
TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| METHODOLOGY | 2 |
| STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT | 6 |
| | |
| CHAPTER ONE. DEMOCRATIZATION, TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE SHOP WORK: THE EXAMPLE OF THE DTU SCIENCE SHOP | 9 |
| INTRODUCTION | 9 |
| 1. THE SCIENCE SHOP MOVEMENT | 12 |
| 1.1. Origins and development of the movement in the Netherlands | 12 |
| 1.2. Spreading to other countries and building up the Living Knowledge network | 13 |
| 1.3. An attempt of classifying the diversity of science shops | 20 |
| 2. SCIENCE SHOP WORK AND THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY | 24 |
| 2.1. Perspectives on science shops and democracy – the strong democracy discourse | 24 |
| 2.2. Critiques of the role of science shops in the democratization of science and technology | 27 |
| 2.3. Science shops versus other forms of participation in science and technology | 29 |
| 3. THE SCIENCE SHOP OF THE TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF DENMARK | 35 |
| 3.1. The DTU Science Shop's trajectory | 37 |
| 3.1.1. The beginnings: the Interdisciplinary Center | 37 |
| 3.1.2. The conversion to a department-based science shop | 40 |
| 3.1.3. The Science Shop's position at the DTU today | 42 |
| 3.1.4. The DTU Science Shop's perspective on its work today | 46 |
| 3.2. The parallel evolution of the DTU urban ecology research and teaching unit | 47 |
| 3.3. The day-to-day work of the Science Shop | 50 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 53 |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| CHAPTER TWO. THE DEMOCRATIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DTU SCIENCE SHOP'S SELECTION OF REQUESTS | 55 |
| INTRODUCTION | 55 |
| 1. DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE 'STRONG DEMOCRACY' PERSPECTIVE AND THE DTU SCIENCE SHOP'S PRACTICE | 56 |
| 1.1. The selection of requests is a complex task | 56 |
| 1.2. An apparent strong democracy perspective | 58 |
| 1.3. The selection criteria in action | 61 |
| 1.3.1. The range of accepted groups and issues | 61 |
| 1.3.2. The re-configuration of requests into demands | 65 |
| 1.3.3. Zooming in: The community groups of two research processes in the light of the criteria... .. | 69 |
| 1.4. Preliminary conclusions on the democratic significance of the selection criteria | 80 |
| 2. SCIENCE SHOP WORK AS 'ISSUE ARTICULATION' | 81 |
| 2.1. Issues as occasions for democratic dynamics..... | 81 |
| 2.2. The DTU Science Shop's qualification work in the light of issue articulation..... | 85 |
| 2.2.1. The demand-driven approach as a mechanism for getting access to issue-publics dynamics | 85 |
| 2.2.2. The qualification of demands: the extraction of the public from the private | 87 |
| 2.3. Guiding questions for the analysis of the DTU Science Shop's promotion of community-based research..... | 89 |
| 2.3.1. The democratic effort involved in community-based research | 90 |
| 2.3.2. The mediating role of the DTU Science Shop | 90 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 91 |
| CHAPTER THREE. A COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH PROCESS FACILITATED BY THE DTU SCIENCE SHOP: THE VANLØSE COLLABORATION | 93 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| INTRODUCTION | 93 |
| 1. THE FIRST STEPS AND THE MEDIATING ROLE OF THE SCIENCE SHOP | 94 |
| 1.1. The transformation of a request into a 'demand' and a project definition | 94 |
| 1.1.1. The configuration of a first demand and a first project | 94 |
| 1.1.2. The definition of a second project | 98 |
| 1.2. Analysis of the definition process from the perspective of issue articulation | 103 |
| 2. 'INDEPENDENT AND PARTICIPATORY'? THE RESEARCH PROCESS | 106 |
| 2.1. Following the steps of student-driven research | 106 |
| 2.1.1. Reviewing theory and Copenhagen's planning strategy | 107 |
| 2.1.2. Adopting a theoretical position | 110 |
| 2.1.3. Analyzing the problem – and reducing it to a manageable complexity | 111 |
| 2.1.4. Elaborating proposals with 'inspirations' from the residents and the community group..... | 113 |
| 2.2. The research process from the perspective of issue articulation | 119 |
| 3. ASSESSING 'IMPACTS' | 125 |
| 3.1. Research outcomes: actors and collaborations..... | 125 |
| 3.1.1. The students: learning about their discipline..... | 126 |
| 3.1.2. The supervisor: a contact to 'reality' | 127 |
| 3.1.3. The Science Shop's team: networking..... | 128 |
| 3.1.4. The community group: 'inspirations' for ongoing negotiations | 129 |
| 3.2. The collaboration's outcomes in terms of issue articulation | 133 |
| 4. THE EVOLUTION OF THE RESEARCH PROCESS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF ISSUE ARTICULATION | 136 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 140 |
| | |
| CHAPTER FOUR. A REFLEXIVE ANALYSIS OF A FIRST-HAND EXPERIENCE IN COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH: THE TALLER DE BARRIS | 141 |
| INTRODUCTION | 141 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 1. THE BEGINNINGS: BRINGING TOGETHER DIFFERENT TRAJECTORIES IN A 'PILOT PROJECT'..... | 143 |
| 1.1. The constitution of the project..... | 143 |
| 1.2. The Taller de Barris as a pilot project: combining two issues?..... | 147 |
| 2. PHASE 1 | 148 |
| 2.1. Establishing objectives and a working routine, exploring the district..... | 148 |
| 2.1.1. The first draft of the project definition | 148 |
| 2.1.2. The first steps of the Taller de Barris | 151 |
| 2.1.3. Confronting ideas in a participatory workshop: the 'Taller de Ideas' | 152 |
| 2.1.4. Parallel projects by students of the Universidad Politécnica de Valencia | 157 |
| 2.2. Exploring the issue potential of the Velluters district | 158 |
| 3. PHASE 2 | 162 |
| 3.1. Preparing the ground for the emergence of concrete projects | 162 |
| 3.1.1. The team grows and its expertise diversifies | 162 |
| 3.1.2. The process focuses on data gathering and its visualization | 163 |
| 3.1.3. Communicating results in a second workshop and making proposals | 166 |
| 3.1.4. The academic side of the Taller de Barris..... | 169 |
| 3.2. Visualizing the district's potential in terms of issue articulation..... | 172 |
| 4. PHASE 3 | 174 |
| 4.1. Focusing on one project and handing the process over..... | 174 |
| 4.1.1. A concrete opportunity becomes the group's focal point | 174 |
| 4.1.2. The relationship with the association turns conflictive | 177 |
| 4.1.3. Setting the stage for a participatory dynamic..... | 178 |
| 4.1.4. After the Taller de Barris: uses and open threads..... | 181 |
| 4.2. An open-ended articulation..... | 183 |
| 5. A REFLEXIVE EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH PROCESS..... | 185 |
| 5.1. Adopting a reflexive approach..... | 185 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 5.2. Choices and uncertainties in issue articulation | 189 |
| 5.2.1. The issue - between definition and exploration..... | 192 |
| 5.2.2. Articulation – a co-creation of knowledge and identities? | 193 |
| 5.2.3. The identity question in the Taller de Barris | 196 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 198 |
| | |
| CHAPTER FIVE. EVALUATION FOR EXPERIMENTATION..... | 199 |
| INTRODUCTION | 199 |
| 1. SCIENCE SHOP WORK IN THE LIGHT OF DEMOCRACY | 201 |
| 1.1. Revisiting the 'strong democracy' perspective on science shop work: representation through intermediation..... | 201 |
| 1.2. No guarantee of representativity, no intermediation!..... | 205 |
| 1.3. An issue-centered democracy perspective..... | 207 |
| 1.3.1. Issues and publics instead of an abstract 'public interest' | 208 |
| 1.3.2. Collaborative research as issue articulation..... | 209 |
| 1.3.3. The science shop's role as a positioned mediator | 211 |
| 2. A FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATION: ISSUES, ARTICULATION AND MEDIATION | 213 |
| 2.1. Principles for evaluation | 216 |
| 2.2. Engaging with issues and publics..... | 217 |
| 2.2.1. Defining what counts as 'issues' | 217 |
| 2.2.2. Getting to the issues and their publics through both a demand-driven and a proactive approach | 220 |
| 2.2.3. Selecting 'good' issues and publics..... | 221 |
| 2.3. The articulation of issues and publics through collaborative research | 224 |
| 2.3.1. Framing the issue for collective exploration | 224 |
| 2.3.2. Defining confrontational expertise | 226 |
| 2.3.3. Opening while being constructive: useful results versus public-ization | 229 |
| 2.4. Being a mediator of issue articulation..... | 233 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 2.4.1. Exploring frames for critical collaborative research..... | 234 |
| 2.4.2. Delegating the articulation while staying responsible for it | 238 |
| 2.4.3. Being the promoter and the object of experimentation..... | 242 |
| 2.5. Synthesis of the dimensions of evaluation | 245 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 246 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 249 |
| REFERENCE LIST | 255 |
| APPENDICES | 271 |
| APPENDIX A - DTU SCIENCE SHOP | 273 |
| 1. LIST OF INTERVIEWS | 273 |
| 2. DOCUMENTS DTU SCIENCE SHOP | 275 |
| 2.1. Schedule for the second project of the Vanløse collaboration resulting from the start-up meeting..... | 275 |
| 2.2. Article in DTU newspaper (Plougheld, 2006) | 276 |
| APPENDIX B - TALLER DE BARRIS..... | 279 |
| 1. LIST OF INTERVIEWS / MEETINGS..... | 279 |
| 2. DOCUMENTS..... | 280 |
| 2.1. First draft of the Project..... | 280 |
| 2.2. Results of the SWOT workshop:..... | 284 |
| 2.3. A version of the matrix crossing the SWOT results with the principles of bioclimatic urbanism | 287 |
| 2.4. Working document with categories and variables defined for the data gathering | 289 |
| 2.5. Map about the equipments in the district..... | 290 |
| 2.6. A selection of further maps..... | 291 |
| 2.7. Results from the second workshop..... | 299 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 2.8. Full-sized version of figure 4.7 | 300 |
| 2.9. Full-sized version of figure 4.8 | 301 |