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Main points of advice and my conclusion from them, previous P4 (May 2014)

- The place of stakeholders in the perspective of the thesis is clear, but show that through precise mapping of the relation between space and stakeholders.
- Be more precise in question and approach, and take a position before the summer. Start from where you want to end, the argumentation can follow.
- The connection between participatory approach and both bottom up initiatives and the inclusion of the needs of local population needs be clearer and supported with better arguments.

“I will start the constraining of the thesis by stating my position as it is now, which I’ll support through images of the output, its context and an argumentation for it. The latter focusses on the capacities of stakeholders and their relations, which gets supported by a mapping of the spatial situation of Wihdaat. Furthermore, I will make a stronger divide between the research and the planning/design part. The first supports the core of the second, with the emphasis of the thesis on the output.”

Advances since the previous P4

Limiting the scope of the thesis and strengthening its structure has been the main concern since May. Although I planned to start with taking a position and redefine the scope and structure of the thesis from there, it turned out to work the other way around. I have redrawn the spatial problem of Wihdaat and planning answers several times, which allowed me to narrow the scope down to a more feasible assignment. In this process, the links to the analysis and theory became clearer with each round of redrawing. From there, the scope of and the links between the different parts of the thesis became easier to narrow down, giving more structure to the thesis. Once the design process became a logical consequence of the planning work done, all the pieces began falling in their place. In the end, reflecting on this and comparing it with work of fellow students allowed a better insight in my position. By now, the different parts of the thesis’ structure and the way they work together have been defined quite precisely. However, the degree to which they logically speak for themselves still needs to be improved. So finally, the communication of the concept I worked with was and is the last major challenge.

As to the points of advice in May, those proved to be insightful, although in a different way I understood back then. They correctly identified the actual core of the project and the gap between it and what I thought to be the core. As this was one of the major obstacles, it took quite some time to recognize this. Like the position, it turned out that producing work in the context, rather than conceptualizing, was the best way to build and test my understanding of the core of the thesis. From that work, I was able to redefine and sharpen my overall understanding of the project. More specifically, the points are met, but to varying degrees of clarity. As such, they can still be helpful in finalizing the project.