

LIVING LAB Report



REPORT FOR LIVING LAB IN VILNIUS

Report: September, 2018

The report of the Living Lab consists of three parts. Part 1 describes the scope of the Living Lab (retrieved from the Work Plan), Part 2 – presents the results of the Living Lab, and Part 3 – conclusions and recommendations.

The Living Lab research concept was applied in conducting this research. The method is based on a user-centered, open-innovation ecosystem concept (Von Hippel, 1986; Chesbrough, 2003; Almirall, Wareham, 2011) which functions in concrete territory and advanced in integrating both innovation processes and research processes (Bilgram et al, 2008) within a partnership among public-private-individuals (Pallot, 2009). This concept based on a systematic user co-creation approach. Such approach allows to integrate research and innovation processes through the exploration, experimentation and evaluation of artefacts (e.g. ideas, concepts, scenarios) related to a real-life situation of (Cosseta, Palumbo, 2014). Living Lab approach differs from other user-centric research concepts, like contextual design, empathic design, emotional design, participatory design, user-centered design, because the involved communities and individual users are both the objects of observation and sources of creation. This dual role allows to consider both – the performance and the potential adoption. Therefore, such research concept is a perfect fit for assessing the impacts of digital tools and mass collaboration platforms (i.e. Wisdom of Crowds, crowdsourcing, collective intelligence) on the capacities of communities.

Living Labs is defined as a place-based research concept that utilizes the place as a test-bed for innovation and knowledge generation through experiential learning, combination of concrete experiences, observations, reflections, and the formation and testing of new concepts. The Living Lab approach turns users into value creators and enables them to explore emerging ideas, innovative concepts and breakthrough scenarios together with the facilitators. Pallot (2009) suggests that the Living Lab should include a multidisciplinary team and should be conducted by integrating four processes (Table 1 below).

Table 1: Processes of Living Lab implementation

Co-creation	Exploration	Experimentation	Evaluation
Bring together technology push and application pull into a diversity of views, constraints and knowledge sharing that sustains the ideation of new scenarios, concepts and related artefacts.	Engage all stakeholders, especially user communities, at the earlier stage of the co-creation process for discovering emerging scenarios, usages and behaviors through live scenarios in real or virtual environments.	Implement the proper level of technological artefacts to experience live scenarios with a large number of users while collecting data which will be analysed in their context during the evaluation activity.	Assess new ideas and innovative concepts as well as related technological artefacts in real life situations through various dimensions such as socio-ergonomic, socio-cognitive and socio-economic aspects.

Source: designed based on Pallot (2009) and Spoehr (2014)

I. SCOPE OF CASE STUDY

<p>Description of the area of Living Lab</p>	<p>The space: Art Factory Loftas (Aukštamiestis district, Vilnius) The initiative: Inclusion of senior citizens in the activities of Aukštamiestis</p>  <p>One of the most outstanding cultural spots is “Menų Fabrikas Loftas” (en. Art Factory Loftas). LOFTAS is located in the industrial district of Vilnius New Town, in an impressive ex-ELFOS factory (and open space around it), where legendary radio receivers, turntables, tape recorders and cassette recorders "Elfa" were produced throughout the USSR. Due to the use of all spaces - open spaces during the summer, and the launch of winter activities under the roof - LOFT becomes a great example of open space, which is especially relevant with more than half a year's cold or cool season in the country. LOFT is known for original events: it holds concerts and parties that have been talked about for a long time, visual arts, cinema, theater, fashion designers, dance experiments, conferences, educational seminars, interactive interdisciplinary art forms, and sometimes even alternative sports. In 2017, November-December it cooperated in initiative “Naujamesčio dienos” (en. New Town days). Event united municipality, district government, representatives of creative industries, communities of seniors, disabled, residents and guests of the city. LOFTAS organized Family weekend, Youth Weekend, Seniors Sunday, Aukštamiestis creative workshop, closing event. “Sunday of Seniors” (2017 Dec. 10) included lesson with drum band, performances of seniors' art collectives, retro and folk dances. One of the main technological and societal difficulties this case might be affected is the lack of publicly available and reliable information. Municipality and district information is service oriented. There is not much insights or analysis done from different perspectives, especially from social sciences sphere. The initiative of creative workshop for architects „Aukštamesčio Arterija“ in 2015 and “Aukštamiestis public spaces” in 2016 might give insight from architects and urban planners perspective depending on the availability of the material and results. While the main source of knowledge about community, activities, events is only Facebook posts, events, news on social media.</p> <p>The place aspects: Aukštamiestis is a district in Vilnius currently undergoing a creative conversion in former or existing factory spaces and courtyards. This part of town has extensive industrial heritage and therefore a huge creative potential. The project is intended to provide spaces and opportunities for creative people to implement their ideas without feeling the constraints of time or space. The vision of Aukštamiestis is a metropolitan industrial district with creative and entertaining solutions.</p> <p>The social aspects: The Aukštamiestis Living Lab is developed through projects, initiatives and workshops including community members, architects, urbanists, students, municipality and other interested parties. The involved stakeholder groups and individuals thus become the sources of creativity, insight and initiative in the ever changing district. The initiative this research focuses on is the senior inclusion into activities of Art Factory Loftas which can be considered as the main public space of Aukštamiestis district. The initiative mainly relates to three groups of stakeholders: (1) residents and their communities, (2) owners of business and cultural spot, (Aukštamiestis one of initiators) and (3) municipality, mainly – district municipality.</p> <p>The digital aspects: The initiative is implemented via the concept of networked community. The senior citizens are encouraged to participate in the events of Loftas via digital means. The digital means of communication might help to break down the barriers of an isolated life and enable new communication channels with the senior citizens.</p>
--	---

<p><i>Objectives of the Living Lab</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To complete document analysis and social media observation for description of case conditions, context and create qualitative and quantitative research instruments 2. To explore characteristics of cyber open places from social, technological, and urban design perspectives by interviewing stakeholders 3. To generalize the scientific results about behavior of focus user group –seniors – based on results of inquiry
<p><i>Description of the actors related to the Living Lab</i></p>	<p>The case study of Aukštamiestis mainly relates to three groups of stakeholders: (1) residents and their communities, (2) owners of business and cultural spot and (3) municipality, mainly – district municipality. The case study targets at aging society using public place who in the case are titled as seniors or seniors community.</p>
<p><i>Research group</i></p>	<p>The research activities will be conducted by Mykolas Romeris University Social Technology research group Prof. Aelita Skaržauskienė, professor at Mykolas Romeris University, Head of Social Technology LAB – group leader Assoc. Prof. Gintarė Žemaitaitienė associate professor and vice-dean at Mykolas Romeris University, member of Social Technology LAB Dr. Monika Mačiulienė, lecturer at Mykolas Romeris University, member of Social Technology LAB Dr. Edgaras Leichteris responsible for the contacts with industrial partners</p>
<p><i>Reflection on the co-creation need and approach that your Living Lab demonstrates</i></p>	<p>In social research, according to Gallivan (1997), the use of one method can be considered as one-sided and non-inclusive. Hence, the analysis of the Living Lab processes in Aukštamiestis required the analysis of different sources of information (observation, interviews, questionnaires, documents, artifacts etc.). The research problem of this study is expressed through a question – how digital tools could help to strengthen the involvement of senior citizens in the activities of Aukštamiestis district? The study employed three research methods – Stakeholder Interviews, Survey of Local Senior Citizens and Digital Monitoring.</p>
<p><i>Research steps and timeframe</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Figure 1: Research methods for Vilnius Living Labs</p> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>The diagram illustrates the research methodology. It features three boxes under the heading 'Data collection methods': 'Stakeholder interviews: 7 Interviews with the stakeholders (urban planners, initiators, senior citizens, gov officials)', 'Digital Monitoring: non-formal and non-participatory observation & netnography', and 'Survey of Senior Citizens: Questionnaire survey of 47 senior citizens who participated Loftas event'. Arched lines connect these three boxes to a central box labeled 'Digital Co-Creation Index'. Below this central box is the text 'Theoretical premises'.</p> </div> <p>The theoretical frameworks provide an interpretative approach to the social reality and empirical investigations are needed to test their consistency with the reality (Jabareen, 2009). The theoretical premises of the study are based on Digital Co-Creation Index which allows to assess, measure and compare the digital co-creation initiatives. This evaluation framework incorporates the works of previous researches – Collective Intelligence of Networked Communities Potential Index (Skaržauskienė et al., 2015), Quality of Experience framework (Möller & Raake, 2014), Social</p>

	<p>Networking Adoption Model (Griggs & Wild, 2013) and Dimensions of Space framework (Project for Public Spaces, 2009). The index consists of three main building parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Place Attractiveness Index evaluates the physical and social aspects of the observed public space that are forming its quality. 2. Digital Inclusiveness Index explains technological readiness of the initiative for enabling co-creation and measures preconditions for the inclusiveness of public places. 3. Social Responsiveness Index refers to the co-creative maturity of actors (stakeholders and community members) in responding to the social challenges and in generating the public value. <p>Table 2 below explains the linkages between the theoretical premises and the research methods applied. The numbers in the brackets show the target groups that were inquired – (1) residents and communities; (2) owners of businesses and cultural spots; (3) municipality and related governmental units.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Table 2. Research Methods for Digital Co-Creation Index dimensions</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d9e1f2;">Dimensions</th> <th style="background-color: #d9e1f2;">Interview</th> <th style="background-color: #d9e1f2;">Survey</th> <th style="background-color: #d9e1f2;">Digital Monitoring</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Uses and activities</i></td> <td>(1); (2)</td> <td>(1)</td> <td rowspan="13" style="vertical-align: middle; text-align: center;"><i>Non-formal and non-participatory observation of digital traces from groups (1), (2) and (3)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Comfort and image</i></td> <td>(1); (2)</td> <td>(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Access and linkages</i></td> <td>(1); (2)</td> <td>(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Sociability</i></td> <td>(1); (2)</td> <td>(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Risk-related technologies</i></td> <td>(2)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Expansion-related tech</i></td> <td>(2)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Pervasiveness of ICT</i></td> <td>(2)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Appropriateness of ICT</i></td> <td>(2); (3)</td> <td>(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Social value creating technologies</i></td> <td>(1); (2)</td> <td>(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Dynamism, opens and flexibility</i></td> <td>(1); (2)</td> <td>(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Transparency</i></td> <td>(2)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Decentralization and self-organization</i></td> <td>(2)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Social impact and engagement</i></td> <td>(2)</td> <td>(1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Generated public value</i></td> <td>(2)</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Dimensions	Interview	Survey	Digital Monitoring	<i>Uses and activities</i>	(1); (2)	(1)	<i>Non-formal and non-participatory observation of digital traces from groups (1), (2) and (3)</i>	<i>Comfort and image</i>	(1); (2)	(1)	<i>Access and linkages</i>	(1); (2)	(1)	<i>Sociability</i>	(1); (2)	(1)	<i>Risk-related technologies</i>	(2)		<i>Expansion-related tech</i>	(2)		<i>Pervasiveness of ICT</i>	(2)		<i>Appropriateness of ICT</i>	(2); (3)	(1)	<i>Social value creating technologies</i>	(1); (2)	(1)	<i>Dynamism, opens and flexibility</i>	(1); (2)	(1)	<i>Transparency</i>	(2)		<i>Decentralization and self-organization</i>	(2)		<i>Social impact and engagement</i>	(2)	(1)	<i>Generated public value</i>	(2)	
Dimensions	Interview	Survey	Digital Monitoring																																													
<i>Uses and activities</i>	(1); (2)	(1)	<i>Non-formal and non-participatory observation of digital traces from groups (1), (2) and (3)</i>																																													
<i>Comfort and image</i>	(1); (2)	(1)																																														
<i>Access and linkages</i>	(1); (2)	(1)																																														
<i>Sociability</i>	(1); (2)	(1)																																														
<i>Risk-related technologies</i>	(2)																																															
<i>Expansion-related tech</i>	(2)																																															
<i>Pervasiveness of ICT</i>	(2)																																															
<i>Appropriateness of ICT</i>	(2); (3)	(1)																																														
<i>Social value creating technologies</i>	(1); (2)	(1)																																														
<i>Dynamism, opens and flexibility</i>	(1); (2)	(1)																																														
<i>Transparency</i>	(2)																																															
<i>Decentralization and self-organization</i>	(2)																																															
<i>Social impact and engagement</i>	(2)	(1)																																														
<i>Generated public value</i>	(2)																																															

2. RESULTS OF CASE STUDY

Place Attractiveness Index

Dimensions	Results
<i>Uses and activities</i>	<i>The public space of Loftas Art Factory is quite established and hosts variety of events – festivals, discussions, workshops, etc. It is open and accessible. However, it is perceived as a place for youth.</i>
<i>Comfort and image</i>	

Access and linkages	The spectrum of events and activities excludes the senior group.
Sociability	Based on the survey results the senior citizens felt quite comfortable with the space. Some even had personal connections from the past with space.

Digital Inclusiveness Index

Dimensions	Results
Risk-related tech	The initiative lacks the functionalities of risk-aversion, expansion and social value creation. The digital aspect of the initiative is quite basic at the moment.
Expansion-related tech	
Social value creating tech	
Pervasiveness of ICT	A more pervasive digital strategy is missing. The senior community lacks ways of receiving information.
Appropriateness of ICT	Most of the surveyed senior citizens (79%) use the Internet and are members of Social networks. However, they need more convenient ways of receiving information about upcoming event and discussions in the venue.
Overview: The initiative has the most problem with digital inclusiveness dimension. However, there is an apparent need for a more inclusive and appropriate digital tool and communication strategy. More suitable for the target community of the initiative.	

Social Responsiveness Index

Dimensions	Results
Dynamism, openness and flexibility	The digital initiative is open to all senior citizens. However, the members of it belong to already established offline communities and senior clubs. Due to lack of dissemination, the networked community does not include more isolated seniors.
Transparency	More data is needed for evaluation of dimension.
Decentralization and self-organization	Seniors community organizer: Organizational issues; Problems detected; New info dissemination channels. Senior participant: Preparation for quantitative research; Useful notes & new ideas on marketing. LOFTAS strategist & Aukštamiestis initiator: Explained creation of Aukštamiestis concept & community; Main actors of the community; Mechanism of virtual community
Social maturity	The motivation to solve social problem (exclusion of senior citizens) is quite high – the initiators show high levels of excitement. However, there is a lack of skill, personnel and especially time to create a comprehensive and efficient digital communication strategy.

Generated public value	<i>The public value of the initiative is apparent. The senior citizens are an important part of the social fabric and their inclusion in the larger projects may bring many benefits both for the seniors and the district.</i>
<i>Overview: The organizational structure is in place. The initiators have know-how on event organization and community building. However, they are missing skills and/or drive for inclusion of the elder part of the society. Based on the interview material, they certainly have the need to include them.</i>	

3. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Digital monitoring study

First of the empirical methods applied to research the Living Lab was non-formal and non-participatory digital data monitoring. Non-formal observation aims to gain data, when there is little knowledge of situation investigated (Bitinas et al., 2008; Žydžiūnaitė, Sabaliauskas, 2017). In such research, genuineness is an important feature – natural environment and data are collected in real-life situations and adapted to the natural course of events. The main concern of the researcher is not to violate the naturalness; hence the investigators have to minimize their interference. When employing this method, the researcher might emphasize the impacts while observing and inaccurate perceptions might undermine the credibility of results (Bitinas et al., 2008; Žydžiūnaitė, Sabaliauskas, 2017). However, the observation allows to get the insights on human behavior, environment, events without predefined bias. Criteria of netnography were applied in the process. Netnography is an observational approach with online interactions as a fieldwork. Kozinets (2010) emphasizes four characteristics of the virtual fieldwork: the nature of the interaction (different from face to face encounters), the relative anonymity of participants, the accessibility of the community site, and the possibility of archiving all minutiae of such communities. Online cultures cannot be divorced from the offline positions, values, meanings, etc. that users bring to the online environment. According to the author, the features of netnography are: focus on flow and connectivity rather than location and boundary as the organizing principle; the ethnography of mediated interaction is mobile rather than single or multi-sided; the cyberspace has rich and complex connections with the contexts in which it is used; boundaries are not assumed, connections exist between the “virtual” and the “real”. The research exercise is based on the observation of social network Facebook and webpages of particular communities.

In addition, publications on Loftas events and philosophy were collected to get familiar with the context of the study. The data were collected using manual and automated web-scraping techniques. The publications were collected from the period of 2016-2018. These search keywords were used separately and in combination: seniors, Vilnius, Loftas, concerts, Aukštamiestis, elderly.

Preliminary results: During the interviews, the researchers noticed a set of successful cooperation and co-creation activities between Aukštamiestis community and art factory Loftas. However, most initiatives were related to other types of audiences with limited orientation to senior community member. The success stories and lessons allow to get insights on how to improve cooperation and communication with specific audiences for both the researchers and the initiators of Loftas public space.

B. Stakeholder interviews

The interviews were conducted in the period of May-August, 2018.

The data were transcribed and coded.

Content analysis is planned to be finalized in November, 2018.

Preliminary results: During the interviews, the researchers noticed a set of successful cooperation and co-creation activities between Aukštamiestis community and art factory Loftas. However, most initiatives were related to other types of audiences with limited orientation to senior community member. The success stories and lessons allow to get insights on

how to improve cooperation and communication with specific audiences for both the researchers and the initiators of Loftas public space.

Seniors community group insights: Organizational issues; Problems detected; New info dissemination channels; Preparation for quantitative research; Useful notes & new ideas on marketing;

Business, initiators group insights: Explained creation of Aukštamiestis concept & community; Main actors of the community; Mechanism of virtual community

C. Questionnaire study

The questionnaire survey of senior citizen who participated in Loftas event has been conducted in the period April-June (2018). The study participants were selected based on their participation in Naujamiestis and Gyvenimas yra gražus communities. The data were processed using SPSS. Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.

Demographics of the sample (Q1-Q3)

Table 1: What is your gender?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female	39	83.0	83.0	83.0
Male	8	17.0	17.0	100.0
Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Table 2: What is your age?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
80-89	3	6.4	6.4	6.4
70-79	23	48.9	48.9	55.3
60-69	18	38.3	38.3	93.6
50-59	2	4.3	4.3	97.9
<50	1	2.1	2.1	100.0
Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Table 3: In which district of Vilnius do you live?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Naujamiestis	23	48.9	48.9	48.9
Senamiestis	4	8.5	8.5	57.4
Karoliniškės	1	2.1	2.1	59.6
Pilaitė	1	2.1	2.1	61.7
Vilkpedė	1	2.1	2.1	63.8
Lazdynai	2	4.3	4.3	68.1
Verkiai	1	2.1	2.1	70.2
Fabijonišės	2	4.3	4.3	74.5
Žirmūnai	2	4.3	4.3	78.7
Pašilaičiai	1	2.1	2.1	80.9
Justiniškės	1	2.1	2.1	83.0
Antakalnis	2	4.3	4.3	87.2
Šnipiškės	2	4.3	4.3	91.5
Rasos	2	4.3	4.3	95.7
Šeškinės	2	4.3	4.3	100.0
Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Participation in senior days (2017) @ Loftas (Q4)

Table 4: Participation in Senior days' 2017 at Loftas x Gender

	Female	Male	Total
No	7	0	7
Yes	32	8	40
Total	39	8	47

Table 5: Participation in Senior days' 2017 at Loftas x Age Ranges

Age ranges	80-89	70-79	60-69	50-59	<50	Total
No	1	1	5	0	0	7
Yes	2	22	13	2	1	40
Total	3	23	18	2	1	47

Table 6: Participation in Senior days' 2017 at Loftas x Living Districts

District	No	Yes	Total
Naujamiestis	1	22	23
Senamiestis	1	3	4
Karoliniškės	0	1	1
Pilaitė	0	1	1
Vilkipėdė	0	1	1
Lazdynai	0	2	2
Verkiai	0	1	1
Fabijoniškės	1	1	2
Žirmūnai	1	1	2
Pašilaičiai	0	1	1
Justiniškės	0	1	1
Antakalnis	1	1	2
Šnipiškės	1	1	2
Rasos	0	2	2
Šeškinė	1	1	2
	7	40	47

Participation in senior days 2017' At the Loftas venue (Q5)

Table 7: Did you participate in Senior Days 2017 at Loftas?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	35	74.5	87.5	87.5
Yes	5	10.6	12.5	100.0
Total	40	85.1	100.0	
N/A	7	14.9		
	47	100.0		

Impressions of the venue after senior days 2017' (Q6 – multiple response)

Table 8: What were your impressions during the event regarding the Loftas venue?

Impression	Frequency
Food and drinks were served	27
Adequate visibility of the stage	23
Adequate amount of seating	22
Adequate programme of the event	21

Convenient seating	18
Convenient movement in the space	17
Easy to orient	17
Feeling of safety at the venue	17
The venue was clean	16
Convenient stairs	15
The noise made it difficult to communicate	14
Security guards were available at the venue	12
Part of the event' programme could be improved	11
Adequate lightning	8
There were not enough of snacks and drinks	7
Inconvenient stairs	2
Pleasant staff-members	1
The venue was hard to navigate	1
The place could be more clean	1

Pictures during the event (Q7)

Table 9: Did you take any pictures during the event?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	30	63.8	75.0	75.0
Yes	10	21.3	25.0	100.0
Total (valid)	40	85.1	100.0	
Missing	7	14.9		
Total	47	100.0		

Arrival to the event (q8-q10)

Table 10: What modes of transportation did you use when arriving to the venue?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Public transportation	28	59.6	70.0	70.0
Personal transportation	6	12.8	15.0	85.0
Arrived by foot	5	10.6	12.5	97.5
Driven by friends/family members	1	2.1	2.5	100.0
Total (valid)	40	85.1	100.0	
Missing	7	14.9		
Total	47	100.0		

Table 11: Did you have travelling difficulties while arriving at the event?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	1	2.1	2.5	2.5
	Yes	39	83.0	97.5	100.0
	Total	40	85.1	100.0	
Missing		7	14.9		
Total		47	100.0		

Table 12: How did you arrive at the venue the first time? Did you have any problems/complications?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	The arrival was not complicated	24	51.1	61.5	61.5
	I had to search for the venue	8	17.0	20.5	82.1
	The arrival was easy but I needed to research the venue before arriving	4	8.5	10.3	92.3
	The arrival was easy but only because I was traveling with people who were here before	3	6.4	7.7	100.0
	Total	39	83.0	100.0	
Missing		8	17.0		
Total		47	100.0		

Describing the functionalities of the venue (Q11)

Table 13: How would you describe the purpose and functionalities of Loftas venue?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Venue is only suitable for entertainment events	8	17.0	20.0	40.0
The venue is suitable for meetings	20	42.6	50.0	90.0
The place is universal	3	6.4	7.5	97.5
The place is suitable only for youth events	1	2.1	2.5	100.0
	40	85.1	100.0	

Participation in other events happening in the LOFTAS venue (Q12)

Table 14: Did you participate in other events at Loftas venue?

Participation the events	Frequency of answers
Participated only in Senior days 2017	31
Participated in a concert	9
Participated in the Summer Festival	1
Participated in the Open Gallery event	1
Participated in the Family days	2

Frequency of participation in the events at the venue (Q13)

Table 15: Who frequently do you participate in the events at Loftas venue?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
I have been here only once	33	70.2	82.5	82.5
Once in 3-6 months	4	8.5	10.0	92.5
Once in a year	3	6.4	7.5	100.0

Comeback to the events (Q14)

Table 16: Would you come back to the events in Loftas?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	3	6.4	7.5	7.5
Yes	37	78.7	92.5	100.0
Total	40	85.1	100.0	
Missing	7	14.9		

Recommending the venue (Q15)

Table 17: Why would you recommend the venue to others?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Would not recommend	3	6.4	7.5	7.5
Interesting events	7	14.9	17.5	25.0
Have no opinion	15	31.9	37.5	62.5
Interesting space	15	31.9	37.5	100.0
Total (valid)	40	85.1	100.0	
Missing	7	14.9		
Total	47	100.0		

The mode of participation in the event (Q16)

Table 18: Do you agree with the statements below regarding modes of participation in the event?

Modes	Frequency
Participated in the event alone	3
Participated with a group	33
Met acquaintances in the event	13
Met new people	4
The venue was appropriate for communication	18
Men were more active in communication at the event	1
There were more women at the event	22
Foreigners also participated in the event	7

Information about the event (Q17)

Table 19: How did you receive information regarding the event?

Channel of information	Frequency
During the meetings at the Seniors Club	34
Paper flyer	2
Through friends/acquaintances	3
Found info online	4
Got an e-mail	1

The history of the venue (Q18)

Table 20: Do you know what was the purpose of the venue in the past?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	22	46.8	46.8	46.8
Yes	25	53.2	53.2	100.0
Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Personal links with the venue (Q19)

Table 21: Do you have personal links with the Loftas venue?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No, I do not have any personal links with the venue	42	89.4	89.4	89.4
I used to work here	2	4.3	4.3	93.6
I used to buy products manufactured here	1	2.1	2.1	95.7
Relatives used to work here	2	4.3	4.3	100.0
Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Usage of internet and Social networks (Q20-21)

Table 22: Do you use Internet?

Use of Internet	Frequency
No, I do not use Internet	21
Yes, I use Internet for reading the news	24
Yes, I use Internet for following the websites for seniors	6
Yes, I use Facebook	21

Activities on Facebook (Q21 – multiple response)

Table 23: If you use Facebook, what are you activities there?

Online activities	Frequency
Share information	10
React to information online	12
Comment on information	5
Participate in online discussion	5
Follow people I am interested in	10

Suggestions (Q22)

Table 24: What are your suggestions for improving the Loftas venue?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
I do not have opinion	19	40.4	40.4	40.4
More events for the seniors	11	23.4	23.4	63.8
Better equipment for choirs	1	2.1	2.1	66.0
More events for children	1	2.1	2.1	68.1
More information about the events in sources available to seniors	1	2.1	2.1	70.2
More concerts and cultural events	14	29.8	29.8	100.0
Total	47	100.0	100.0	