



NTNU



The smart city and the engagement of publics

Thomas Edward Sutcliffe, PhD student,
Department of Interdisciplinary Studies of Culture

+CITYXCHANGE

(<http://cityxchange.eu>)

***“The smart city as a sociotechnical imaginary –
Translating visions of the future into local networks
and interpretations of smartness”***



([Smart Pisek.eu](http://SmartPisek.eu))

Theory

- Sociotechnical imaginaries
- Actor-Network theory
- The sublime (Nye, 1996)

Method

- Mixed methods with quantitative and qualitative interviews, and document analysis

THE SMART CITY AS A SOLUTION TO CLIMATE CHANGE

- A technical fix?
- The smart city as a sociotechnical imaginary



Understandings of smart cities in Trondheim municipality

- *“The vision for me is also very clear in terms of business development. Very closely linked to business development [...] because focus on smart city approaches gives you opportunities for business development.”*
- But also a platform and a toolbox

For whom is the smart city?

- *“Trondheim municipality and NTNU puts a lot of work into this, and it is obvious that the smart city should be an advantage for how the municipality of Trondheim works on the transition, and how the involved partners continue to work [...] **The smart city is directly for those involved as partners, the municipality and NTNU, who receive the possibility to develop projects and implement them**”*
- However...

- *“But what, then, about the citizens? If Trondheim became a smart city, **it would have consequences for how we relate to mobility day to day, our buildings through new technologies, ICT applications and solutions which we otherwise might not be exposed to [...]. Indirectly, the city's population will receive benefits through the realization of the projects of course”***

- *“Ultimately, it was pretty much taken apart due to budget issues. They (the consortium) interpreted, how shall I say, the call text a bit stricter which made them argue for that and that part might not be as important in the end. So for example citizen engagement was relatively stripped and integrated into other parts and didn’t get a clear enough profile as I had hoped”*

So, what do citizens think? I

- 7 of 60 had heard of smart cities, whereas 1 of 7 could elaborate on the term
- Scepticism regarding collection of user-data
- “Passive”-participation

So, what do citizens think? II

The five most preferred			The five least preferred		
Channel	Number of yes	Number of yes in %	Channel	Number of yes	Number of yes in %
1. Social media	55	91.7 %	1. City book	21	35 %
2. Web pages	53	88.3 %	2. E-mail	28	46.7 %
3. Via an app	50	83.3 %	3. Advertisement	37	61.7 %
4. Newspapers	50	83.3 %	4. Public hearing	38	63.3 %
5. Work place	48	80 %	5. Workshops	40	66,7 %

Table 4: List of most and least preferred channels to be informed and engaged with.

Engaging the public on a level beyond flash, and what to do next?

- Smart cities are framed differently
- A need for bridging the gap?
- RRI (Responsible Research & Innovation) as a solution?

Thank you for your attention!

Contact information:

- Thomas Edward Sutcliffe
- E-mail: thomas.e.sutcliffe@ntnu.no