

## CHAPTER 4 RESULT

The data from chapter 3 was analyzed by using the matrix analysis method. The key insight is about the meaning of space, learning space, area, boundary partners and community identification.

**Table 4.1** Matrix analysis of informants

Informants	Meaning of space	Learning space	Area	Boundary partners of informant	Community identification
Youth	Safety place and comfort zone	The informal area	Radio station, football field	Family, friends and community shelter	Driving force
Head of community health center	Focus on the issue that solves the social problem	Space for learning and sharing	Community shelter or formal area	Youth and health volunteer	Strategic planner
Health volunteer	Open mind and share	Meeting place that exchanges the story	Under the tree, food vending store	Villagers and youth	Support and a magnet of community

There are several meanings of the space and learning space as can be seen in Table 3.1. Youth referred that the learning space should be safe and comfort so they could work without anybody controlling them fully. They preferred the informal area such as radio station and football field. Their boundary partners were family, friends and community shelter, acting as the driving force of the team.

Head of community health center focused on the strategic issue to solve the social problem. The way they worked was to coordinate all groups in the formal area such as community shelter. Mostly they were government officers and wanted to have a

consensus from the community. They defined learning space as a place for learning and sharing.

#### **4.1 Learning space**

Most of the health volunteers were parents of teenagers. They preferred the natural place such as trees and food vending stores. This group would like to solve social problems. The way they would like to communicate is to exchange stories. They suggested the idea of the learning space differently from others. The learning space from their opinion was about the open mind, since they concerned the public issues such as minority group and drug problem. They were magnet group that could draw other groups to the community. They encouraged people to focus on their inner values instead of outer ones. This can also be applied for the problem of ethnic minority groups as the space can be functioned for various ethnics and people from different ages who are as well the co-livings in our society.

From the research question, the collective learning was generated from appropriate space, environment and opportunity. From the participatory design, the researcher finds out that the significant key is the issue that everybody is interested in, for example, the issue of social problem such as accident and drug problem. The three variables: space, environment and opportunity encourage subjects to work together. The uncontrolled variable that is important is the politics that affects to the learning opportunity.

#### **4.2 Key Leader**

A good key leader should be able to stay in that community for a long time and be able to link with other key partners. The research assumptions were changed three times due to

the uncontrolled factors and context in that area. Male teenagers represented the dynamic variables that can be changed according to external factors like context and time. The female teenagers, who failed to establish the community connection, were another representation of different variables. As a result, the most static variable was the health volunteers who can be the key leaders.

The focus of the subjects was changed from the teenagers to health volunteers since the teenager group was more dynamic than health volunteers. The priority of subjects in research is very important. The first priority should be the head of the community since they are health officers who communicate to the less of community quite well. The second priority is the health volunteers who are parents that want to see the well-being of the community. The last priority is the teenagers who have a strong power of running activities. They are the ones that other stakeholders think that they are the risk of social problem. The design of community should integrate three partners that can learn together. The learning space should have the goal that everybody can target to.

The common ground that all subjects agree is the share of comfort zone, open minded, and participation. It is a combination of three informants. To answer the research question, the meaning of the space is the open minded space. The environment should be a comfort or safety zone since there is a different generation. The opportunity is the participation from all levels starting from planning, action and supporting roles.

From the observation, the researcher has found that the families have changed their attitude about the problem of their kids. They feel impressed that their kids could work



for the community. The working group in the village is more clearly seen from the community. The community sees the value of the learning space that is used to share the story. The discovery of this research is that the learning space should start from the heart of people rather than a specific space or from the brain.

### **4.3 Participatory design**

The outcome of activities from the participatory design process is the effective result of male teenagers' participation in the radio station producing the connection within the community. The important impact of participatory process is to re-connect the relationship of the participating subjects in the community to work together. Regarding female teenagers, on the contrary, they did not try to connect other partners during their process. This result made an unsuccessful community foundation. For the health volunteers, they built up the connection of people who could take part of community development. For example, they could promote the health issue through other key partners like male and female teenagers.