the minimum of it if it was to come to live. The participants identified as most crucial aspects of the refugee guide system the “Future plan” consulting service and the Education information. On the second line of priorities they placed the organising of some activities. This confirms the prime significance of the topics of Future building, Help to make it happen and Studying as part of it with the additional value of Social encounters and Integration.
Team 2 solution: Diary of my life in Sweden - private and shared

The other team co-designed a system that is a private diary where the user chooses which parts of their personal entries to share with others (fig. 28, right). It is about personal life tracking in a private manner with the option to also share parts of it or the whole thing on facebook with friends or other social media places. “Everybody wants to have their privacy. And after that one can decide which part I want to share.” explained the participants. “It’s like a book, a diary.” - one of the participants who co-designed this solution shared that he does have that kind of diary book right now and it is very important for him to write in it and having it on his mobile will make it even better according to him. Thus confirming the need that the people in vulnerable situations have of pouring out personal experiences and thoughts for the Therapeutic value of it and sharing some of those experiences with others for the Social significance of it and the Help. Additionally this adds on to the call for modern portable means of running the collaborative archiving solution, a call that was already raised by the archivists earlier in the process.

In the second group’s co-designed solution of a shared diary, the participants envisioned offering the possibilities to the user to have one’s diary entries organised (ordered and entered) by either timeline or categories, such as for example:
- First impressions in Sweden
- New contacts
- Studying the language
- Society and social life
- Challenges and problems
- Daily activities/routines
- Working/ Looking for a job
- Hopes
- Experiences

During the discussion of the solution with all the participants there also emerged the idea of one constructing a book (“the story of my life” style) from the collection of all of one’s personal stories. This started a discussion about the system/application offering to make such “a book” of your life in the end or send “your story to a director to make a movie about it” as a participant fantasised about. It is a concept of leaving your personal thoughts and experiences, your story to the next generations, a heritage in the shape of personal human stories. This relates to memory - “it’s nice to save it for whole life. Good memory, bad memory. You will remember.”, a participant comments, “and show to children, the barnbarn” (grandchildren) another participant continues.

This testament type of stories sharing also related to the sharing issues discussed, lead by the fact that not all participants felt like sharing private stories and feelings with the public now while they are still living it, but then the perspective of making a book of it all, later in life, was seen as an exception in which sharing all the private matters was considered acceptable. This also points to the importance of the user being in control of what part of their private stories gets shared and what not, relating to the Trust theme from before manifesting here in the shape of ‘is this receiver a trustworthy one?’ ‘is this system to be relied with when it comes to my private space?’.
Group work dynamics analysis:

The second team worked in synergy when designing their system solution, while the other, first team felt a bit more disbalanced. During the co-design time the participants were discussing matters in their own language but in the first team it was still noticeable that one of the two participants seemed to be the one driving it. It was this participant who also solely did the presentation of their solution as she had a fluent English while her teammate could understand most of the English but wasn’t good at speaking it. This might have influenced their co-design results due to the less active participant not taking part in the follow-up discussion of their solution due to the language limitations. Perhaps I should have initiated special time for them to translate to him instead of relying on his word that there is no need of it as he understands .

(See appendix for more photos and documentation of the workshop)

5. FINAL RESULTS

5.1. Qualities for a collaborative self-archiving system for vulnerable groups
(more specifically - the refugees in Sweden)

As a result of all my explorations for this project, a final list of qualities have been identified that would empower such a co-archiving system to have the potential to work in a scalable way in the real-life setting of refugees in Sweden’s context. The qualities to be pursued are:

- **Social aspect**
  Refugees are very socially driven human beings and in order to be motivated to contribute to the archive, some kind of socially engaged benefit should be up for them (even in the case of not having an archivist moderator). Sharing their stories and experiences with the goal to help others in the same situation is an example of a socially engaged benefit that a collaborative self-archiving system could implement and encourage.

- **Therapeutic value**
  Sharing to a trusted receiver who is genuinely interested in hearing it all without judging is the key to therapeutic effect of the sharing process. It is easier achieved when there is a personal relation between people so the system could either inspire and facilitate such meetings of people or achieve it in other ways, e.g. by encouraging the sharing of feelings and personal matters for private use by providing safe environment of trust.

  - **Trust**
    The system should have a very trustworthy look and feel to aid the sharing process and provide a comfortable feeling for the user that could lead to the therapeutic benefits. Having trust in the system is key for getting people to enter in it genuine personal experiences.
- **Aiding the Future building**
  The system should relate in one way or another to the topic of Building our future here and how can we do it better.
  - **Help**
    The sub-topic of help is strong here as exchanging experiences from tackling different kind of problems and challenges can be useful for the other users and thus motivating people to share. At the same time such experiences exchange can also be a good entry for the archive. Integration is another part of this topic as that is what help is mostly needed for in the refugees context.

- **Practical & Concrete**
  The system should be very clear and pragmatic about how to be used and what is expected. Introducing high-level abstractions detached from reality might not work so well as refugees are very problem-focused in their time here and when you have to worry for things as basic as having a safe roof above your head, it is hard to think of artistic and beautiful abstract conceptions.

- **Modern technologies**
  The system should be implemented in a modern tech setting - a mobile based solution might be even best due to the refugees’ extensive (and often exclusive) use of mobile devices. Analog alternatives are not so practical and not at all scalable so to pursue a functioning system in the real refugees’ context and in a more inclusive way, a mobile/online based, easily accessible solution would be most optimal.

5.2. Co-design solutions analysis

Both the international students and one of the refugee teams came up with systems that will be useful to them in their practical lives here, systems that are focused on helping and informing the newcomers of what are the possibilities here and what are the hard earned tips that the immigrants before them in the same situation have learned. They are about very practical information and advice, story sharing only for the purposes of sharing experiences that can serve as a guide/advice for the other people in the same circumstances.

These solutions confirm the emerged assumption from the initial concept explorations via the first workshops that “people will only take part in an archiving practice if it helps their problems”, if it guides them and offers them advices.

This emerges the concept of a system that mainly serves a useful function for its users on the surface, but does archiving from the generated materials in the background (with the consent of the users of course). It is a concept worth exploring further as the format of the materials that are valid for going in the archive is pretty broad and anything could be a valid input for the archive if it has been framed as such properly in the beginning of it, as it got clear from the interview I ran with Karin from Kulturen (chapter 4.6. Interview with an archivist from Kulturen i Lund).

The other solution of the refugee groups, a diary with shareable entries, was the one that was more focused on the therapeutic value of sharing one’s own story - to get it out and keep it going. The
format of a private diary that they came up with is a good way to get people’s genuine stories for the archive even if they are not to be published at the time being. This still, though, holds the risk of people not sharing personal emotional stories in the diary format of the solution due to only filling it for the purpose of sharing with others.

What is more, designing for yourself does in general hold the danger of this not covering the majority of other people and the participant with a strong diary routine might after all not be as representative as one would hope. Even though the other participants reacted positive to the idea, it needs to be tested in a real setting to see how the mass of people react to it - would the majority go for private therapeutical sharing of genuine feelings and thoughts for the self (with the long-term possibility to leave it to the world/family members as heritage after passing away) or would they rather go for the social side of it which is sharing only for the others to see it in the here and now, share both with people you know and those you don’t?

5.3. Final solution

Based on all the qualities identified as important for assuring the system has the potential to work in reality, together with the solutions created by the participants and the combination of all the insights from what people Say, Do and Make, I finished this project with formulating a final concept proposal for a potential collaborative self-archiving system for vulnerable groups.

I decided to develop further the concept that the refugee participants came up with at the co-design workshop - the one that combines the writing of a private diary with sharing parts of it with the community. I deem this to be a great combination due to applying the core drivers for the sharing process of the refugees that have been standing out throughout the research, namely it combines:

- **The therapeutic value** of sharing what genuinely bothers you and enlightens you in this life, what you truly feel and think with a trusted receiver.
  
  And who is a more trusted receiver than the self? Writing a diary just for the self, with the back thought of maybe passing it on to your children later on, is a mechanic worth exploring in this pursuit of inspiring vulnerable groups to share intimate stories. It achieves the therapeutic value for the storyteller in the process of keeping a diary, a stimulated format for filling the story of your life and continuing it (focus on the future building)

  What is more, the long-term aspect of the concept of leaving your diary as a heritage for the future generations after you pass away, is one that may succeed in getting genuine input of feelings and the private life, getting intimate stories from the users to the archive.

  Combined with

- **The social aspect** of sharing personal experiences and thought with others

Letting the user choose what parts of their diary entries could be shared with the public, whether anonymously or identified to your friends, is giving the system the needed social driver for the refugees to contribute in the first place.

When dealing with intimate and vulnerable stories, though, it is of vital importance the system to be a very safe place that doesn’t share anything unless the user explicitly expresses such desire and agreement.
I sketched on paper (fig. 29) how the UI of such a system could be organised.

The system features an inspiring space for writing the story of your life and offers to automatically present it as a book or a short movie. The goal is to inspire the refugees to fill in the story and continue it. As one of the participants said in his interview - “to have the motivation to finish the story instead of focusing on the past and the problems”. (Future building quality)

In each entry the system will offer the user to highlight parts of the post both for

- the self - highlighted parts will be featuring in the “movie version” of the story and will stand out in the timeline and book formats of it as well.
  (Therapeutic value quality)

- sharing with others - users can choose to let the public audience see some of their highlights. Those shared selected pieces will be shown alongside the other people’s stories and insights and will be in this way forming “the collaborative archive”
  (Social aspect and Help qualities)

*Figure 29: Paper sketch of the final concept proposal - Home screen (left) and Personal diary screen (right)*
The system will embody the collaborative self-archiving mission by showing on its home page a mix of “Glimpses in the lives of” the refugees. Those “glimpses” will be random quotes or pics taken out of people’s diaries in a generally anonymous way (if a user chooses to, the glimpses could link to their profile instead). This will happen only with the consent of the user being a random-based part of the anonymous stories bulk. This aims at creating the feeling of shared reality and through the anonymity and randomness of it, create the feeling of private life kept while at the same time sneaking a peak in other people’s inner worlds.

This could also be a desired share - e.g. something you’ve come to the conclusion of after a hard struggle so you want to share it with the world, with the others who could make use of the insight.

Then one can explicitly choose to share with the public that part, that insight, that inspiring photo. In this way the aspect of helping each other can be developed within the system.

6. DISCUSSION

Overall this project ended up spending vast amounts of time on field research and participants coordination. Due to working with people always holding the danger of things getting delayed, getting canceled, going all wrong, etc it took its toll on the resources for this project.

For example, I consider a mistake in my time management that I ran too many interviews. Scheduling an interview and all the communication, delays, rescheduling, misunderstandings, relocations, etc did take a lot of time. Seven interviews were more than I actually needed to get a gist of what is important for those people. For future projects I would limit the number to 3-4 interviews and try to fit in those a more diverse excerpt of target participants. For example, in the context of the current project, the one participant that haven’t got the asylum yet should have been in the number of 3-4 as he is the only representative of that otherwise much bigger group.

The conversation format of the interviews, though, turned out to be very fruitful and nice. Yet on the other hand it also took longer time and was harder to predict the time for it properly as it depended on the participant and how the conversation was flowing. This, though, wasn’t really a problem in this context because the refugee participants love social interactions and have a relative perception of time in addition to having a lot of free time so the interviews that did span for longer than the planned one hour were actually enjoyed by both parties and no one minded it.

During that whole getting to know them and their values process, I did spend quite the extra time just on social events with the refugees, getting emerged in their culture - food, music, society habits, etc. While it was a pleasurable process and did help the ongoing design work, becoming friends with the participants has its small drawbacks too:

- It requires quite the time and commitment (making the project more time and energy demanding) Not to mention the expected maintenance of it later on.
- It creates a much less official atmosphere
  Which can result in less serious attitude to the assignments as was witnessed by the workbook home exercise. That is actually likely to have been due to other reasons but it is
worth considering how serious an environment a researcher would like to create and limit the
levels of friendships with the participants accordingly.

Half of the workbooks being not returned and 2 out of 6 no-shows for the workshop was a downside
for the process on one hand but possibly an up side on the other. No workbook filled was not good
only because one of the four participants who did come to the workshop haven’t been so sensitised
due to it (that was indeed the least active participant but that was most likely due to language
barriers). The no show up of two participants perhaps was good for me because it could have been
harder to manage 6 participants by myself, but on the other hand it could have generated even a third
interesting co-designed solution.

When it comes to co-design I have come to the conclusion that it is a priceless practice when it
comes to problem solving for very specific contexts. For example, if one is designing a solution for the
emergency department of a hospital, the specialists working in this environment will know extremely
well exactly what will make their work better, what can and what can’t work. When it comes to more
open-ended problem formulations, though, with a wider target group and more loose goals, co-design
could potentially result in too vague or too general solutions. Like it was witnessed from the co-design
workshops for this project, people tend to go for designing super systems overflowing with a variety of
wonderful features because the problem domain allows it. For future co-design sessions on broader
briefs I would choose to add some significant limitation for the co-creation. Some “constrained
creativity” could have been useful to apply to help the participants to come up with more feasible for
fast implementation solutions.

On another note, my design of the second task in the sensitizing workbook was actually confusing for
several of the participants - instead of writing what they have been sharing with others via social
media/messages/ calls, they’ve been writing there what they have been doing these days. I should
have made the design of this task more limiting to avoid the confusion. The current open space does
create the feeling of free entry. The wording of the title of the task may have also been confusing:
“What have you shared with others” - this was perhaps interpreted also as moments shared with
others which is easy to happen if one ignores the guidelines and examples provided in the workbook.

Another reflection regarding the workbook was the motivation of the participants to fill it. To drive that
motivation I should have planned an activity for some kind of push for them in the middle of it. That
happened naturally in this instance as I was at a friends’ gathering at the home of two of the
participants (a benefit from becoming friends with them) and because of my presence there they
decided to spend some explicit time filling the books and give them to me before I go.

All in all I enjoyed this project a lot and especially the field research part of it. Due to my overly
devotion to the research aspect, though, I didn’t have enough time in the end to come up with a more
fully fledged solution of the final concept and most significantly I regret not managing to run a simple
but actually functioning online system to be tested in the real world refugee community. To be able to
deal with these time limitations inevitable for any co-design process but at the same time managing to
include prototypes earlier in the project’s timeframe, I would consider making a bigger use of each
scheduled encounter with participants. Since scheduling a meeting with a participant is already a
resource demanding activity, it feel essential for the researcher/designer to make as big use of this encounter with a participant as possible. Thus assuring more optimal time management that could be crucial for the success of short-termed projects like this one. For example, combining an interview with an already fastly put together low-fi prototype could be one way of making bigger use of each encounter with participants.

7. CONCLUSION

To design a successful collaborative self-archiving system for vulnerable groups, one needs to first gain profound understanding of that vulnerable group’s values and drivers and only then start implementing solutions that embody those specific discovered needs in the system qualities. In the context of refugees in Sweden, such a system for collaborative self-archiving of both the individual refugee and the community of them all should incorporate social benefits for its users, therapeutic feeling of sharing stories and personal input to the system, environment of trust that encourages thinking of and building one’s own future, support for helping each other by sharing useful experiences and do it all in a clear, practical format via modern mobile or online technologies. Such a solution could be the combination of personal and private diary keeping with sharing certain aspects of it with the public or leaving it as heritage for the next generations in the long term. When it comes to design methods, co-design have proved to be capable to work good in both gaining extra insight about the target group through exploring what people Make and using that to feed the design process, as well as in directly gaining good concept ideas co-designed by the experts in their own feed - the users themselves.
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APPENDIX

Letters to Sweden probes. Text and audio recordings: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B0L0hvY9N18Uc1JScVZUaEhSMTQ?usp=sharing

Hand-written letter to Sweden:

Dear Sweden,

When I first met you I immediately felt welcomed. You were so lively, with people in the parks and in the streets. You also were peaceful, safe, and I felt at home. This I will always be thankful for.

At first, I didn't like when you got sad, when winter came and your sky became grey. Then I learned to like it because it was a part of you. Also because it made me appreciate the better days.

To be honest; I didn't get to meet a lot of your inhabitants. I didn't really tried either. But I met a lot of international people, which was amazing, sharing languages and cultures. By coming to Malmö, I didn't just discover Sweden but a new part of the world. At least it felt like it.

Maybe I don't see your flaws because I idealize you too much, and because I am in a cozy cocoon, as an international student at the new university of Malmö. But it is fine, because it is by looking up to someone that we try to become better people ourselves. I know you have many downsides, but it feels good to focus on the positive emotions.

I don't think I will stay with you next year, though, I would love to, but I cannot imagine living far from my family. I will try to bring back with me what I learned while being with you: the inner calm, the openness.

Thank you for everything (especially the Kanelbullar)

Lisa Paahl
Workshop 1 with practitioners via the Living Archives. Documentation: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1V4zKdPDYwCpw2FGvKVEdo6krSDoFa-imVMpZ4/edit # *in the documentation it is referred to as “Workshop #2” because the Living Archives ran one more workshop before I joined.

Workshop 2 with camp refugees via the Living Archives. Documentation: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nRWoG4x1dZ9aUolv6CG0Rbh99pdVLQLQ4Kx87bhO10/edit *in the documentation it is referred to as “Workshop #3” because the Living Archives ran one more workshop before I joined

Interview with Karin Hindfelt at Kulturen i Lund, audio recording: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B0L0hvY9N18UR3dxMUJKTJZSnc/view?usp=sharing

Survey with Swedes, participants’ demographics:

![Age distribution chart]

- 33.3% <10
- 46.7% 18-23
- 13.3% 24-34
- 13.3% 35-46
- 4% 45-56
- 0% > 59

![Gender distribution chart]

- 50% Female
- 43.3% Male
- 6.7% Prefer not to say
Your thoughts about the refugees in Sweden

This questionnaire is a short inquiry into what Swedes think and would be interested to know about the refugees in Sweden.

The results will be used as an inspiration about designing a system for archiving the refugee situation in Sweden as part of a thesis project in Interaction Design, Malmö University.

What do you think about the refugee situation in Sweden?
Honestly.
Your answer

What would you like to ask the refugees in Sweden if you had the chance to?
Your answer

What do you think would be interesting and worthy to go in the Swedish archive (for history) from the refugees’ perspective?
☐ Personal stories of their experiences/life in Sweden
☐ What they think and feel about Sweden
☐ How they see themselves in the future if they get to stay in Sweden
☐ How they came to Sweden and why
☐ Other:

Survey with Swedes, results in a spreadsheet:
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/15trCUeVzhw6Ji0UHQ-hWHdPD7V6YiuSHSHmQERy4yc8/edit?usp=sharing

Survey with Swedes, analysing results. Close-ups:
Survey with Swedes, analysing results. Sum up:

**Swedish survey**

- 20% think SW should do better in it
- 5% don’t have the capacity / not capable
- 4% purely negative (locally)
- 3% things it’s good
- **☑** 17% Integration interest
- **☒** 7% No interest
- **☑** 6% More human interest
- **☒** 9% Politicians/Authorities responsible
- **☑** 4% I would personally engage to help
- 14% Disappointed of SW (authority for ppl)
- 14% Angry at Swedish (system)
- 14% Angry at refugees, vs. 2a positive attitude to refugees / having refugees

**Interviews with refugees:** questions guidelines for semi-structured discussion
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1iPFtvJfEnJPxcCW0lIRz7_Ja65iE3W0ZftOkfs3qP/Uwc/edit?usp=sharing

Interviews with refugees: audio recordings plus semi-transcripts and notes for some of them:
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B0L0hvY9N18UTV9ZaDRDemg2TZ?usp=sharing

**Sensitizing booklet:** some of the results:
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B0L0hvY9N18UVWFXTc1EMTJYQ0k?usp=sharing

**Workshop 3** with international students, agenda:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ww3lbQiTqtpbABtFCy_jpJxBaojz1F9Kvclhd1k/edit?usp=sharing

Workshop 3 with international students, some photos:
Activity 3, paper prototyping Spotify:
- Activity 3, paper prototyping Facebook messenger
- Activity 4, co-design
- Structure of the co-designed solution drafted by a participant:
Collective formation of the final co-designed solution
Workshop 3 with international students, short recap and conclusions:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1phPoMwtD6dVfoeZuT3tF9e4UDnzXYwdMvhFVem5fvUc/edit?usp=sharing

Workshop 3 with international students, audio recording:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B0L0hvY9N18UVzd1REp4aDZvUVU/view?usp=sharing

Workshop 4 with refugees, agenda:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19fEb7-ZimTqipRZjapFVhng4Sev0RTUyOMi-EL0m1-M/edit?usp=sharing

Workshop 4 with refugees, some photos:

- Activity 1, sketching and presenting “My Sweden”: 
- Activity 2, paper prototyping apps:
- Activity 3, co-designing in 2 teams:
- Activity 3, final co-design solutions & their presentations:
Workshop 4 with refugees, audio recording:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B0L0hvY9N18UczUyWml2ZXc4WWM/view?usp=sharing

All “My Sweden” drawings from both workshops 3 and 4:
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B0L0hvY9N18ULWRkRUQyTHJ0THc?usp=sharing
It was fun, enlightening and interesting!
Thank you for reading. Hope you found something of value within my explorations :)