



Manchester, H., & Cope, G. (2019). Learning to be a smart citizen. *Oxford Review of Education*, 45(2), 224-241.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2018.1552582>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1080/03054985.2018.1552582](https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2018.1552582)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Taylor & Francis at <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03054985.2018.1552582>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>



Learning to be a smart citizen

Journal:	<i>Oxford Review of Education</i>
Manuscript ID	CORE-2018-0098.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	smart city, digital inequalities, urban futures, citizen engagement, critical, creative citizen, learning

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Learning to be a smart citizen

For Peer Review Only

Abstract

The international Smart Cities movement (of cities driving digitally-led urban innovation) is not often linked with the international Learning Cities movement. However, there are learning questions at stake here. Smart City agendas are often criticised as being predominantly technocratic and instrumental, prioritising market-led solutions to urban issues (Cardullo and Kitchin, 2017). Such criticism has led, however, to recent moves to place the citizen at the centre of these discussions. This raises pedagogical and educational challenges: what theories and forms of learning are required for citizens to play a role in the development of increasingly digital, urban futures? To address this question, this paper adopts ethnographic methods to study the assumptions about learning and learning methods in a large, Europe-wide smart city project that aimed to include a component of citizen-led development.

Our argument provides important messages for policy makers, technology companies and Smart City planners keen to include citizens in smart city development. It suggests that the current ‘banking’ models of learning adopted in relation to citizen participation are not fit for purpose and that a new model is needed. This needs to recognise citizen learning as being situated in different social and material contexts and embedded in unequal relations of power, knowledge and resources. We make the case for Smart City initiatives to offer city inhabitants diverse experiences of technologies through critical, creative learning processes that value the different knowledge that communities bring and that begin to address some of the social, economic and technical inequalities that constitute the contemporary Smart city.

Keywords: Smart City, citizen engagement, learning, digital literacies, creative citizen

Funding details: the research was funded by the European Union Horizon 2020 fund under grant number 691735

Biographical notes

Introduction

A key feature of contemporary cities is their increasing digitization. This development of so called ‘Smart Cities’ in which digital services and tools are being implemented to foster a range of goals from more inclusive democratic dialogue to more efficient transportation poses pedagogic and educational challenges. What do citizens need to learn to be able to live well within and understand these environments as well as to shape their future development?

1
2
3 This educational challenge is visible in urban theory literature which argues that there is a
4 distinct mismatch between the rhetoric of the potential of Smart Cities worldwide to create more
5 inclusive, democratic or more innovative cities and the actual practice of Smart City planning
6 (Hambleton, 2014; McFarlane, 2011; Campbell, 2012; McFarlane and Söderström, 2017). In
7 addition, whilst citizens are increasingly placed at the centre of Smart City visions problems with
8 questions of governance, citizenship models and relationality of power have been noted
9 (Hollands, 2015; Joss, Cook & Dayot, 2017; Gabrys 2014; Cardullo and Kitchin, 2018). Batty,
10 for example, asks whether,
11
12

13
14 Smart cities are equitable cities.... that... the sort of infrastructure, expertise and data
15 that will characterise the smart city will enable equity to be easily established and such
16 cities will improve the quality of urban life. (Batty et al, 2012 p. 516)
17

18 This paper explores these challenges by putting educational theories into conversation with those
19 of urban theorists. To do so, we study the models of learning that gain authority in one Smart
20 City project and the emerging models of learning that might inform more equitable design of
21 future, digital cities.
22
23

24 In the first section of the paper we explore two models of learning and how they emerge in the
25 existing academic (and grey) literature relating to Smart Cities and digital learning in the city.
26 We point out how they frame learning and learners in particular ways that have distinctive
27 effects on participation and inclusion in conversations about digital, urban futures. In section 2
28 we go on to introduce our research questions and discuss the ethnographic methods we used to
29 explore how these models of learning circulated within one European Smart City project in the
30 city of Bristol, UK. We suggest how ethnographic methods can enable scholars interested in the
31 enactment of Smart City policies and practices to engage meaningfully with the diversity of
32 actors involved. In Section 3 our findings explore how placing creative, collaborative models of
33 learning at the heart of Smart City planning might enable more inclusive approaches to learning
34 about and designing urban futures.
35
36

37 **Section 1: Two models of learning**

38 **The Banking Model**

39
40 Current analyses of Smart City literature (Cowley, Joss & Dayot, 2018; Hambleton, 2014;
41 Hollands, 2008; Nam & Pardo, 2011) suggest that learning in the city is framed in a narrowly
42 instrumental manner. In this model citizens are offered a limited set of roles as service users or as
43 enthusiastic entrepreneurs detached from place, context and everyday experiences.
44
45

46
47 In Smart Cities literature, the citizen is often placed in a passive role, as a 'service user' where
48 digital technologies are designed to improve the functioning of existing infrastructure and
49 systems. Cowley, Joss & Dayot, (2018) have observed that the public here are assumed to be
50 consumers rather than co-creators of services; that the new digital infrastructure is embedded and
51 rendered invisible in the citizens' lives, and that processes of automation often render invisible
52 opportunities for critical digital learning.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 Hambleton (2014) further points out that there is an assumption that cities and their citizens must
4 learn a universal set of skills as defined by city leaders and technology companies in order to
5 participate in so-called inevitable ‘smart future’ visions. Dominant voices from the large
6 technology companies, who have a vested interest in profit making in an ever-increasing market,
7 are the source of these visions (Hambleton, 2014; Hollands, 2008; Nam & Pardo, 2011). Here
8 citizens are challenged to adapt to and embrace new digital infrastructures as a necessary
9 precursor to building more liveable, democratic and prosperous cities. This technologically-
10 determinist approach places the technologies and their innovation as centre stage. Learning is
11 understood as the development of a set of digital and business skills that might enable citizens to
12 become more involved in entrepreneurial activity related to Smart Cities. Through hackathons
13 (technology focused events, typically lasting several days, in which a large number of people
14 meet to work together to solve a design problem) and other devices citizens are offered
15 opportunities to create new services and products that might ‘plug into’ the Smart City (Cowley
16 et al, 2018). The almost exclusively entrepreneurial outlook of these discourses can undermine
17 more collaborative and consensus-building opportunities (Deakin and Al Waer, 2011) and tend
18 to favour those with existing digital skills and expertise.
19
20
21

22
23 In these visions, as Caprotti, Cowley, Flynn, Joss & Yu, (2016) suggest there is a focus on
24 innovation and novelty as catalysts for change. Learning is therefore detached from context,
25 effectively ignoring the social, historical, cultural and political dimensions of everyday urban
26 life. This focus fails to engage with the situated nature of citizen participation and learning,
27 which emerges from existing practices and experiences of and in the city (Hambleton, 2014;
28 Cowley et al, 2018).
29

30
31 Indeed, reading these texts the dominance of what Freire called the ‘banking metaphor’ for
32 education is clear (Freire, 1972). Here citizens are imagined as containers either waiting to be
33 filled with the digital knowledge and skills necessary to engage in new, inevitable ‘smart’ futures
34 or as nascent individual entrepreneurs needing to be taught to react quickly to new digital
35 infrastructure. There is a paternalistic concern expressed for those ‘have-nots’ who are excluded
36 from both access to and the ability to use digital technologies for their own purposes. Simplistic
37 top-down educational responses are imagined as a way to respond to this. For instance,
38 suggestions that tackling digital inclusion may be, ‘as simple as providing publicly accessible
39 devices or launching a series of educational seminars for residents.’ (DXC. technology, 2016,
40 blogpost).
41
42

43 **The Creative Citizens Model**

44 In 2016 we (names redacted) were brought into a major city-wide, project in Bristol in which the
45 question of how to build the capacity of citizens to engage with Smart City developments was
46 central. Our role was to ‘document and explore the role of citizens in co-designing digital futures’
47 in the city. Located in a School of Education we came to the project with a very different set of
48 assumptions from those outlined above, about both learning and how learning might play a role in
49 citizens’ shaping of a city.
50

51
52 First: our assumption was that learners are active. Theories of critical digital literacies have long
53 suggested that citizens should be considered active learners when engaging with new
54 technological developments (Potter & McDougall, 2017; Eynon, 2015). Seeing the citizen as an
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 active learner places value on attending to how their diverse knowledges, creative approaches
4 and critical social actions might contribute to positive future urban development. Here, learning
5 can be understood as a tool to enable people to understand new and emerging digital
6 technologies in order to change the Smart City, not adapt to it (McFarlane and Söderström,
7 2017).
8
9

10 Second: we recognised literacy practices as being ideological not neutral. Current Smart City
11 discourse presents the introduction of a particular set of digital literacy skills as an unalloyed
12 good (Tapscott, 1998; Jenkins, 2007). The long history of literacy studies (Street, 2003),
13 however, would suggest the importance of situating literacy practices in social, cultural and
14 historical contexts, paying attention to relationships between literacy, power and knowledge and
15 attending to the inequalities and knowledge hierarchies that these produce (Gee, 2000; Pahl and
16 Rowsell, 2010; Buckingham, 2006; Selwyn and Facer, 2013). These literatures suggest that
17 models of learning in Smart City projects must involve a deeper understanding of the already
18 existing cultural knowledges and experiences of the city (Barton and Hamilton, 2012; Erstad &
19 Sefton-Green, 2013).
20
21

22
23 Third: As the digital increasingly becomes the ‘stuff’ of everyday life (Miller, 2010) the
24 development of knowledge hierarchies becomes invisible, embedded in hidden infrastructures
25 and algorithms that permeate the instrumentation of the city (Star, 1999). This perspective
26 suggests that learning is distributed across digital and material spaces (MacFarlane, 2011). This
27 requires us, as researchers, to consider that learning practices in the Smart City also include the
28 material infrastructures being embedded to make smart cities work, the place-based memories
29 held by the communities involved, and the new material goods such as electronic cars that
30 suddenly appear on street corners.
31
32

33 Our position on entering this Smart City project, then, was one that views learning as situated,
34 ideological and material, drawing attention to why and how particular ideas about citizen
35 learning become dominant over others and how these ideas might be questioned and reframed
36 (Gee, 2000; Street, 2013). It sees the learner as creative, active and critical, as wanting (rather
37 than needing) to learn certain things in relation to making urban futures. It recognises that, given
38 the historical patterns of inequality that produce patterns of ownership, access and control of
39 technologies, there are obstacles to city inhabitants finding routes to influence policy and
40 technology shaping the development of the city.
41
42
43

44 **Section 2: Introducing the Mimeo Project & Research Aims**

45

46 The Mimeo project took place in Bristol, a medium sized city in the UK. The city partnered with
47 two other European cities to successfully bid for a large European Union Horizon 2020 project.
48 The project lasts for 5 years (2016 – 2021) and is just entering its implementation phase as we
49 write in 2018. The project is managed by the local municipality with around 16 partners
50 including small and medium sized enterprises, community organisations as well as academic
51 partners working on technology implementation and other evaluation.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The increasing focus on the need for citizens' involvement in Smart Cities is stated in the overall
4 objective of the project:
5

6
7 To increase the quality of life for citizens across Europe by demonstrating the impact of
8 innovative technologies used to co-create smart city services with citizens, and prove the
9 optimal process for replicating successes within cities and across cities.
10 (Mimeo Project documentation)
11

12 The stated ambition of the project is that a 'co-creation' approach would enable innovative,
13 replicable Smart City services to emerge in dialogue between citizens and project team that
14 tackle familiar urban problems such as traffic congestion, poor air quality and unsustainable
15 energy use. However, the project proposal documentation had no specific aims relating to citizen
16 engagement or learning. Further, it is worth noting that while the development of technology
17 accounts for half of the budget, citizen engagement in the process has just over 10% of the
18 budget.
19
20

21 Bristol is known in the UK as a base for creative, digital business and arts practice. In addition, it
22 has a strong voluntary and community sector involved in supporting citizen engagement and
23 participation in decision making. This is exemplified, for instance, by the Mayor's 'One City'
24 Approach, by the 'youth mayor' initiative and by the pioneering work of the Bristol Green
25 Partnership¹. The management of citizen participation in the project is led by a media arts
26 organisation in the city (Knowle West Media Centre: KWMC). The organisation is not based in
27 the Mimeo case study area but is known for its innovative work around digital inclusion in the
28 city. KWMC have been working closely with the municipality and the universities in the city for
29 a number of years to develop a framework that creates a smart city where 'the power of
30 technology is harnessed to tackle the issues that people care about.' (KWMC, 2016). Their
31 approach rejects an emphasis on the role of data, hardware and software in Smart City projects
32 by seeking to include the knowledge and lived experience of the citizens within the community
33 to address actual needs (Soderstrom, Paasche & Klauser, 2014). The stated goal of their
34 approach is to collaborate with citizens to 'tackle local issues by enabling participatory
35 processes, bottom-up sensor infrastructures and collecting, making sense and sharing relevant
36 open data' (Balestrini, Creus, Masfarre & Canigearal, 2016, p. 3). The approach was designed
37 in collaboration with a European wide think tank, who worked alongside KWMC to develop a
38 set of research reports and booklets to communicate their ideas (KWMC, 2016; Balestrini et al,
39 2016).
40
41
42
43

44 The Mimeo project is working in a 'case study' area in each city on the implementation of
45 specific smart infrastructure. In Bristol a vibrant and diverse area of the city was selected. The
46 population living in this area (N= 50,000 approx.) has the highest percentage of black or
47 minority ethnic citizens (BME) in residence (44% whereas the city average is 16%). 51% of all
48 accommodation in this area is flats, whereas the city average is 20%. The district also has the
49 lowest levels of car availability in the city with (46% of households with no car, city average
50
51

52
53 ¹ See <http://www.bristolnbn.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/18-01-09-City-Plan-Comms-Pack.pdf>,
54 <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/youth-council-youth-mayors>, <http://bristolgreencapital.org/>
55
56
57
58
59

29%). According to the Department of Energy and Climate Change two areas within this district are in the top 10% of households in the country experiencing fuel poverty. Almost one third of the neighbourhoods within the district are classified as amongst the 10% most deprived neighbourhoods nationally. The number of recipients of out of work benefits is significantly higher than the city average (12.1%), with the rate in one neighbourhood amongst the city's highest at 26.2%. These multiple deprivations resulted in the area being granted European Union Objective 2 status and 'New Deal for Communities' status by the UK government.²

Mimeo is directed towards developing a suite of new technological designs including innovations around smart homes and retro-fitting of homes to become more energy efficient, the installation of electric bikes and vehicles and an electric vehicle charging infrastructure, an on demand electric bus service, the development of a Smart City platform and an energy demand management service. The challenge of diverse partners with competing motivations and desires meant that, although attempts were continually being made to embed citizen engagement and co-design into the project, this was challenging. KWMC recognised this and created a specific stream of work within the Mimeo project called 'Created By Us' in order to achieve their aims related to increasing the role of citizens. The focus was on 'Citizen Sensing': a process involving people building and using small and generally low-cost sensor technology to help them to collect data about issues of importance to them. It was hoped that the 'Citizen Sensing' element of the work would also feed into the design of some of the larger scale technological infrastructure projects.

Our own position on the project was as researchers tasked with researching the citizen engagement activities on the project. Our research aimed to explore the way that citizens, and their learning, were imagined and included in the Mimeo project. Instead of only offering description or critique our research was designed to uncover and explore the learning models and practices of citizen involvement in the Mimeo project. Our purpose was not to provide a framework for citizen engagement (as other projects have tried to do, see European Union, 2017) but rather, through in-depth empirical work, to illuminate approaches to digital learning that might support the participation of those often marginalised from conversations about digital, urban design.

The key project partners and associated partners brought into the Mimeo project in Bristol included a diverse array of organisations. Below the cast of actors important to the narrative and argument in this paper are introduced,

Overall co-ordination

- Municipality overall project lead: co-ordinating the whole city project and liaising with other cities involved.

²Statistics from

<https://www.bristol.gov.uk/documents/20182/928407/Ashley%2C+Easton+and+Lawrence+Hill.pdf/c83444ac-a3d8-4417-b967-b1c19ec3512f> accessed 14th Feb, 2018

- Municipality city pilot lead: co-ordinating the work in the city pilot, sits on the engagement sub-group

Engagement subgroup actors

- Municipality city pilot lead
- KWMC citizen engagement lead
- Ourselves

Media arts organisation actors

- Citizen engagement co-ordinator on the project
- Citizen Sensing co-ordinator
- Communications co-ordinator
- Others involved in the Citizen Sensing projects

Others

- Local community anchor organisations
- Large, commercial technology companies designing specific software and infrastructure.
- City/University technology partnership leading technical infrastructure development.
- Local SMEs involved in energy and transport actions, including e-vehicles and e-bikes, on demand bus service, connected homes

In the process of seeking informed consent confidentiality and anonymity were not promised to those involved. However, in reporting our findings names are not used and labels given when quoting individuals are deliberately ambiguous in order to avoid, as far as possible, directly identifying actors.

Questions, Methodology and Methods

In this paper, we explore the following questions through detailed analysis of this case of a Smart City in the making:

- What learning models (assumptions about learners, theories about learning) circulate in the Mimeo project and what are their effects?
- How might a Creative Citizens model offer opportunities for critical, digital learning in Smart City planning?

Our methods aim to address some of the shortcomings of previous research in the area of Smart Cities; namely that there has been a ‘one size fits all’ (Kitchin, 2014) approach that has been based on ‘reading of corporate or government documents, rather than interview, ethnographies or genealogies that would add substantive insight’ (Kitchin, 2014, p.134). This previous approach has led to a foregrounding of business interests and a tendency to hide growing social polarization (Harvey, 2000). Our research recognises the need to ground critical Smart City scholarship within

1
2
3 specific places, foregrounding the distinctive knowledges, concerns and challenges of marginal,
4 often excluded citizens (McFarlane & Söderström, 2017).
5

6
7 The Mimeo project is funded for 5 years (2016 -2021). Our engagement in the field began as the
8 project began and will finish in October 2019 when the major intervention in the city is due to be
9 completed. By exploring learning in a Smart City in a specific location and time we are
10 attempting to understand ‘situated bodies of practices, into which human actors are differently
11 enrolled’ (Cowley et al, 2018, p.55). In order to understand citizen learning on the project we
12 recognise a need to account for the conditional and changing local situatedness of people,
13 policies, technologies and places that create the dynamic landscape in which the project operates.
14

15
16 We therefore sought to explore how citizen learning was constituted in relation between multiple
17 and diverse actors ‘rather than as only imposed by state or corporate actors from ‘above’
18 (Cowley et al, 2018, p. 55) To that end, one of us (name redacted), conducted participant
19 observation by becoming embedded with the actors involved in the project from municipality
20 employees to EU project documentation to community engagement partners. This supported her
21 to understand how ideas of the citizen and their learning circulated both formally through, for
22 instance, project team meetings and measurement metrics, and informally through conversations,
23 everyday encounters and materially in the district.
24

25
26 The data generated include observations of nine whole project team days, twenty-seven other
27 meetings, including engagement and communication group meetings and ten workshops held
28 with local organisations and citizens, producing in-depth fieldnotes from meetings and events.
29 Details on how citizen learning was discussed by these project partners were carefully noted and
30 any changes over time specifically recorded. Cope also conducted twenty face-to-face interviews
31 with project partners and organisations, which she transcribed herself, including those who were
32 not formal partners on the project but were brought in as the project evolved, for instance, anchor
33 community organisations in the locality.
34

35
36 Discourse analysis of key texts, project documentation and online communications was also
37 undertaken. As we were particularly looking at the citizen engagement package in the Bristol
38 case study site, we spent time with, and worked alongside, the KWMC staff, joining their team
39 meetings and recording their approach throughout the project. In all of our work we were looking
40 for where accounts of learning became visible and we followed the actors, attending smaller
41 meetings and having informal conversations as and when interesting data emerged.
42
43

44
45 Data were analysed iteratively and analysis was carried out using Nvivo software, following a
46 thematic approach. As the themes emerged from the data analysis, the approach to the research
47 could be iteratively developed, in collaboration with the engagement subgroup (see cast of actors
48 above). Interview schedules were adapted to reflect findings as they emerged and to build on our
49 understandings of citizens and their learning as the project was rolled out.
50

51
52 We worked with a relational ethics framing in which our ethical practice went beyond the
53 procedural or even the situational to continuously ask ourselves and others involved questions
54 around privacy and consent (Ellis, 2007). This is especially important as we are working in the
55 city in which the project is located. As researchers working alongside the project and wanting to
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 support work around citizen learning we recognised the need for ongoing ethical sensitivity
4 around disclosure and the negotiation of access to different actors and sites (Scott & Russell,
5 2005). Engaging in ongoing analytical reflection on the relationships we were developing and
6 how they might influence actors to speak to us, or not, about certain elements of the project
7 required us to be very clear throughout on issues related to informed consent and the
8 impossibility of complete anonymity. Our collaborative approach created constant tensions
9 between telling a positive story of the project and making visible the tensions and contradictions
10 we observed and heard about from the actors. Our key interlocutors in the project were the
11 ‘engagement sub group’ comprising the municipalities project manager for the city pilot, the
12 project manager from the media arts organisation involved and ourselves.
13
14

15 16 **Section 3: Findings**

17
18 In this section we use our data to illustrate, unpick and discuss the models of learning circulating
19 within the Mimeo project, how and where they emerge and what their various effects are on
20 citizen participation in thinking about digital, urban futures.
21
22

23 **The Dominance of the Banking Model**

24 In general, perhaps not surprisingly given previous studies of Smart Cities, the dominant model
25 of learning we observed on the Mimeo project focussed on the need for the inhabitants in the
26 case study area to adapt to new digital infrastructures, largely viewing ‘citizens’ as consumers
27 and service users. Inequalities, everyday lives and experiences of the citizens, and hierarchies of
28 knowledge and power, are edited out of this model.
29
30

31 From the beginning a communication working group was set up to publicise the project to
32 different audiences, particularly to inhabitants in the case study area. Communication was largely
33 ‘broadcast’ in order to inform people in the area about the project and the benefits of Smart
34 Cities. This was despite the fact that the municipality were aware that inhabitants in the selected
35 area had various existing, historical relationships with the municipality, with the funding body
36 (the EU), and with the notion of Smart Cities that might affect their participation. These
37 understandings were not taken seriously in communicating the project, as can be seen below,
38
39

40 ...as an EU funded project people do question whether it’s relevant to them so there will
41 have to be education about relevancy and how, if a community organisation does get
42 involved, it can benefit the community and they can have a part in making that happen.
43 There is a little bit of reticence but generally the more you talk to people the more excited
44 they become. (Interview, municipality project worker)
45
46

47 Here, little attention is given to the ongoing histories and everyday experiences that might have
48 led to the ‘reticence’ referred to or, indeed, in what might lie behind their reticence. In fact, a
49 local community organiser noted that the whole premise of the project and the technologies
50 being designed failed to engage with the realities of lives lived in this area of the city when she
51 suggested that,
52
53

54 if you are relying on smart phone and broadband technology don’t pick an area where
55 most people are on pay as you go basic phone or the whole of an area which doesn’t have
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 decent broadband connection. People in high rise or social housing have key meters³ and
4 they don't have the ability to change those things. (Interview, local community organiser)
5

6
7 This 'broadcasting' approach to citizen learning about the Mimeo project was paternalistic in
8 tone and tended to homogenise people. For instance, one piece of advertising for the project tells
9 a story of an 'average household' where everyone switches on their kettles following the end of
10 England's run in the football world cup (2018) . This is used as an example of energy demand
11 spikes which are '*bad for the environment as it's usually the polluting energy sources that are*
12 *able to meet this short-term demand.*' (Mimeo project advertising, 2018). In these processes we
13 see the cultural diversity of inhabitants in the area being edited out and the messages from the
14 project addressed to individual as consumers. They are invited to adapt to and adopt new
15 technologies to improve their lives (and potentially the planet), in mostly rather instrumental
16 ways. The culturally diverse inhabitants in the area are therefore framed primarily as polluters
17 who need to be told how to behave better, rather than active learners able to engage in thinking
18 about behaviour change around energy use. The double irony here is that the Smart City
19 engineers and civil servants involved in the international air travel necessary for the Mimeo
20 project are much more likely than these inhabitants, often non car owners and perhaps less likely
21 to engage in international travel, to be those responsible for significant carbon emissions.
22
23
24

25 The problems with such an approach became clear in workshops held with inhabitants in the area
26 during the project development where this top down, broadcast material was described as
27 'propaganda' by some of the participants. Participants discussed how words such as 'smart' and
28 'data' were alienating. They also argued that inhabitants in the area do care about the ethics of
29 new digital infrastructures by pointing out the general scepticism about data privacy following a
30 facebook data scandal (2018) and that there was a perception that 'everything smart is being
31 hacked into' (workshop participants, June 2018). Despite this clear engagement with key ethical
32 issues inherent within Smart City planning the idea of inhabitants in the area as vessels waiting
33 to be filled with the knowledge necessary to encourage their involvement was all-pervasive. One
34 of the technology partners, for example, told us,
35
36

37
38 There is a lot to be understood in terms of education, explaining to people what a smart
39 appliance is, explaining to them in a meaningful way how it might be beneficial to them
40 in the future, to Bristol, the environment.
41 (Technology developer, interview)
42

43
44 Throughout the project we noticed that people in the area were imagined as passive users of
45 technology and/or uninterested or not skilled enough to engage in co-creating the Smart City.
46 This is despite the linguistic appropriation of the ideals of co-design, or user centred design
47 (UCD) in the talk surrounding the project. For instance, one of the partner technology companies
48 claimed to be adopting a UCD approach whilst simultaneously explaining at a team day that in
49 their lab-based simulations citizens are represented as Minions from the popular film franchise
50 Despicable Me⁴. Although humorous, this demonstrates an implicit model of homogenised,
51
52

53 ³ Key meters are pay as you go meters for domestic energy consumption

54 ⁴ Minions 'live to serve, but find themselves working for a continual series of unsuccessful masters (Animation
55 source, retrieved 2018).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 passive citizens assumed to need to learn certain ways of behaving in order to engage with the
4 smart infrastructure. Interestingly, the idea of an entrepreneurial citizen ready to take advantage
5 of new smart infrastructure is barely visible in relation to the inhabitants living in the case study
6 area of this project.
7

8
9 There is a sense too, expressed by the programme manager, that understanding and engaging
10 with smartness is not a priority in ‘the citizens’ lives. One solution to this was to hide digital
11 infrastructure through processes of automation as described below,
12

13
14 From my perspective people are really interested when they get data about their energy
15 use for the first few months and then they forget it so the key thing for us is how to
16 automate it. Previously people used to just turn some lights off but people want to spend
17 time with their families rather than worrying about turning off the lights so how do we
18 automate that stuff as much as possible?
19

20 (Interview, Municipality worker)
21

22 As the digital layer is made invisible, as described above, so too is the potential for critical
23 digital literacy learning. The potential for the devices themselves to be used to encourage digital
24 learning is overlooked on the project. Inhabitants of the area are largely seen as data points in
25 relation to the smart devices being put into their homes. Therefore, opportunities for knowledge
26 production and learning to take place between the data gatherer and the data provider, in
27 dialogue, are not developed. For instance, where smart devices have been put in the hands of
28 inhabitants they are not supported to understand the data being collected or consider how it
29 might be useful in their lives, potentially altering their energy use and therefore their bills. As
30 Hollands, (2008, p.306) suggests, assumptions that the technology itself can bring about
31 transformation in communities without citizen’s active and informed engagement, raises
32 questions around,
33

34
35 how, and in what way is it being transformed?’ , but it also automatically assumes that
36 there is some kind of community ‘consensus’ and involvement in the transition, and that
37 such a change is inherently positive.
38

39
40 All of these observations suggest that the knowledge hierarchies at work in the project de-value
41 the historically constituted concerns of the community in favour of a particular ‘smart’ vision of
42 being and living in the city, where citizens are understood as consumers of new technologies,
43 rather than active participants in mobilising technologies for their own purposes and to reshape
44 the city. Negotiation between these different knowledges and the potential to build new
45 connections is challenging on the project for a variety of reasons which we go on to explore later
46 in the paper in our discussion.
47
48
49

50 **Creative Citizens Model**

51 A different model of learning, which we call the Creative Citizens model, operated in the
52 Created By Us element of the Mimeo project run by KWMC. This approach situates learning in
53 historically constructed, unequal relations of power, knowledge and resource, it recognises the
54 significance of learner diversity and is focused on how inequality might be challenged through
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 working alongside individuals and communities to discover what animates them, but also in
4 thinking about how they might be connected into powerful processes at work in the city.
5

6
7 In initial conversations with anchor community organisations in the area it became obvious to
8 KWMC and ourselves that there was a disconnect between the everyday lives of many of the
9 inhabitants in the case study neighbourhood, and the ‘smart’ technologies being introduced and
10 discussed on the project. This key tension was discussed with one of the project managers at
11 KWMC who suggested that,
12

13
14 the technology doesn’t mean anything to the community and so [we are] trying to steal
15 that space where technology is developed based on its meaning and its purpose to real
16 people. But these real people having a part in that is challenging.
17 (Interview project manager, media arts organisation).
18

19
20 As KWMC did not have a long history of working in the targeted area they recognised that they
21 needed to understand better the histories and knowledges held in the local community. A first
22 step involved inviting local anchor organisations to discuss their possible participation. Many of
23 the community practitioners were very dubious about the effectiveness of using digital media to
24 tackle inequalities and felt that there were a range of other priorities in citizens’ lives that should
25 be given priority (fieldnotes, March, 2017). Taking into account historical relations of power,
26 and negative feelings towards both the municipality (in a context of UK austerity) and the EU,
27 meant that drawing these local knowledges from local civil society organisations and inhabitants
28 into Mimeo needed to be carefully managed. As one of the project managers observed:
29

30
31 Quite rightly some of the organisations were apprehensive even before it started but for
32 me having seen how those negotiations have been done and how careful you have to be
33 this has been a great learning process. And I think if you want to test out anything with
34 people then you have to build in the groundwork to introduce the project properly,
35 finding and respecting the key stakeholders who are already in the community and
36 working from there.
37 (Interview project manager, media arts organisation)
38
39

40
41 Connecting with community anchor organisations in the area, which had been overlooked in the
42 bid writing, here helped KWMC to connect with the huge amount of knowledge, understanding
43 and research around the key assets, concerns and challenges faced by those living in the area.
44 This included integrating the findings from a timely publication of a community research led
45 project that had identified a key set of priorities around quality of life for inhabitants of the area.
46 For instance, when asked which services were important to people’s wellbeing, over half of
47 respondents in the area pointed to parks and green spaces. These were also identified as a key
48 focus for municipality investment (Up Our Street, 2017). This community-led research
49 questioned the assumption in the Mimeo project that ‘smartness’ will deliver a better quality of
50 life. Instead, these findings suggested more green spaces (we might argue the opposite of
51 smartness) was what was truly desired.
52

53
54 Starting with the everyday issues of concern to residents and providing diverse opportunities for
55 engagement and learning, meant that this work stream began to switch away from a focus on the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 technology and the narrow, technocratic deliverables of the Mimeo project. As a result, this
4 methodo-political work was silo-ed, largely because the inhabitants' concerns did not connect
5 with the technological developments listed in the project deliverables. Despite this, the
6 experimental work that took place through Created By Us continued, this was because the
7 municipality project team were committed to trying out different models of digital learning with
8 marginalised communities in the city. As a result, the 'Citizen Sensing' strand of activity began
9 to take shape.
10
11
12

13
14 Initial activity designed by KWMC in the project area involved in depth, informal on the ground
15 work involving artists and community development workers 'hanging out' and beginning
16 conversations in local chicken shops, cafes and nailbars. Several issues emerged including
17 concerns around damp homes and poor air quality. Both issues connected with wider concerns
18 that had been expressed in the community-led quality of life research (Up Our Street, 2017).
19 Initially the damp homes issue gathered momentum, partly because it connected with multiple
20 local concerns including health issues, social stigma and poor-quality housing, demonstrating the
21 complexity of connections between issues faced by marginalised communities. In order to
22 challenge knowledge hierarchies in the city it was deemed essential to connect these emerging
23 local concerns with powerful processes and people in the city. This was possible as these
24 concerns around health, social and housing inequalities were also shared by many local
25 organisations and by policy makers in the municipality. In addition, computer scientists and
26 technologists, open data and other experts were interested in exploring how sensor data might be
27 utilized by citizens to understand the issues of concern in more depth. Out of this dialogue, the
28 'Damp Busters' (Citizen Sensing) project emerged. Citizen Sensing involves collaborating with
29 citizens on the development of low-tech sensor infrastructures and supporting them to make
30 sense of and share the knowledge gained through the sensor technology.
31
32
33

34
35 In developing this work, the importance of connecting lay knowledges with expert knowledges
36 in order to generate dialogue between them became clear. The mutual exchange and learning
37 required was challenging, particularly when innovative technologies, often seen as 'irrelevant' in
38 the area, were at the heart of the inquiry,
39

40
41 It's great to have different partners from different worlds, it's a challenge as well, but
42 the level of expertise is amazing - to speak to someone who is creating a cutting-edge
43 network the like of which has not been seen before is a challenge but it's also exciting
44 to connect people up who might not have had the chance to access those sorts of
45 technologies.

46 (Interview, project manager, media arts organisation)
47

48
49 The role of KWMC was vital here in 'holding' (in the psychoanalytical sense of 'holding'
50 emotions and doubt so that they are manageable, see Bion, 1984; Bibby, 2009) the collaboration
51 at the early stages, which required them to support the translation of knowledge and ideas across
52 the different groups involved. The importance of offering multiple and varied opportunities for
53 participation and involving a diverse team in order to facilitate the inclusion of citizen
54 knowledge and to challenge unequal relations of power quickly became obvious. Artists,
55 technologists and engagement specialists designed and offered a wide range of opportunities for
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 learning and participation including workshops, hack days and working on design briefs
4 together. Participation across the activities varied, as a KWMC project manager explained,
5

6
7 We didn't get hung up on everyone attending everything, it wasn't that we were going
8 to do lots of hackdays. We offered a range of different activities to keep people on
9 board.
10

11 Learners were seen here as active in understanding what they might want or need to learn and
12 how Citizen Sensing might help them to do so. Digital learning opportunities involved diverse
13 groups of people coming together in practice based, material encounters bringing the technology
14 design into relation with the everyday lives of those living with damp. Learning here was
15 understood as both relational and material, involving engagement with artefacts and policy
16 agendas. For instance, social tenants worked alongside the tenancy officer in the municipality to
17 identify and target private landlords who ran damp properties in order to challenge those who
18 were not acting ethically.
19
20

21 In addition, a focus on critical engagement with the actual technologies was visible in events
22 throughout the damp project that offered people opportunities to play with sensor technologies
23 and other digital, material devices. Technologists as well as residents in the area, academics, civil
24 servants and others took part. The events were designed to share knowledge and expertise and to
25 demystify terms like 'data' and 'sensor technologies'. In this way an open design process was
26 created where different knowledges were put into conversation in order to open up new questions
27 around digital, urban futures (Storni, Binder, Linde & Stuedahl, 2015). Autonomy and creativity
28 were encouraged in these workshops where the processes and the digital tools and interfaces
29 were designed as 'tools for conviviality' to encourage engagement among and between people
30 and the city environment (Illich, 2002). This contrasted strongly with the 'UCD' approach
31 (remember the Minions) adopted by the technology companies involved.
32
33
34

35 The Citizen Sensing group built a prototype sensor together using open technology. The tool was
36 designed in response to a real concern raised by those involved in the design process. This
37 'making together' approach (Ingold, 2013) enabled those who were not technology experts to see
38 how things are put together and to build knowledge about sensors and their design. The co-
39 design process also supported inhabitants of the area to ask questions around data and ethics that
40 related to their everyday lives and concerns. As a KWMC project manager suggested, it was
41 important that the interface itself was user friendly, however,
42
43

44
45 what was really important to the citizens was 'I want to choose when it's switched on,
46 what happens with the data, I want to know who the data is being shared with'.
47

48 The interface that was co-designed in order to house the sensor technologies in people's homes
49 was in the shape of frog. The frog, who loves to live in damp places, became an accessible
50 material symbol for the project that linked the digital data being collected with the everyday lives
51 of those experiencing damp. It was designed to be as attractive and easy as possible to use.
52 Notably, the intention here was not to make the infrastructure invisible to citizens, rather, tenants
53 in the five households involved in the testing phase were trained so that they all understood how
54 the technology worked and what data it was collecting. Through the co-construction of a data
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 agreement, issues related to data ownership were experimented with, allowing different voices to
4 be heard in the process, and raising awareness of the various concerns of all of those involved
5 from the sensor developers, through to the landlords, municipality officers and residents
6 themselves.
7

8
9 In terms of the sustainability of the work a national sustainable energy organisation worked
10 alongside 16 people to support them to become ‘Community Damp Busters’ - a knowledgeable
11 local team of people able to support others with damp issues in their neighbourhood.
12 Interestingly, the focus of the action very firmly moved away from the frog sensors and their
13 deployment to the issue itself. As the KWMC project manager explained,
14

15
16 Although the frog became a symbol for the project the real focus is on making a
17 difference. If we had more information, like if we knew who owned the property, then
18 we could ask are these buildings fit for purpose? The key thing to keep momentum
19 going is to empower people to make changes.
20

21
22 The Created By Us Damp Busters project offers us insights into how practices of situated,
23 critical learning might be adopted with citizens on a Smart City project. This involved
24 accounting for the everyday lives and unequal relations of power, knowledge and resources in
25 the area. The approach stresses the need to provide multiple and varied opportunities for
26 participation, including those that are creative, encourage autonomy and involve linking citizens
27 into powerful processes and people in the city. Direct engagement in building technologies
28 together also has the effect of making visible technology design processes and, in particular,
29 ethical issues that may be significant barriers to the implementation and sustainability of Smart
30 City infrastructure.
31

32 33 **Conclusion** 34

35
36 The current model of learning that tends to surface in these complex Smart City partnerships
37 prioritises the technologies and the infrastructure development associated with them and
38 therefore struggles to account for the inhabitants in the area. A top down delivery mode where
39 residents are largely seen as consumers, service users and recipients of information about Smart
40 City development cannot account for the complexities inherent in the situated, historical relations
41 and lived experiences of those in the area. Instead, workshops, online materials and project
42 documentation are designed to ‘educate’ people about the benefits of smart technologies, rather
43 than engaging with their expressed concerns. The banking learning model that gained
44 prominence in the Mimeo project, imagines citizens as needing to learn how to use digital
45 infrastructure and tools that have been designed by others to ‘improve’ their lives, it
46 homogenises citizens and their learning, sometimes ignoring the role of citizens entirely. The
47 approach is one where either the digital operates as an ‘invisible’ layer working behind the
48 scenes in citizens’ daily lives or is one where citizens might need to be taught digital ‘skills’ in
49 order to enable them to use the technologies, with no critical engagement. Although a practical
50 approach to getting things done on the project to the satisfaction of funders, and for the
51 development of new smart infrastructure, this approach cannot take account of the diversity
52 within community and assumes a passive ‘empty’ citizen upon whom a digital layer can be
53 easily overlaid. This negates the ongoing everyday lives of citizens and the complexity of the
54
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 negotiations necessary in building and embedding smart infrastructure. In addition, the focus is
4 on a narrow set of digital skills needed in order to make the smart technologies work and deeper
5 critical engagement around some of the key ethical challenges in building a smart city together is
6 considered out of the reach of ordinary citizens.
7

8
9 Despite a genuine desire to include citizens in the Mimeo project it remained difficult for the
10 team to do so. Writing a successful, ambitious and innovative bid had created a constant tension
11 running through the project in balancing the roll-out of the technological infrastructure with what
12 could be delivered on the ground that might be of benefit to local residents. Our argument in this
13 paper is that in order to include citizens in Smart City planning much greater reflexivity is
14 needed around models of learning, and assumptions about citizens and their capacities and
15 interests. In particular, early discussion of different learning models and the collaborative design
16 of developmental practices with all partners is necessary.
17
18

19 Our argument is that a model of learning that foregrounds collaborative, creative, critical
20 learning for all involved is necessary in order to include citizens in powerful urban design
21 processes. This requires significant commitment from policy makers, technology companies,
22 funders and citizens themselves and the work needs to be brought out of the silos of sub projects
23 and ‘engagement activities’ and into mainstream Smart City policy and practice. It is only in this
24 way that we can begin to weaken the hold of neoliberal, technocratic approaches in the critical
25 imaginations of those involved in smart urban planning (Cardullo and Kitchin, 2018; Joss et al,
26 2017).
27
28
29
30

31 **References**

- 32 Balestrini, M., Creus, J., Masfarre, G. & Canigearal, A. (2016) A Future in Common:
33 Understanding and Framing Commoning Strategies for Bristol Accessed, June 2018
34 https://marabalesdotcom.files.wordpress.com/2016/01/bristol-approach_phase2_d2_v6.pdf
35
36
37 Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (2012). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*.
38 Routledge.
39
40 Batty, M., Axhausen, K. W., Giannotti, F., Pozdnoukhov, A., Bazzani, A., Wachowicz, M., &
41 Portugali, Y. (2012). Smart cities of the future. *The European Physical Journal Special*
42 *Topics*, 214(1), pp.481-518.
43
44
45 Bibby, T. (2009) 'How do children understand themselves as learners? Towards a learner-centred
46 understanding of pedagogy' *Pedagogy, Culture & Society* 17 (1): 41- 55
47
48 Bion, W. (1984) *Learning from Experience*, London: Karnac Books
49
50
51 Buckingham, D. (2006) Is there a Digital Generation? In Buckingham, D & Willet, R. (eds.)
52 *Digital Generations: Children, young people and digital media*.
53
54 Campbell, T. (2012). Beyond Smart Cities: How Cities Network. *Learn and Innovate*,
55 *Earthscan, New York (NY)*.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Caprotti, F., Cowley, R., Flynn, A., Joss, S., & Yu, L. (2016). Smart-Eco Cities in the UK:
5 Trends and City Profiles 2016. *University of Exeter (SMART-ECO Project): Exeter, UK.*
6

7
8 Cardullo, P. and Kitchin, R. (2017). Being a 'citizen' in the smart city: up and down the scaffold
9 of smart citizen participation in Dublin, Ireland. *GeoJournal*, pp.1-13.
10

11 Cardullo, P. & Kitchin, R. (2018) Smart Urbanism and smart citizenship: The neoliberal logic of
12 'citizen-focussed smart cities in Europe. *The Programmable City Working paper 39*,
13 <http://progcity.maynoothuniversity.ie/>
14

15
16 Cowley, R., Joss, S., & Dayot, Y. (2018). The smart city and its publics: insights from across six
17 UK cities. *Urban Research & Practice*, 11(1), pp. 53-77.
18

19 Deakin, M., & Al Waer, H. (2011). From intelligent to smart cities. *Intelligent Buildings*
20 *International*, 3(3), pp.140-152.
21

22
23 DXC.technology (2016) How smart cities can engage citizens and bridge the Digital Divide.
24 Retrieved March, 2018 [https://blogs.dxc.technology/2016/10/27/smart-cities-need-smart-](https://blogs.dxc.technology/2016/10/27/smart-cities-need-smart-citizens-and-that-starts-with-education/)
25 [citizens-and-that-starts-with-education/](https://blogs.dxc.technology/2016/10/27/smart-cities-need-smart-citizens-and-that-starts-with-education/)
26

27 Ellis, C. (2007) Telling secrets, revealing lives relational ethics in research with intimate others.
28 *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13 (1) 3-29
29

30
31 Erstad, O., & Sefton-Green, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Identity, community, and learning lives in the*
32 *digital age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
33

34 European Union: Market Place of the European Innovation Partnership on Smart Cities and
35 Communities (2017) *Inclusive smart cities: A European manifesto on citizen engagement*.
36 Retrieved October 19th, 2018,
37 [https://eu-smartcities.eu/sites/default/files/2017-09/EIP-](https://eu-smartcities.eu/sites/default/files/2017-09/EIP-SCC%20Manifesto%20on%20Citizen%20Engagement%20%26%20Inclusive%20Smart%20Cities_0.pdf)
38 [SCC%20Manifesto%20on%20Citizen%20Engagement%20%26%20Inclusive%20Smart%20Citi](https://eu-smartcities.eu/sites/default/files/2017-09/EIP-SCC%20Manifesto%20on%20Citizen%20Engagement%20%26%20Inclusive%20Smart%20Cities_0.pdf)
39 [es_0.pdf](https://eu-smartcities.eu/sites/default/files/2017-09/EIP-SCC%20Manifesto%20on%20Citizen%20Engagement%20%26%20Inclusive%20Smart%20Cities_0.pdf)
40
41

42
43 Eynon, R. (2015) The quantified self for learning: critical questions for education, *Learning,*
44 *Media and Technology* 40 (4) pp.407-411.
45

46 Fenwick, T., & Edwards, R. (2010). *Actor-network theory in education*. Routledge.
47

48
49 Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 1968. Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. New York:
50 Herder.
51

52 Gabrys, J. (2014). Programming environments: environmentality and citizen sensing in the smart
53 city. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 32(1), 30-48
54
55

1
2
3
4 Gee, J. (2000) Chapter 3 : Identity as an Analytic Lens for Research in Education. *Review of*
5 *research in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X025001099>
6

7 Hambleton, R. (2014). *Leading the inclusive city: Place-based innovation for a bounded planet*.
8 Bristol: Policy Press.
9

10 Harvey, D. (2000). *Spaces of hope* (Vol. 7). Univ of California Press
11

12
13 Hollands, R. G. (2008). Will the real smart city please stand up? Intelligent, progressive or
14 entrepreneurial?. *City*, 12(3), 303-320.
15

16
17 Hollands, R. G. (2015). Critical interventions into the corporate smart city. *Cambridge Journal*
18 *of Regions, Economy and Society*, 8(1), 61-77.
19

20 Ingold, T. (2013). *Design and anthropology*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd..
21

22
23 Jenkins, H., with Purushotma, R., Robison, A.J. Weigel, M., and Clinton, K. (2007) Confronting
24 the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century (Part One) *Nordic*
25 *Journal of Digital Culture*, 1:2, pp. 23–33
26

27 Joss, S., Cook, M., & Dayot, Y. (2017). Smart cities: Towards a new citizenship regime? A
28 discourse analysis of the British Smart City Standard. *Journal of Urban Technology*, 24(4), 29-
29 49.
30

31 Kitchin, R. (2014). The real-time city? Big data and smart urbanism. *GeoJournal*, 79(1), 1-14.
32

33
34 Knowle West Media Centre (2016) *The Bristol Approach in action: working together to create*
35 *tech for the common good*. Accessed June 2018
36 https://issuu.com/knowlewestmedia/docs/bristol_approach_booklet_issu
37

38 McFarlane, C. (2011) *Learning the City: knowledge and translocal assemblage*. Oxford: Wiley
39 Blackwell.
40

41
42 McFarlane, C. & Söderström, O. (2017) On alternative smart cities, *City*, 21:3-4, 312-328, DOI:
43 10.1080/13604813.2017.1327166
44

45 Miller, D., (2010). *Stuff*. Cambridge: Polity.
46

47
48 Nam, T., & Pardo, T. A. (2011, June). Conceptualizing smart city with dimensions of
49 technology, people, and institutions. In *Proceedings of the 12th annual international digital*
50 *government research conference: digital government innovation in challenging times* (pp. 282-
51 291). ACM.
52

53 Potter, J. & McDougall, J. (2017) *Digital Media, Culture and Education: Theorising third space*
54 *literacies*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3
4 Scott, D., & Russell, L. (2005). *Researching voluntary and community action: The*
5 *potential of qualitative case studies*. York: The Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

6
7
8 Selwyn, N. & Facer, K. (2013) *The Politics of Education and Technology*. London: Palgrave
9 Macmillan.

10
11 Söderström, O., Paasche, T., & Klauser, F. (2014). Smart cities as corporate
12 storytelling. *City*, 18(3), pp. 307-320.

13
14
15 Star, S. L. (1999). The ethnography of infrastructure. *American behavioral scientist*, 43(3), pp.
16 377-391.

17
18 Storni, C., Binder, T., Linde, P., & Stuedahl, D. (2015) Designing things together: intersections
19 of co-design and actor-network theory, *CoDesign*, 11:3-4, 149-151, DOI:
20 10.1080/15710882.2015.1081442)

21
22
23 Street, B. (2003). What's "new" in New Literacy Studies? Critical approaches to literacy in
24 theory and practice. *Current issues in comparative education*, 5(2), 77-91.

25
26 Street, B. (2013) (2nd edition) *Social Literacies: Critical Approaches to Literacy in Development,*
27 *Ethnography and Education*. Routledge: Oxon

28
29
30 Tapscott, D. (1998). *Growing up digital: The rise of the net generation*. New York: McGraw-
31 Hill.

32
33 Up Our Street (2017) *Understanding wellbeing through community research in Easton and*
34 *Lawrence Hill (Research Report)*. Accessed, June 2018:
35 <https://upourstreet.org.uk/project/486/wellbeing-research-project>