reflection
This chapter reflects on three topics: the project, education and personal process. Regarding the project, it will reflect on the defined values and its work-definitions that have been set in the theoretical essay written at the start of the project. Regarding education, it will reflect on the added value of a double degree. And finally, regarding the personal process, it will reflect on the changed attitude towards, and experience of, residential diversity.

10.1 The Project and its values

In November 2018 a theoretical essay has been written as a first step in the thesis design process. The theoretical essay can found in “Appendix I” on page 302. The essay describes the spatial and social conditions in the city district Delfshaven and analyse the urban developments on the basis of values of the just city index (Griffin, 2018). The essay concluded with three values: access, connectivity and recognition, and defined a working-definition for each value. The value of connectivity is ultimately treated as the core part of this thesis. The thesis has furthermore no longer focused on the values of access and recognition. However, the values have been kept in mind. This paragraph reflects to which extent the values, and its working-definitions, have been consciously or unconsciously met in the design and its process.

Connectivity

The work-definition of the value of connectivity in the theoretical essay, was: (a) places on borders for encountering diversity in culture and lifestyle, (b) spatial network integration of areas within the city fabric. In the end this research defined the value of connectivity more broadly, however, part a and b are seen as design goals that have been included and achieved in the design. The work-definition highlighted above, presents a spatial interpretation of the value. This work-definition is seen as met, especially in relation to what is possible to achieve within the urban design discipline. During the process, however, there have been moments of doubts regarding the capacity of space to facilitate connectivity in diversity. A value reaches much further than its own discipline. Therefore, education and work have been seen as of high importance as well.
Access
The value of access has been defined in the theoretical essay as, *access: (a) to public spaces that are inclusive within the design and amenities for the diversity of users, providing residents with agency to act on behalf of their own interest, (b) to housing, including the ability to compete for housing in the community of choice, (c) to jobs and associated education, to succeed in terms of economic prosperity for all residents.*
The first part, part a, was considered in this research, and further developed in the design principles. In this thesis, this is also seen as a characteristic of *connectivity.* The other two parts of the value definition are not part of the design principles. Although, part b, did influence the research, especially in the analysis phase. The urban conditions of the case study area and its potential gentrification processes have been analysed. These potential developments are taken into account in the applied design, especially in the zoom-out scale. Thus, it has been taken into consideration, however the problems caused by these developments, are not tackled. The c part of the working-definition was not tackled, as, now, at the end of the research, this is seen as something outside the scope of the urban planner.

Recognition
The value of recognition is a value that has highly influenced the thesis. It motivated to write the first essay “2.2 [A]” on page 49, ‘Approaching residential diversity.’ The essay answered the question: “How to approach residential diversity, taking ethical considerations into account, so it is suitable for urban analysis and design?”
In the theoretical essay the value of recognition was defined as: *(a) an inclusive approach to different opinion, attitudes and behaviours and a non pre-given or singular view on identity, (b) an understanding of the lived experience of residents and inclusion of this understanding in urban environmental design.* Both parts of this definition are seen as met. The first part is extensively described, with a theoretical search and support, in the perspective chapter. It has formed the basis of the ambiguous perspective, as explained in design mechanism “E – Switching perspective” on page 243, named the *ambiguous perspective.* The value of recognition also functions as the foundation of the described forms of connectivity, that incorporates the ‘non pre-given or singular view on identity’. Part b of the definition, formed the motivation to execute fieldwork to a comprehensive level, and to aim for a strong incorporation of these found lived experiences into the applied design.
10.2 Added value of double degree

This paragraph reflects on the added value of doing a double master degree. It reflects on the two masters: Master of Urbanism and Master of Science Communication. The reflection highlights five important notions, labelled as A to D.

(A) Mentor perspectives
Multiple educational perspectives have enriched the integrated thesis, this was, especially, experienced in the mentor sessions. During the 3-year master program, courses of each master were achieved separately. This thesis, however, is done by an integration of both disciplines. In doing so, the development of the thesis was experienced as a broadening of knowledge of both studies, including interesting cross-fertilizations, as described in the discussion chapter “9.2 Opportunities for cross-pollination” on page 272. The four mentors all have commented differently on the topic, which has greatly enriched it. During the process it turned out that everyone understood the research topic, however the mentors were all focused on other aspects of the subject. This has further broadened the topic.

(B) Appreciation of science
To be honest, at the start of the master, the appreciation of science and technology was not so high. This was mainly caused by the view on architecture and urbanism as neither science or technology. Additionally, societal topics seems to be way more interesting than scientific or technical topics. However, discussions held during the master have changed these thoughts. In the science communication master, thinking about the creation of science and technology in relation to society, showed that it is all interconnected.

(C) Curiosity has increased
Something unexpected is that the science communication triggered the development of a curious attitude. This was mainly triggered by other students that do a double degree, but a different combination. It brought me in contact with ‘experts’ who are motivated and passionate about their expertise. The science communication master provides an opportunity to learn and collaborate with these multiple, but diverse ‘experts’. The urbanism master made it possible to further specialize knowledge and
skills, and to become ‘an expert’ myself, and share knowledge on the built environment. An individual can only absorb in-depth knowledge on a few topics. Other students, and the learning environment, offered contact with in-depth knowledge of other scientific fields, and with that triggered curiosity.

(D) Increased understanding of complexity
The lessons learned from both masters are related to complexity. Both approach complexity completely different, and both contribute to an increased understanding of complexity. Urbanism teaches to understand all aspects that influence an urban development, from politics, to economy, to human behaviour. These lessons helped to keep considering multiple factors, which should also be taken into account in practice. Science communication, on the other hand, helped to research complexity by actually making the topic and observation’s scale very small. This helped to understand different topics to an in-depth level, and to make it suitable for a proper research. And, that precisely points out the difference: urbanism prepared me for understanding complexity in practice related to urban development, and science communication helped me to understand, and design for, complexity with a research attitude.

10.3 Personal process

Personally, in daily life when present in the streets of Delft or Rotterdam, I experienced ‘social tension in diversity’, as it is so extensively present in the media. The many writings regarding polarization and politics of extreme right and extreme left, formed my perspective on diversity in the Dutch society. This also formed the motivation to do extensive research regarding analysing diversity in a justice way and the motivation to do a lot of fieldwork.

The research, and the fieldwork helped to let go of the ‘fear of labelling’, and to be able to embrace human-beings in their complex form. First of all, by understanding the ambiguous perspective (as described in design mechanism “E – Switching perspective” on page 243) that promotes to perceive individuals as human beings with multiple identification. This was experienced in fieldwork as true, or as Wessendorf (2010) states: ‘”The more people I met, the more difficult I have found easy
labelling and categorization.” (p. 20) Secondly, in contradiction to the previous notion, conversation with Reijndorp helped to formulate an unambiguous perspective on diversity – embracing the environmental perspective. Reijndorp explained that everyone is a practicing sociologist (‘praktiserende socioloog’ in Dutch), as we all divide people into groups based on their appearance. All of this helped to be more at peace with my own hier, and to explore with open arms, the daar. So, it provided me a broader way of being (een ruimere manier van zijn). It is in line with Latour thoughts (as explained in Wessendorf, 201) on the notion that the author will influence the research, and the research will influence the author.
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