

Course manual “Creative urban technologies: exploring and navigating the smart and social city”

Version: 1 October 2015

- Course coordinator and instructor: Michiel de Lange m.l.delange@uu.nl.
- Instructor working group 2: Heleen Klomp leentje0847@hotmail.com.
- Minor Creative Cities: <http://students.uu.nl/en/hum/creative-cities>.
- Course description in Osiris: <http://bit.ly/1X4pZ71>.
- Blackboard link: <http://bit.ly/1NOXEyv>.
- Time/location lectures: Tuesdays 9:00 – 10:45, [Drift 25](#), room 102 (starting Sept. 8)
- Time/location working groups: WG1 on Thursdays 15:15 – 19:00, [Drift 23](#), room 103 (starting Sept. 10) and WG2 13:15 – 17:00, [ICU Descartes](#), room 006 (starting Sept. 11).

1. COURSE OUTLINE
2. ASSIGNMENTS
3. CLASS MEETINGS SETUP
4. COURSE COMPLETION
5. CONTACT
6. LITERATURE

1. COURSE OUTLINE

A. About the minor *Creative Cities*

The minor Creative Cities caters to students interested in emerging artistic practices, subcultures and new media and how these phenomena relate to creative dynamics in society. Investigating cities, urban citizenship and the multidimensional dynamics between them obviously suggests an interdisciplinary academic approach while simultaneously offering endless possibilities for exploring connections between theory and practice. All four courses literally open the door to the urban world immediately beyond the university classroom and provide students with theoretical concepts, practical tools, and creative space to explore it. The minor consists of the following four courses:

1. Creative urban technologies: exploring and navigating the smart and social city; Level 2, *Michiel de Lange*.
2. Wild Years: social theories on youth and generations; Level 2, *Peter Selten*.
3. Community Art: Practice and Theory; Level 3, *Eugene van Erven*.
4. The City as Stage: Critical Interventions in Public Space; Level 3, *Sigrid Merx*.

B. About the course *Creative Urban Technologies*

Aim: The course aims to introduce students to the burgeoning cross-disciplinary field that studies the relationships between digital media technologies and today’s cities, with a specific focus on the phenomenon of the “smart city”. Students investigate and develop insight into how digital technologies shape city life. Under guidance, students will read literature thoroughly and critically, learn to differentiate between various types and sources, frame theoretical discussions in the field, position themselves, develop new ways of conceptualizing the treated issues, find sources, and undertake a research project. Students are trained in developing their ability to deploy academic skills in written and oral presentations, individually and as part of a group. Attention is given to students’ capacity to reflect critically on current issues, practices, discourses, and academic research about smart cities, and the ability to develop an appropriate research method for their research. All activities should meet the requirements of the manual "[Academische vaardigheden](#)" (in Dutch).

Content: A wide variety of digital media technologies have come to shape the organization and experience of urban life. These urban technologies influence how we live, work, travel, meet, and spend our leisure time in the so-called “smart city”, the city augmented with digital technologies. Examples include mobile communication, wireless internet access, GPS navigation, rfid access cards, media facades, embedded

sensors and the Internet of Things, camera surveillance, location based services, and pervasive games. The “smart city” has become a popular corporate and policy term that refers to the use of digital technologies to optimize urban infrastructures and processes. Frequently, such technologies are designed and implemented by large corporations and institutions. Moreover, they tend to act in the background of everyday life and remain relatively invisible. This seems to place citizens in a rather passive role as mere consumers, or as subjects of control through data profiling and surveillance. The central question in this course is how urbanites use digital technologies in smart and creative ways to actively shape their own uses and experiences of the “smart city”. We investigate the role of urban technologies in specific fields like public space, media art, play and games, citizen participation and co-creation, (big) data and privacy/surveillance, and identity construction.

2. ASSIGNMENTS

Below an overview of the required assignments for the course.

Note: All written assignments must be posted on Blackboard’s discussion forum in a single individual thread, as inline text (no attachments, except for mid term assignment and final paper). For your first assignment, please start a thread titled with your name. Proceed by posting the other assignments as replies to yourself, changing only the week numbers. Assignments must always contain your name, student number, the title of your assignment, and a list of references.

A. Individual assignments - 20% of final grade

Individual assignments consist of the following:

i. Weekly course literature reviews + two propositions (6 times) – 300 words in total.

Each week you hand in a written assignment about at least two of the mandatory texts. Additionally, you raise two relevant propositions to spur the debate during working group sessions. Central is the critical comparison of texts. Do not produce abstracts of the texts but create your own small argument or point. Think of a catchy title for your assignment to frame your own point. It helps to think of the following questions: What type of text is it? Who is/are the author(s) and what is the source? What different views on the same theme can you extract from the texts? What are the central issues of debate? Are the texts complementary or do they highlight different or even opposite views? Do the authors use the same concepts and definitions? How strong are their arguments? What position do you agree with and why?

Weekly assignments must meet the following conditions:

- A comparative analysis of at least two items from the mandatory literature list, with name, student number, assignment title, correct references (recommended style: [Chicago A or B](#)) and literature list. 250 Words max. excluding title, personal info, and literature list.
- Two propositions to spark the debate. Together 50 words max. Be prepared to bring these in during the working groups!
- Students doing their team presentation do not need to submit a written assignment in that week.
- **Deadlines:** Every Tuesday before 17:00 in the discussion forum on Blackboard. Please post as inline text (no attachments please). Please respect these deadlines in order for the week teams to be able to incorporate your propositions in their presentations.
- **Note:** the first assignment is already due in week 1 but you get more time: Friday 11 Sept. 17:00.

ii. Paper proposal in week 3 – 500 words max

In week 3 students submit an initial research proposal for their final paper. These are the five required elements (“schijf van 5”) that should be clearly described in your research proposal:

1. Phenomenon: the topic you wish to research and the case you will use (what are you researching?). Often

introduced through an anecdote or original observation.

2. Question and hypothesis/argument: a well-formulated question about your phenomenon that cannot be answered with a simple yes/no, but is not too broad either; plus the expected outcomes and/or point you want to make (which question are you asking and what are the expected outcomes?). The research question often needs to be broken down into subquestions, and key notions must be operationalized.

3. Positioning: providing reasons for its academic relevance and perhaps also societal relevance (why are you researching this?)

4. Theory: the perspective and concepts you use to research the topic (within what framework are you addressing this phenomenon?)

5. Method: the approach you use to gather data and increase your understanding (how you are going to conduct the research to find answers to your question?).

- The order may vary but all of these five points should be addressed in the proposal. It is not necessary use separate headers, instead try to incorporate these points into a logical structure.
- **Deadline:** The proposal must be handed in via Blackboard on Tuesday 22 Sept. at 17:00, and is peer reviewed in week 4.

Note: It is advisable to work on the same topic or case for your paper and the mid term assignment!

iii. Mid term assignment in week 5 – 750 words max.

For the mid term assignment in week 5 students carry out an independent investigation of the intersections of digital media technologies and urban life, critically reflect on this using academic literature and course lectures, and frame issues for further research and discussions. The aim of this assignment is to connect theory and practice through a combination of observation, participation and reflection.

- **Length** 750 words max
- **Deadline:** Tuesday 6 October 17:00 on Blackboard in your own single thread (inline or as a pdf attachment).
- **Important:** as always, use the course literature and/or other academic sources for your assignment!

Possibilities:

1) Mapping urban technologies

In a manner similar to Dan Hill (week 2), you take an undirected walk of ca. 1 hour, either alone or together with a fellow student. You shall (independently!) identify two urban technologies that you encounter. You visually represent these media technologies and their connection to urban situations (without text, e.g. by creating a map, by capturing data, by making a drawing, a scheme, etc.). You use this visualization to reflect on the question how these technologies shape city life, e.g. place and time, social interactions, informational processes, or people's sense of place. What does your visualization show and what remains hidden? How do these urban technologies shape certain aspects of everyday city life? What possible discussions does this give rise to?

Examples may include - but are not limited to - mobile communication networks, wireless access points, GPS navigation, rfid access cards, media facades, embedded sensors and the Internet of Things, camera surveillance, location based services, pervasive games.

2) Discours analysis of smart city video, or other source

Analyze one or more movies on Youtube, or newspaper article(s), or other source, about smart cities/citizens. Briefly explain why you chose that video or source. What underlying (implicit) views of the city, of smartness, and of the active role of citizens can you discern? How is this smart city vision shaping particiular aspects of everyday city life? What possible discussions does this give rise to?

3) Design a hypothetical “smart solution” that gives rise to debate

By designing a prototype or ‘probe’ you can question so-called “smart technologies”, by eliciting debate. You will make a sketch, drawing, or other kind of documentation of your proposed design intervention. You will then use this to raise questions and points for discussion about what this intervention is suppose to address.

Examples:

Mark Shepard’s Sentient City Survival Kit - <http://survival.sentientcity.net>.

Next Nature - <http://www.nextnature.net/tag/design-for-debate/>.

Dunne & Raby about ‘critical design’ - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-bns4qcRRYY>.

The “adversarial design” interventions discussed in Morozov’s chapter from week 2.

4) Event review about smart cities/citizens

Visit a smart city event, or something related. Write a review of an event: what happened, what did you learn, what was missing? How did it connect to what we have learned so far during the course? What new insights did it bring?

5) Smart city essay

The mid-term assignment is explicitly meant as a step towards the final paper. The aim is to develop your own case and argument about smart cities/smart technologies and the creative role of citizens. Find a relevant case of smart urban technologies being used in practice. Describe this case in some detail, paying attention to questions like who, what, where, when, why, how (350-400 words). Critically reflect on this, as a way to develop an argument for the final paper (350-400 words).

B. Team assignments - 20 % of final grade

During the first working group meeting students are organized in six teams of about 4 to 5 people. Teams are expected to meet at least once a week outside of class meetings and discuss assigned texts and other sources, continuously monitoring their relevance and possible uses for both the team’s class meeting lecture and each team member’s individual research paper project. These are the team tasks:

i. Team presentation

Each week one of the six teams will prepare and be responsible for leading the first part of one of the class meetings (ca. 30 minutes). Teams will scrutinize and if possible to contextualize the assigned texts and place them within relevant theoretical and historical fields. Make sure not to provide simple summaries; course participants will have read the texts, so regard them as colleagues with similar interests who happen to want to know more about the subject from you, the experts! Seek connections between the texts (as well as with other texts you think are interesting), critically rethink views and opinions, refer to similar or antithetical sources and reflect on their use. Try to make it an interactive session by raising lots of issues for

group discussions. Teams are advised to use the propositions handed in by their fellow students as part of their weekly assignments to guide the debate. You may use relevant audiovisual material, interactive platforms, etc., as tools or illustrations or as case material to make your own point.

ii. Peer review in week 4

Teams will do peer reviews of each other’s paper proposals in week 4, and post these reviews on Blackboard (under both their own thread and the threads of fellow students). Peer reviews must pay attention to the presence and strength of the five elements of the so-called “schijf van 5”.

- Length: ca. 250 words per review.
- **Deadline:** Post on Blackboard before Tuesday 29 Sept. 17:00.

Students are strongly advised to repeat this team-based peer review procedure among themselves to prepare for the final paper.

C. Individual final paper - 60% of final grade

Students will write a final paper of about 3000 words. Either write a report on doing an experiment with a creative urban technology and connecting this to course literature, or write a more theoretical paper about one of the weekly themes or a related topic relevant to the course. Students are advised to choose a similar topic as the one explored in the mid term assignment. Use a concrete case study of a particular urban technology in order to answer the main question of this course, how urban technologies are used creatively to help shape urban life. Especially towards the end of the course we shall dedicate ample time during the working group hours to discuss final paper progress.

- The final paper should be 3000 words (± 10%).
- The **deadline** for handing in your **final paper is 30 October 2015** before 17:00.
- Please hand in papers via Ephorus, using the course instructor's e-mail address as the submission code.
- Also hand in a print version in the dedicated pigeon hole on Kromme Nieuwegracht 20 in Utrecht. Students who don’t live in Utrecht may also send their hardcopy version via snail mail to the instructor's home address (ask for address via e-mail).

See example scheme below. The grey block depends on your team membership (in this example week 2).

	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Week 6	Week 7	Week 8	Week 10
<i>Weekly reviews</i>	x		x	x	x	x	x		
<i>Team presentation</i>		x							
<i>Written assignments</i>			Paper proposal	Peer review proposal	Mid term assignment			Final paper due	Grades

3. CLASS MEETINGS SETUP

Below an indication of how the meetings are structured. Changes are possible as needed.

A. Class meetings - First part

The subgroup that is responsible for leading the class meeting will start the session by doing a 30-minute lecture and discussion. Before the break we will briefly reflect on the team presentation and identify

possible aspects for improvement.

B. Class meetings - Second part

After a break, we will dedicate time to discussing the week texts in further depth. An active attitude from students is expected here: you should raise questions, points for debate, and criticize the author's ideas (of course using sound arguments!) and forward your own ideas. Students are advised to also use this time to develop and test ideas for their final papers. Aside from discussing the literature, we will expand more on theories and methods, and discuss how to read texts, how to work with hypotheses, and how to write with a specific audience in mind.

C. Class meetings - Third part

After another break, the remaining time of the contact hours can be used for further questions, discussing paper proposals, teacher feedback and/or group meetings.

4. COURSE COMPLETION

The course is successfully completed when these conditions are met:

- Students have handed in on time all required weekly assignments (20% of final grade), with a minimum total grade of 5.5. An average score below 5.5 means students may not hand in their final paper. Failure to hand in an assignment on time will result in an irreparable 1. Students who miss more than one assignment cannot complete the course. The grading scale is from 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest).
- Students have participated in the team assignments: presentation + peer reviews (20%), with a minimum grade of 5.5.
- Students have handed in their final paper on time (60%), with a minimum grade of 5.5. The **deadline** is 30 October 2015 before 17:00. Students have the right to repair a 4 or higher. Only final papers can be repaired.
- Students have attended all class meetings. If students miss one class they need to notify the instructor in advance and compensate with an extra assignment. Students who are absent from more than one class cannot complete the course.

Fraud and Plagiarism

Please read the rules concerning fraud and plagiarism: <http://students.uu.nl/en/practical-information/academic-policies-and-procedures/fraud-and-plagiarism>. These rules apply not only to the final paper but to every assignment.

5. CONTACT

Please use Blackboard's discussion forum to ask questions about the course. Not only will you likely get quicker answers from other students and from the instructor, your question may also help fellow students. E-mail the instructor if you feel that you need to discuss a more personal matter. Exception: notify the instructor per e-mail of a successful group change at m.l.delange@uu.nl.

6. LITERATURE

Note: many URLs only work from within the university network, or after logging in with your account.

Week 1. Creative cities, smart cities, social cities (1)

As a general introduction both to the Creative Cities minor and to this course, we will get to know key notions like the creative city and smart city. What do they entail? What is a city, what is creativity and how is it tied to city life? What is the role of digital media technologies in creating smart cities?

Florida, Richard L. 2012. *The rise of the creative class: Revisited*. New York: Basic Books. Ch. 1 "The Transformation of Everyday Life" (1-12) + excerpt from Ch.3 "The Creative Class" (54-62).

<https://db.tt/CUB4QiMq>.

Hill, Dan. *The street as platform*. 2008. <http://www.cityofsound.com/blog/2008/02/the-street-as-p.html>.

de Lange, Michiel. 2014. The "urban" in "urban media". Short position paper, Utrecht University.

<https://db.tt/jxltuugE>

Optional

Wirth, Louis. 1938. Urbanism as a way of life. *The American Journal of Sociology* 44 (1): 1-24.

<http://bit.ly/1AGC3Qt>.

Landry, Charles, and Franco Bianchini. 1995. *The creative city*. London: Demos.

www.demos.co.uk/files/thecreativecity.pdf.

Karlsson, Charlie. 2011. Clusters, networks and creativity. In *Handbook of creative cities*, eds. David E. Andersson, Åke E. Andersson and Charlotta Mellander. Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Pub. 85-114. <http://bit.ly/XnNHka>.

Week 2. Creative cities, smart cities, social cities (2)

In week 2 we follow up on the first week by looking at how digital technologies in today's smart and social cities are forwarded to address various urban problems.

Albino, Vito, Umberto Berardi, and Rosa Maria Dangelico. 2015. "Smart Cities: Definitions, Dimensions, Performance, and Initiatives." *Journal of Urban Technology* no. 22 (1):3-21. <http://bit.ly/1FkMk5f>.

Hemment, Drew, and Anthony Townsend, eds. 2013. *Smart Citizens*. Manchester: FutureEverything Publications. Pages 1-3 and 9-12. <http://bit.ly/1LWDcLL>.

Morozov, Evgeny. 2013. *To save everything, click here: The folly of technological solutionism*. New York: PublicAffairs. Ch. 9 "Smart Gadgets, Dumb Humans" pp. 318-352. <http://bit.ly/1JMS8Fm>.

Optional

Caragliu, Andrea, Chiara Del Bo, and Peter Nijkamp. 2011. Smart cities in Europe. *Journal of Urban Technology* 18 (2): 65-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10630732.2011.601117>.

Allwinkle, Sam, and Peter Cruickshank. 2011. Creating smart-er cities: An overview. *Journal of Urban Technology* 18 (2): 1-16.

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10630732.2011.601103>.

Shepard, Mark. 2011. Toward the sentient city. In *Sentient city: Ubiquitous computing, architecture, and the future of urban space*, ed. Mark Shepard. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 16-37.

http://mixedrealitycity.org/readings/Shepard_SentientCity.pdf.

Greenfield, Adam. 2011. *Beyond the 'smart city'*. <http://urbanscale.org/2011/02/17/beyond-the-smart-city/>

Week 3. Creative citizenship

This week we further focus on the question how new media technologies may be used to leverage the creative potential of urbanites as active shapers of their own living conditions.

de Lange, Michiel, and Martijn de Waal. 2013. Owning the city: New media and citizen engagement in urban design. *First Monday, special issue "Media & the city"* 18 (11).

<http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/4954/3786>.

Saunders, Tom, and Peter Baeck. 2015. Rethinking smart cities from the ground up. London: Nesta.
<http://bit.ly/1N5t3JL>.

Optional

Frei, Hans, and Marc Böhlen. 2010. Micropublicplaces. In *Situated Technologies Pamphlet series*, eds. Omar Khan, Trebor Scholz and Mark Shepard. New York: The Architectural League of New York. (only the first part: pp. 12-28). <http://www.situatedtechnologies.net/files/ST6-MicroPublicPlaces.pdf>.

Graham, Stephen, and Alessandro Aurigi. 1997. Virtual cities, social polarization, and the crisis in urban public space. *Journal of Urban Technology* 4 (1): 19-52.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10630739708724546>.

Vajjhala, Shalini. 2005. Integrating gis and participatory mapping in community development planning. In *25th Annual ESRI User Conference, San Diego, CA, July 25–29 2005*.
<http://proceedings.esri.com/library/userconf/proc05/papers/pap1622.pdf>.

Citizen Science and Smart Cities Report of Summit Ispra, 5-7th February 2014 Max Craglia and Carlos Granell (Eds.) 2014

Week 4. Playful City

How can play and games be used to reprogram the city in creative ways? In this week we explore the intersections between urbanity and play and games by focussing on pervasive urban games, gamification, and gameful design.

Foth, Marcus, Andrew Hudson-Smith, and Dean Gifford. 2016. "Smart Cities, Social Capital, and Citizens at Play: A Critique and a Way Forward." In *Research Handbook on Digital Transformations*, edited by F. Xavier Olleros and Majlinda Zhegu. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar. <https://db.tt/Wwi7ynMX>.

de Lange, Michiel. 2015. "The Playful City: Using Play and Games to Foster Citizen Participation." In *Social Technologies and Collective Intelligence*, edited by Aelita Skaržauskienė, 426-434. Vilnius: Mykolas Romeris University. <http://bit.ly/1hWbkeb>.

Gordon, Eric, and Jessica Baldwin-Philippi. 2014. *Playful Civic Learning: Enabling Lateral Trust and Reflection in Game-based Public Participation*. Vol. 8, 2014. <http://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/2195/1100>.

Videos (to be shown during class)

McGonigal, Jane. 2010. "Gaming can make a better world". *TED Talk*.
http://www.ted.com/talks/jane_mcgonigal_gaming_can_make_a_better_world.html. (20 min.).

Squire, Kurt. 2013. "Civic Engagement Through Digital Games"
<http://www.edutopia.org/kurt-squire-games-civic-engagement-video> (9 mins.)

Optional

Juul, Jesper. 2011. "Gamification Backlash Roundup". Blogpost on:
<http://www.jesperjuul.net/ludologist/gamification-backlash-roundup> (+ blog comments!)

Debord, Guy-Ernest. 1956, 1958. "A User's Guide to Détournement" + "Theory of the Dérive". Available on
<http://www.bopsecrets.org/SI/index.htm>. [classic Situationist texts about playful subversive practices].

Licoppe, Christian, and Yoriko Inada. 2010. Locative media and cultures of mediated proximity: The case of the mogi game location-aware community. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28 (4): 691-709.

<http://www.envplan.com/abstract.cgi?id=d13307>.

Tan, Ekim. 2014. Negotiation and design for the self-organizing city: Gaming as a method for urban design. Delft: Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment, Department of Urbanism. (Ch. 3 "City Gaming for the Self-Organizing City" pp. 107 – 140). <https://db.tt/OC77dxkx>.

Recommended websites

<http://urban360.me/2012/08/24/if-urban-life-is-a-game-smart-cities-are-the-playgrounds/>

<http://www.engagementgamelab.org>

Week 5. Artistic City

This week focusses on locative media, digital art and urban screens, and how these media provide alternative perspectives to smart city discourses. There is less reading in this week because of the mid-term assignment.

Paul, Christiane. 2008. *Digital art*. 2nd ed, *World of art*. London ; New York: Thames & Hudson. (pp. 216-237). <https://db.tt/4DzCiNj5>.

Galloway, Anne. 2004. Intimations of everyday life: Ubiquitous computing and the city. *Cultural Studies* 18 (2/3): 384-408. http://www.purselipsquarejaw.org/papers/galloway_culturalstudies.pdf.

Videos (to be shown during class)

- Mark Shepard / Sentient City Survival Kit (5 min.) <http://survival.sentientcity.net>.
- Dunne & Raby about 'critical design' (7 min.) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-bns4qcRRYY>.
- [optional] RedSheep – Critique on Critical Design (5 min.) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-FTTamBXo_w

Optional

Picon, Antoine. 2008. Toward a city of events: Digital media and urbanity. *New Geographies* 0: 32-43.

http://cuma.periplurban.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/06/picon_digitalmediaandurbanity.pdf.

Tuters, Marc, and Kazys Varnelis. *Beyond locative media* 2006 [cited February 20 2008].

http://networkedpublics.org/locative_media/beyond_locative_media.

Dodge, Martin, and Chris Perkins. 2012. Maps, memories and Manchester: The cartographic imagination of the hidden networks of the hydraulic city. In *Mapping cultures: Place, practice, performance*, ed. Les Roberts. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 101-122.

<http://www.palgraveconnect.com.proxy.library.uu.nl/pc/doi/10.1057/9781137025050>.

Recommended websites

<http://cuma.periplurban.org>.

<http://www.medienkunstnetz.de>.

<http://uranus.media.uoa.gr/hc2/onlineresource/>.

<http://vagueterrain.net>.

Week 6. Data City, Maker City

In week 6 we focus on the role of digital media technologies in (re)creating urban subjectivities, by looking at the role of (big) data, maker culture, and the 'quantified self' movement.

Tufekci, Zeynep. 2014. Engineering the public: Big data, surveillance and computational politics. *First Monday* 19 (7).

<http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/4901/4097>.

Anderson, Chris. 2012. *Makers: The new industrial revolution*. 1st ed. New York: Crown Business. Ch.2 "The New Industrial Revolution" & Ch. 3 "The History of the Future" pp. 17-51.

<http://tinyurl.com/pu8begz>. [password: creativecities]

Nafus, Dawn, and Jamie Sherman. 2013. This One Does Not Go up to Eleven: The Quantified Self Movement as an Alternative Big Data Practice. *Draft paper*.

<http://quantifiedself.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/NafusShermanQSDraft.pdf>.

Optional

Jensen, Klaus Bruhn. 2013. How to do things with data: Meta-data, meta-media, and meta-communication. *First Monday* 18 (10).

<http://firstmonday.org/article/view/4870/3751>.

Simmel, Georg. 1997 (originally published in 1903). The metropolis and mental life. In *Simmel on culture: Selected writings*, ed. David Frisby and Mike Featherstone. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications. 174-185. [a classic text about mediated urban subjectivities.]

http://www.esperdy.net/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/Simmel_21.pdf.

Whitson, Jennifer R. 2013. Gaming the Quantified Self. *Surveillance & Society* 11 (1/2): 163-176.

http://www.click4it.org/images/1/1f/Gaming_the_Quantified_Self_Whitson.pdf.

Week 7. Critical reflections: the too smart city?

In the final week we pay specific attention to critical notes made about the media city. This includes the omnipresence of surveillance technologies, the pervasive practices of data gathering, the rhetoric of participation, and mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion.

Crang, Mike, and Stephen Graham. 2007. Sentient cities: Ambient intelligence and the politics of urban space. *Information, Communication & Society* 10 (6): 789-817.

<http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/13691180701750991>

Crandall, Jordan. 2010. The geospatialization of calculative operations: Tracking, sensing and megacities. *Theory, Culture & Society* 27 (6): 68-90.

<http://tcs.sagepub.com.proxy.library.uu.nl/content/27/6/68.full.pdf+html>.

Söderström, Ola, Till Paasche, and Francisco Klauser. 2014. "Smart cities as corporate storytelling." *City* no. 18 (3):307-320. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2014.906716>.

Optional

Long, Joshua. 2013. Sense of place and place-based activism in the neoliberal city. *City: analysis of urban*

trends, culture, theory, policy, action, 17:1, 52-67.

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13604813.2012.754186>.

Jacobs, Jane. 1992. *The death and life of great american cities*. Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage Books (originally published in 1961). Original edition, 1961. Ch. 2: "The uses of sidewalks: safety" (pp. 29-54).

[http://www.gwu.edu/~art/Temporary_SL/177/pdfs/Jacobs Part 1.pdf](http://www.gwu.edu/~art/Temporary_SL/177/pdfs/Jacobs%20Part%201.pdf).

Mann, Steve, Jason Nolan, and Barry Wellman. 2003. Sousveillance: Inventing and using wearable computing devices for data collection in surveillance environments. *Surveillance & Society* 1 (3): 331-355.

[http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/articles1\(3\)/sousveillance.pdf](http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/articles1(3)/sousveillance.pdf).

Deleuze, Gilles. 1990. *Postscript on the societies of control*. *L'autre journal*,

<http://www.nadir.org/nadir/archiv/netzkritik/societyofcontrol.html>.

Solove, Daniel. 2005. Of Privacy and Poop: Norm Enforcement Via the Blogosphere. (June 30, 2005).

<http://balkin.blogspot.com/2005/06/of-privacy-and-poop-norm-enforcement.html>.